



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Monday, 2nd March 2020

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

Volume 9, No. 9

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

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

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

St Sampson

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

The Vale

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

The Castel

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

The West

Deputies A. H. Brouard, E. A. McSwiggan,
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

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

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

Absent at the Evocation

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur), R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller);
Deputy P. R. Le Pelley; Deputies, J. A. B. Gollop and C. P. Meerveld (*relevés à 9h 42*);

A. C. Dudley-Owen, (*relevée à 11h 02*);

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and A. Snowdon (*absent de l'île*)

Business transacted

Evocation	645
Statement	645
Global coronavirus situation – Statement by the President of the Committee <i>for</i> Health & Social Care	645
Billet d'État V	648
Requête	648
X. Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Debate continued	648
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.48 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>683</i>
Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Debate continued	684
Procedural – Extension of sitting hours and into next day if necessary – Propositions carried	686
Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Debate continued	687
Procedural	736
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 6.58 p.m.</i>	<i>737</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Senior Deputy Greffier

EVOCATION

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

STATEMENT

Global coronavirus situation – Statement by the President of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, although you might think that the most pressing thing is this education debate, globally you may have noticed that front-page news has become the situation relating to the coronavirus and accordingly I have given permission to the President of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care, Deputy Soulsby, to make a Statement at this time, and I am going to interpose it because it is important.

So Deputy Soulsby, please.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, firstly I would like to thank you for allowing me to give this update to the Assembly today regarding the Bailiwick's response to the global coronavirus situation.

The World Health Organisation declared a global health emergency on 31st January 2020 in view of the spread of coronavirus outside of mainland China, especially in those countries with weaker health systems. On Friday, 28th February, that is last Friday, the threat level was raised to 'very high'.

Sir, as Members are aware, the situation regarding the virus, which causes the disease COVID-19, is evolving rapidly. Ten days ago the situation was largely contained to mainland China. The situation has now changed markedly and the recent increase of cases in northern Italy creates increased risk and growing concern.

There have been over 89,000 confirmed cases worldwide, 9,000 of which have been outside of mainland China. There have been over 3,000 deaths, 145 outside of China. Sixty-eight countries and territories globally have reported cases and three international hotspots of concern have been identified: South Korea, the Lombardy region of Italy and Iran.

In the UK, over 10,000 tests have been carried out with 36 confirmed cases of the disease and there is evidence over the weekend that the number of suspected and actual cases is likely to accelerate.

Locally, we have tested 63 Islanders with no positive cases to date. We are awaiting results on four cases and are working closely with the Public Health laboratory in the UK. This small number includes students and teachers who have been tested following a recent school trip near an affected area.

30 The Bailiwick's response to this evolving situation is being led by our very capable Director of Public Health, Dr Nicola Brink, and her office and is being supported by a cross-organisation team on non-clinical matters. The Committee *for* Health & Social Care has been monitoring the situation closely since early January this year.

35 Managing such a dynamic situation is challenging, but we are working with our partner agencies, including Primary Care, St John's Ambulance and the Medical Specialist Group, together with the support of business representative bodies and the public, to adopt a 'whole islands' approach.

40 An influenza pandemic has routinely been recognised as one of the Bailiwick's highest risks from an emergency planning perspective and therefore considerable effort has been invested over recent years to ensure that robust and co-ordinated plans are in place.

Members will recall the pan-Island exercise held in November of last year to test our preparedness. Health experts, emergency planners and emergency services tested our general preparedness and to update the joint Channel Islands Pandemic Flu Strategic Plan. Such an exercise, as was agreed at the time, was also totally relevant to the management of an emerging and novel respiratory tract infection.

45 As a result of this exercise, we have extensive preparedness plans in place specifically for what we are seeing with coronavirus and COVID-19 disease. The focus of these plans is mitigation and reducing the risk for Islanders, as well as communicating with the public to build awareness, managing anxiety within the community and providing reassurance that we are well equipped to respond to circumstances that are changing at pace. Public Health Services have brought together the relevant specialists to provide practical advice and recommendations to ensure an informed and coordinated response to the Bailiwick's needs.

50 Sir, to provide a detailed summary of our preparedness for Members in this speech would take a considerable amount of time. However, I will provide some key highlights to demonstrate the breadth and depth of planning that has taken place:

55 Our Pre Event Assessment Team (PEAT) and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Cell (STAC) are meeting weekly, bringing together a cross section of specialists to provide practical advice and recommendations, ensuring an informed and coordinated response specific to the Bailiwick's needs. Twenty four hour access to Public Health advice has been made available to Islanders. The use of JESCC technology to establish a dedicated 24/7 call handling facility, if needed, has been developed, which will be utilised should a positive case be confirmed locally or should we start to experience high call volumes.

60 A review of local policies and pathways for testing and treatment has been undertaken to ensure preparedness of the hospital, Primary Care, and the Ambulance Service. Pathways have been developed for transporting and testing of samples for the novel coronavirus in England. On behalf of the Committee *for* Health & Social Care, I have signed an order making the disease and infection notifiable in the Bailiwick which establishes compulsory notification and quarantine.

65 Procedures have been developed in the local context for contact tracing in the event of a confirmed case of novel coronavirus infection. A dedicated expert group has been established to consider the potential issues surrounding the cruise liner industry, with further evidence-based decisions due ahead of the forthcoming season.

70 We have had discussions with the community and voluntary sector on support for people in self-isolation if and where this may be needed. The Civil Contingency Authority has been informally briefed and arrangements have been put in place for necessary powers to be made by the CCA to help manage the outbreak should it be determined that there was an emergency situation or an emergency situation is about to be declared.

Our communications have focussed on public awareness and information, as well as providing specific guidance for health and care workers, schools and colleges, local businesses as well as Islanders planning or participating in events. Advice is also available on how to follow good respiratory and personal hygiene, with a timely reminder over the traditional cold and flu season. A dedicated page has been set up at www.gov.gg/coronavirus detailing all of the updates and information we have in one place. Sir, I would be grateful if Members could familiarise themselves with this information and note that it is updated frequently. We all have a responsibility to reassure the community of the facts. (A Member: Hear, hear.)

So, what next? Well, we continue to plan, prepare and respond where we can be proactive. Within the last seven days the situation has significantly changed and at an early stage, efforts have been expanded beyond Health & Social Care. Increased effort is now being dedicated to business continuity, supply chains and the impact on the economy and businesses should the situation escalate.

It is difficult to predict, but we need to prepare for every eventuality whilst ensuring a proportionate response. The experience gained from working across the organisation in preparing for the potential of a no-deal Brexit has helped. But we also require the collaboration, understanding and good will of businesses and the public to effectively and proactively manage this situation.

Sir, I would like to commend the work of the Director of Public Health and her office to date and the wider team, who have been working on a multitude of workstreams behind the scenes. Both the Committee for Health & Social Care and Members who would constitute the Civil Contingencies Authority, if convened, are assured by the work undertaken to date and the public should have confidence in the advice that it receives over the coming days and weeks.

Sir, our staff are trained to respond to emerging and unpredictable events and I am pleased to be able to update Members on the calm and meticulous approach that has been taken to establish our preparedness in relation to coronavirus and to give reassurance that this will continue. Recognising the ever-evolving situation, a further, more detailed briefing for States' Members is being planned for next week, with invitations due to go out later today.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you very much, Deputy Soulsby.

There is an opportunity now Members, if you wish, to ask the President any questions within the context of that Statement.

Deputy Gollop: May I and Deputy Meerveld be relevéd, please sir?

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, Deputy Gollop you can.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Mooney.

Deputy Mooney: Yes, sir.

I would just like to ask Deputy Soulsby, what is the advice given to people who are awaiting the outcome of the results of tests?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, are you able to answer that question?

Deputy Soulsby: Yes. For the individuals concerned we are asking them to self-isolate and we have given details about what self-isolation means. All that information is on the gov.gg website.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.

130 I think we are reassured and comforted by the Statement today, but how far have plans been made in the unlikely, but not impossible, event of a cruise ship coming close to Guernsey waters where one or more travellers could have been diagnosed with the virus or be showing symptoms.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

135 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, as I said in my Statement, we have a specific group looking at the whole cruise liner industry and will give more of an update next week, the second week of March, about what our intentions are.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

145 I am not sure if the President will be able to help me answer this one, but if not, perhaps she could check with the Director of Public Health. Those that have been asked to self-isolate, if they have not done so and it is actually starting to cause a problem if that is the case, is there any way of how the Director of Public Health can deal with that and are any plans for in the future if that is not the case?

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

150 **Deputy Soulsby:** Sir, yes. As I mentioned in my Statement, I have signed an order making the coronavirus both notifiable and ... so compulsory notification and quarantine, and it is particularly for those instances that we need to ensure that people are following the advice given.

155 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, thank you very much, Deputy Soulsby, for that update. I am sure Members will take on board the advice to familiarise themselves with what needs to be done and the importance of ensuring that there is a good message to all members of our community across the Bailiwick.

Billet d'État V

REQUÊTE

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

160 **The Deputy Bailiff:** We will now resume debate on the Requête – Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education. We have reached the stage now of amendment 5 and therefore I invite the proposer of that amendment, Deputy Fallaize, to speak to it.
Deputy Fallaize, please.

[Amendment 5](#)

To delete the Propositions and substitute therefor:

"1. To note that in 2018 and 2019 the States directed that secondary education in the mainstream sector shall in future be organised in two 11-18 colleges operating as a single school as the optimum model in terms of educational benefits, equality of opportunity, high quality

facilities for all students and making the best use of the funds which the States are prepared to invest in education annually.

2. To note that in September 2019 the States approved the capital investment necessary to establish two 11-18 colleges (de Saumarez College at Les Beaucamps and Victor Hugo College at Baubigny) operating as a single school (Lisia School) and also in relation to the co-location of health and care facilities at those colleges, the integration of further and on-island higher education in one institution (The Guernsey Institute) in new purpose-built facilities (at Les Ozouets), the redevelopment of La Mare de Carteret Primary School and improvements in digital infrastructure and services at schools and colleges.

3. a) To note that the reforms to secondary education are already well under way in a transition period which started in 2018 and will conclude in 2023;

b) To note that in October 2018 parents were advised where their children will be at school in every year of the transition period and thereafter and that these arrangements for students cannot be maintained unless the development of the 11-18 colleges proceeds according to the current timetable and that no credible or reliable alternative transition model for students could be put into effect without certainty about the future model of secondary education;

c) To note that the number of students in the colleges will increase gradually until there are year groups in all seven years at both colleges in the academic year 2023/24 and that the operation of the school and its colleges (including, for example, arrangements for lunch and enrichment activities and the future staff structure) is being developed iteratively and remains subject to further discussion between the Committee, the Office of the Committee, school and college leaders and teachers and support staff; and

d) To direct the Committee to ensure that decisions about the operation of the school and its colleges shall follow an improved process of consultation with teachers and support staff and that such consultation shall proceed in a way which secures the maximum possible confidence of key stakeholders.

4. a) To note that the space standards at the 11-18 colleges upon which the Committee's plans are based are the result of a rigorous independent external review of the space necessary which was commissioned by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and the Policy & Resources Committee and not insubstantial additional space which the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture considers to be desirable for the benefit of students and staff;

b) To note that stopping the reforms to secondary education approved in 2018 and 2019 would cause new and unnecessary uncertainty and disruption to many hundreds of students and deny them the benefits associated with the reforms – including broadening their curriculum offer, equality of opportunity, access to high quality facilities for all and enhanced provision for students with special educational needs and students with communication challenges – and would maintain, possibly for a lengthy period and certainly for an unidentified period, the numerous inadequacies of the current arrangements and invariably cost many millions of pounds which, if they are to be spent, would be better spent investing in educational facilities and services; and

c) To direct that as soon as possible, and after further consultation with school and college leaders and teachers and support staff, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture shall submit to the States a Policy Letter, together with any Propositions considered necessary, in which it shall set out its opinion on whether further building space should be added at the 11-18 colleges for the time when they have year groups in all seven years and in order to provide the best possible facilities which the States are prepared to fund, and in doing so the Committee shall consider space for, inter alia, recreation and social times, sport (in the case of Victor Hugo College including for students at Le Murier School), libraries and sixth forms."

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

Given the nature of this amendment, which is a 'delete and replace' amendment, I will speak quite widely on the Requête and why my Committee is asking the States to reject the Prayer of the Requête and to substitute the Propositions for the Propositions in this amendment.

Sir, you said the Requête was entitled, as it is, 'Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education'. But given its proposals it probably should be entitled, 'Not Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education', because the proposal in the Requête is not just to stop the current reforms of course, but then to send the States into a further cycle of endless reviews of other models without presenting any ideas even for which model might emerge in place of the current reforms.

Sir, my Committee considers the Requête to be unnecessary, ill-considered, damaging and destructive. The effect of the Requête would be to stop for an indeterminate period of time the transitions into one school in two 11-18 colleges which has been underway since 2018.

For many students this would remove the certainty of where they will be at school in the next academic year and in future years. It would leave them in the current configuration of four sites which is widely considered to be unsatisfactory despite the best efforts of schools and professionals to overcome its inherent weaknesses. And it would deny students the benefits of the reforms agreed by the States twice which include broadening the curriculum offer, equality of opportunity, access to high quality facilities for all, rather than only some as at present, and enhanced provision for students with special educational needs and with communication challenges.

It would be especially destructive to do this, as is the case with this Requête, without proposing any viable alternative model for secondary education, but rather taking the States back years to review models previously considered and previously rejected – and I will come back to that point in a moment. Ironically, in the case of most such models previously rejected, they were rejected by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture before the election of the current Committee, when some of the signatories of the Requête were Members of that Committee.

When the States agreed the model of one school in two 11-18 colleges, they did so after successive States and successive Education Committees had spent several years studying the advantages and disadvantages of numerous potential models for the future structure of education. Long periods of time have been spent examining four-school models, three-school models, two-school models – there is no new information to unearth. In the opinion of the Committee, it would be highly regrettable and disadvantageous for the States to stop the current reforms and direct that a different model be adopted instead. But at least clearly adopting a different model would provide some direction and before too long re-establish some certainty.

However, it would be extraordinary if the States having come into office in 2016 pledging to resolve the future structure of education above all other issues should leave office handing their successors more or less the same blank sheet of paper which they inherited four years ago. And yet that would be the practical effect of turning the Prayer of the Requête into States' Resolutions.

The States agreed the current reforms because they are the optimum model for delivering important principles on which secondary education should be founded. These include promoting the highest possible educational standards and outcomes; capturing the best of non-selective education for young people in the Islands; equality of opportunity regardless of where in the Island a student lives; providing all schools and students with high quality facilities; and, not unimportantly, making the best use of the funds the States are prepared to invest in education annually.

The reason my Committee remains fully committed to this model is because it is overwhelmingly in the best interests of the young people whose futures should be the paramount consideration in this debate.

Sir, the current reforms are in the second year of a five-year transition plan. All students and parents have known for nearly 18 months what each of their steps would be through their years of secondary education. It is almost incomprehensible that the States should want to consider stopping the reforms now and remove the certainty of the current transition plan when a clear

majority of Members have supported the reforms twice already and when the benefits of these reforms remain unchanged and when, nearly five years after this debate started, no Committee and no Member has been able to put forward a different model which would better fulfil the principles upon which we pledged to build the future of education.

220 Stopping the reforms now, with no clear idea of which other structure should be adopted instead, would be an abdication of leadership unprecedented in recent times and would greatly disadvantage young people whose futures will not be secured by another round of weakness and indecision from their Government.

225 Sir, there has been a lot of focus, and understandably so – and I will come back to this as well in a moment – on the view of teachers in the secondary sector. I think it is also important, and Deputy Dorey referred to this last week in debate on another amendment, to place some weight on the advice of those people who we pay and trust actually to run and manage and lead our education system and our education providers. And Members may remember that back in January, I think possibly the Requête ... it certainly had been trailed by then, I do not think it had yet been submitted, but nine school leaders in the secondary and further education sectors wrote to States' Members to outline their views and their advice in relation to the concept of stopping these reforms.

230 Now, I want to quote from their letter. Before I do, I want to say that of these nine school and college leaders, eight of them were appointed to senior positions in education before my Committee was elected. They advised States' Members, indeed the community, because this was an open letter to the community, as follows:

As leaders of secondary and post-16 education on the Island, it is not our place to comment on or provide a public view about the policy decisions taken by the States ... what is absolutely within our area of responsibility is the welfare of ... students and ... colleagues, who have had to endure so much uncertainty in recent years.

[...]

Guernsey has spent too long rejecting education plans whilst leaving students in buildings which are inadequate and in schools which are too small to offer a broad curriculum, with inequality built into the system.

Should there be a further delay, there will be no winners. The current uncertainty is the cause of much anxiety, tension and wasted resource. We like everyone in our profession, the politicians and the wider community, care deeply about the welfare and best interests of children, young people and students and keep them at the centre of our decision-making.

[...]

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.

[..]

Whatever comprehensive model you might have preferred originally, or if you would prefer to return to selective education, we all now need to get on and see through the decision[s] made by the States and, in so doing, provide the best secondary and post-16 education possible. We are trying to build an educational community and can do this so much more effectively with your support.

That is the clear, unambiguous advice of the school and college leaders.

240 Now, I want to come on to the financial consequences of this Requête. Deputy Meerveld, I think in debate last week, or I think it was Deputy Meerveld, certainly one of the signatories to the Requête, said that the figures which the Committee has provided in relation to the costs associated with the Requête have not been broken down. In fact, they have been broken down. They are broken down in the appendices which were released to the letter of comment we provided to the Policy & Resources Committee and which was published the week before last, and they were also made clear at the presentation to States' Members which we provided the week before last as well.

245 We are talking about writing off around about £3 million of work primarily in the development of the model associated with the current reforms since the time the States agreed them initially in January 2018. The Committee has had to provide underwriting assurances to suppliers who understandably have become concerned about what we are asking them to supply, given that the

States are now being asked to reconsider this matter again, and they are in the region of £0.5 million.

The efficiencies that can be delivered in this model we know are somewhere in the region of £2 million per year. They are actually greater than that, more than £1 million greater than that, but part of the package is to reinvest a reasonable portion of those savings back into the education system including in the provision of enrichment activities for all students, which incidentally requires additional teachers and helps us to keep the pupil-teacher ratios low as we and parents and the teachers themselves would wish.

If this model falls and the efficiency savings that are in the financial model, the revenue model for the Committee approved by this Assembly continue to be applied, those efficiencies are going to have to come from somewhere. As I say, we are talking about being able to make efficiencies and on top of that reinvest in education and employ more teachers, keeping the pupil-teacher ratio lower than it would be otherwise if this model is rejected.

The total costs or the financial impact of the Requête are estimated by officers, and the Committee has had nothing to do with putting these figures together, somewhere between £2½ million and £11 million. Now, the reason for the range, of the wide range of these figures, is because it depends on the outcome of the review that is proposed in the Requête. If the Requête succeeds and the timeline in the Requête is maintained, that is to say that the next Committee reports to the States this year, and at that moment the States reaffirm the current model, then the financial impact of the Requête will be at the lower end of the range of figures.

But let's just consider that on two grounds. First of all, it is plainly not the intention of this Requête for there to be a pause before the current reforms are then implemented. Six of the seven signatories to the Requête have vigorously, consistently, assertively campaigned for two years against this model of secondary education. Their intention is to stop it and scrap it and eventually hope – Deputy Gollop says yes, I am pleased he confirmed that as a signatory (*Laughter*) – hoping eventually that another model which nobody has yet alighted upon or been able to demonstrate has more benefits emerges.

And the timeline in this Requête is hopelessly unrealistic. If Members imagine that any work carried out by this Committee in analysing various models is not going to be accepted uncritically by the Committee which follows. Clearly, given the nature of this debate, given my Committee's commitment to the current reform, then there will be a new Committee elected in July, the States do not meet in August and the real work will begin in September.

The policy letter, in order for it to be considered in the timeline that is set out in the Requête, will have to be submitted in October. That is to resolve the whole question of the future structure of secondary and further education having considered *numerous* models. Now, our committee has obviously been working only with one model, as directed by the States, the previous Committee was considering various three-school models, but this Requête proposes an analysis of all previous models previously presented to Committees. That is a very large number of models and somehow we are meant to believe in the terms of this Requête that that Committee will start work in September and submit a policy letter on all of this in October. This is clearly a fantasy.

If this Requête is successful unamended we are heading in to a very lengthy period of review. It is not pause, it is stop. And if it achieves its ultimate intention, which is to scrap these reforms and hope that a different model emerges over the kind of longer period of time that we are obviously talking about, the financial impact is going to be towards the top end of the range of possibilities that the Committee has laid out. As I say, at its greatest point it is just over £11 million.

Now, in terms of what is set out in the Requête, because I have said I think that the terms of the Requête are unrealistic, but I accept that the signatories to the Requête obviously believe they are realistic otherwise they would not be laying it before the States. But I just say this to the signatories and particularly to those who have been most prominent in submitting and advocating for this Requête. I think, and I remember Deputy Ferbrache and other Members saying this to me when we were laying our proposals before the States two years ago, that if you are going to come along, or, sir, if Members are going to come along, and propose stopping major

strategic reforms which have been in train for the last two years, where you are already in the second year of a five-year transition plan and it is inevitably going to be significantly disruptive to a large number of young people and potentially cost millions of pounds, I think, sir, that Members who do that have got to be prepared to own the consequences of their actions. (Several Members: Hear, hear.) I think that if that succeeds today, they have got to confirm that they, as we confirmed back in January 2018, will step up to plate and lead the Committee through the consequences of the actions they are trying to visit upon it.

I will be happy to give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy Prow, Deputy Meerveld, if they wish to confirm that if they are so certain that they are right, if they are so certain that the terms of the Requête are deliverable, that they will be prepared to own the consequences of their proposals.

I will give way to Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: I can confirm that I would be willing to serve on the Committee and take forward this pause and review if that is what the Assembly desires.

Deputy Fallaize: Well, thank you, sir, I commend Deputy Meerveld for outlining what the position would be, that Deputy Meerveld would be prepared to step up to the plate and presumably lead the consequences of this Requête if it is successful and I respect him for that. But I notice that the other signatories, though there are six of them, have said no such thing.

Now, sir, I – Oh, I will give way to Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, I thank Deputy Fallaize for giving way.,

Sir, it is just to clarify that I am not standing in the next Election, otherwise if I was and I was successful I would step up to the plate.

Deputy Gollop: Members may recall that – are you giving way? – I briefly served on the former Committee when nobody else appeared to be standing (*Laughter*) and although perhaps it was a difficult time and I had many other Committee responsibilities. If circumstances went that way then I would have to consider standing, yes I would.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize, just a minute. You cannot give way to Deputy Dudley-Owen because she has not been relevéed.

Deputy Fallaize: Oh okay, sir. Okay.

Right, so I think it is very clear what the position would be, that the signatories to the Requête are saying, 'Yes, we would form a Committee'. That is of course the previous Committee. Deputy Meerveld, Deputy Lester Queripel, Deputy Gollop: that is the previous Committee which brought their considered three-school model to the States – I am not giving way to Deputy Prow because I think we have established a theme – they brought their three-school model proposals to the States after 18 months of consideration and they were rejected by the States. So I think that is what we are heading back into in the event that this Requête is successful.

Now, this Requête has been mis-sold, in my view, and I use that term advisedly, because when the signatories to the Requête have been challenged they have insisted that this Requête has nothing to do with further education. Now, I am afraid it does. The argument that they run is, 'No, there is no mention of further education in the Requête'. Well, yes, that is exactly the problem. That is why it engages further education, because the terms of the Requête direct the Committee to undertake:

a comprehensive comparison of the structure and implementation of the ... [current model] with other viable models of non-selective educational delivery in Guernsey previously presented to and considered by the Committee ...

Now, those models include models in which the Guernsey Institute in its current concept is just simply ... you just cannot fit it. So for example, the model which was put forward by the previous Committee, which is now offering itself for re-election, included a model in further education which split the College of FE in half and put its provision into two separate institutions. That model would be back on the table under the terms of this Requête.

Another model previously considered is the bells-and-whistles tertiary college model where all sixth form studies and vocational and technical provision are in the same organisation. That model would be back on the table.

Now, no Committee would be able to continue with the reforms of the Guernsey Institute in its current concept and according to its current timeline if other models were back on the table and being considered which did not include the Guernsey Institute in that form. That is how this Requête affects further education. If it is successful and if the terms of this Requête are pursued as set out, the integration of the Guernsey Institute, the development of the Guernsey Institute, will have to be stopped in the same way that the reforms to secondary education will have to be stopped. I think it is important that the States recognises that is a consequence of this Requête.

Sir, as I said, the transition plan for students would be seriously disrupted. Now, it is easy to talk in terms of transition plans, but that is a bit Government-speak. So to try and bring it down to a more human level and capture the effects, they include these. Next year parents and children who are currently in Year 5 – so this is in 18 months' time, and they have known this for the last 18 months – they are expecting to in Year 7 to be admitted to St Sampson's, the Victor Hugo, or Les Beaucamps de Sausmarez, with no intake at Les Varendes and no intake at La Mare de Carteret. The only way that they can continue to ... or that they can enter those two schools, as they have been advised 18 months ago, is for the current reforms to continue and for the current timetable to continue. If not, they will have to be advised that they will be admitted to other schools. But this is where it becomes very complicated because if you do not know where your end point is, how do you put in place a transition plan?

How will the next Committee, I mean not after the Election but next month, how will the Committee decide what the admission arrangement should be for the children who are now going to have their admission disrupted when that Committee will not know what the end point is the States are trying to get to?

Under the current transition plan the last set of students leave La Mare de Carteret in two years; and we know the condition of La Mare de Carteret. My predecessors have been standing before the States proposing redevelopments of La Mare de Carteret for many years. It is 20 years since the need either to close or redevelop La Mare de Carteret has been accepted by almost everybody and yet there are still students there.

Now, under our transition model we have had the last Year 7 intake ... sorry, we will have the last Year 7 intake at La Mare de Carteret this September. If this Requête is successful the likelihood, I suggest, is that there will be intakes there indefinitely with no prospect of redevelopment or serious major refurbishment that would change the experience, at least as far as the facilities are concerned, of the students going to that school.

There are also problems in higher year groups if the transition model is disrupted. The transition model was put in place on the advice of the school leaders. The current Year 7, which is the first non-selective year group, under the terms of our reforms, when they make their GCSE choices they will be in the larger year groups which will give them the widest possible choice and the greatest opportunity. If the reforms are halted or stopped that will not be possible and the likelihood is they will have to continue in much smaller year groups and they will not have the range of opportunities or they will not all have the same range of opportunities.

There is also a problem, if the reforms are stopped and then restarted, with the students who are currently at the Grammar School because in the academic year 2022-23 it is to run with only the selective Year 11 cohort and a Year 13 cohort, that is the senior A-level/IB year and the senior GCSE year. Now, if there is a stop in the way is suggested in this Requête there will be a difficult choice facing the next Committee, which will be either leave the non-selective Year 11 cohort at

Les Varendes out of the new system, that is the non-selective year, just leave them there outside of the two 11-18 colleges, or split the cohort between – the sixth form cohort – between Years 12 and 13 on to two sites, which clearly would not be remotely desirable. So these are the kind of practical affects.

Now, this Requête does not refer to those at all. Not only is there no proposal for how to deal with the disruption to the transition model, not only are there no ideas for how it might be approached, it is not even mentioned in the Requête. It is as if the signatories to the Requête believe that it would be possible just to carry on without any kind of disruption to students. Obviously any delay means that students at La Mare de Carteret and the College of Further Education are required to continue in wholly inadequate facilities for many years longer than they should be.

Sir, the reason, as I said, why my Committee is asking the States to allow ... I will give way to Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Deputy Fallaize, thank you for giving way.

I am just intrigued. Much has been made of this depth and breadth. Now, my daughter is taking 11 GCSEs next year, one of them happens to be Russian which she is just doing separately. What is the breadth that she is actually missing? She is taking all of the ones, the exams, that she has to and she has got seven or eight different ones. I am struggling to understand the idea that Education keep saying that for some reason there are GCSEs or depth or breadth that she is missing, because that seems an awful lot of GCSEs to me.

Deputy Fallaize: Okay, I will deal with that issue of inequality now.

The fact is that the current curriculum varies widely across the four schools. It was explored to some extent in debate last week that there has been, there is, a drawing together of the specifications. So where schools different schools offer the same, or there is a demand for the same, subjects they are using the same exam specifications. We are going to be able to achieve that. But we still have vast inequality in what is actually being studied at the four schools.

Now, that is partly because of constraints on what can be offered and it is partly because of demand – relatively low demand. So if you have a situation where there are 16 students who want to study something across four sites, it might not be possible to run it economically with four students on each site. It might be possible to run it economically with eight students on both of two sites. The Committee has already published information which demonstrates the differences in choices and opportunities across the mainstream secondary schools.

Deputy Inder – I am replying directly now to Deputy Inder's give way point. We published some examples: at La Mare de Carteret and Les Beaucamps, French is the only language offered at GCSE, whereas other GCSE languages have been offered at the Grammar School and St Sampson's; Spanish is studied only at the Grammar School, and this is not, incidentally, because it has been a Grammar School. It is because its size and the sixth form provision provides it with more flexibility to offer more courses lower down the school. Psychology is now available only at the Grammar School; computer science is studied at the Grammar School and St Sampson's but in one year group only at Les Beaucamps and La Mare; GCSE business studies is available at the Grammar School and St Sampson's, but something different is studied at La Mare and Les Beaucamps. In addition, recently GCSE geography could not be put on at La Mare de Carteret because there was no teacher. These things do not need to happen in larger schools with larger year groups and larger and more resilient staff teams in departments.

A previous attempt to make available more subjects to more students through federated courses, such as GCSE psychology, led to poorer student outcomes and were judged by many teachers to be ineffective. Federating courses at GCSE level, which is the only way of trying to get around the narrowness of the offer at Key Stage 4 if you try and do it in four sites – and remember, this Requête is proposing to continue with four sites indefinitely – but federated courses do not have a happy history.

Science is delivered in a range of ways. Individual subject specialists teach Triple Science at the Grammar School. More recently, Triple Science has been studied at some of the high schools but not always delivered by three separate specialist teachers. Double Award Science is taught in several different ways across the four schools and at St Sampson's some students have completed Key Stage 4 with only a Single Science qualification. These are not the fault of our schools, they are *our* fault as a Government for requiring schools to operate despite their best efforts in a structure that is significantly compromised.

This lack of parity across our schools is unacceptable and there is nothing we can do about it unless we press ahead with our current reforms to create larger year groups and larger schools with larger and more resilient teams of staff across all subjects. In the view of our Committee, we cannot have a postcode lottery. It cannot be acceptable that a 15-year-old who lives in one part of the Island has very different opportunities at school to his or her counterpart in another part of the Island who may share the same subject interests and aptitude.

So the reason that my Committee remains committed to these reforms is because of their significant benefits. I want to spend a few moments referring to them because clearly that is what is set out in the terms of this amendment: a continuation of the current reforms.

Sir, there will be no change to the existing class-size policy in the new model or during the transition period. The tutor groups will be smaller in the new colleges than they are on average at present with an average of 14 or 15 students in each group. The school will meet the individual needs of all of its students, including those designated with special educational needs and disabilities. This has been factored into the design of the two new colleges. At the two new colleges there will be a base for students who have difficulties with communication, language and social interaction, and considerably more space has been allocated to this provision than at present and than in previous school building plans. The sixth form will offer A-levels on both sites and the IB programme on one site. In each college the sixth form will be in-line with or slightly larger than the average size of sixth forms in 11-18 school nationally.

We have a slightly skewed picture of school size in Guernsey because we have an unusual situation where our school-based sixth form is twice the size of the average size of sixth forms nationally, our primary schools, our larger primary schools, are twice the size of the average primary school nationally and our secondary schools are *tiny* compared to the average size of secondary schools in England. And yet we defend the *status quo* as if anything else is unimaginable.

No doubt if we started proposing the division of primary schools now, people would say, 'Why on earth are we wanting to do that? Because we do not want smaller primary schools, our primary schools are the right kind of size'. This is what we heard in relation to the Sixth Form Centre. 'Why have the sixth form on two sites? It needs to be on one site'. But, as I say, the size of the two sixth forms in our model will be in line with or slightly above the average size of sixth forms in 11-18 schools nationally.

Sir, the very small size of our schools places tremendous pressure on staff teams. I already referred to the example at La Mare de Carteret with geography. But there are several cases at the moment where we have – and I think this is a really important point for Members to at least acknowledge – at the moment and over a period of time quite a number of examples of secondary school teachers teaching outside of their subject specialism to students who are studying public exams in those subjects. Now, that is clearly a long way from ideal.

If you say to a parent, as has been presented to some parents in this debate, 'Do you want supersize secondary schools?' you might get the answer, no. But if you say to parents, would you like son or daughter, first of all to be able to take GCSE geography? Probably the answer will be yes. And if you ask, 'And when they take it, would you like them to be taught by a geography specialist rather than a historian?' they probably would say, yes. These are the kinds of things which are the reasons why these reforms are necessary, in order to provide our students with the best possible opportunities. If we have larger staff teams they are more resilient, there is much

505 less chance of teachers having to teach outside of their subject specialism and that must be to the advantage of all students.

Sir, in the model that the States have ... Oh, and I want to say something else, actually, about recruitment, because there has been a lot of focus on retention of teachers. It has been claimed that there is a particular problem at the present time retaining teacher. Actually, the retention
510 rates, or the departure rates, are in-line with previous years. Where there is an increasing problem is in recruitment. It is increasingly difficult to recruit to small 11-16 schools, particularly where the school has been under the risk of closure for many years and where the facilities are in the state that they are in, the condition that they are in. It is increasingly difficult to recruit.

If the States decide to stop these reforms and stick with the current model indefinitely there is
515 a very high likelihood that the next Committee is going to face very substantial difficulties in recruiting across the secondary estate, putting teachers in front of students. Because in this kind of environment, where there is this kind of uncertainty and we are trying to recruit into small 11-16 schools and the facilities at one school in particular are in a very poor condition and there is no certainty about what model of education is going to emerge or which schools might close, which
520 is the holding pattern, as Deputy Dudley-Owen has called it, into which this Requête tries to send schools and students, it is going to be really *very* challenging indeed to recruit.

So the model that is currently in train, students will benefit from a high quality learning environment, with modern purpose-built facilities: excellent facilities for PE and sport, including indoor swimming pools and new, extended multi-use games areas; a broader range of
525 combinations of subject choices and a greater likelihood of being able to study their first choice combination of subjects; smaller tutor groups than the current average, strengthening pastoral support whilst retaining the current average class size policy; the opportunity for a greater number of students to continue into the sixth form on the same site. Some Members talk about the possibility of a very small number of sixth formers transferring site between GCSE and sixth
530 form – a very small number, based on the modelling – at the moment, *half* of those who want to transfer from GCSE to sixth form are having to move site because they have to go from the 11-16 schools to the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre.

The ability of the school to recruit from a wider pool of teachers; the proposed enrichment programme which will provide all students with access to a broad range of enrichment
535 opportunities regardless of individual circumstances; more space allocated to students with additional needs and the introduction of feeder primary schools which will strengthen the relationship between primary schools and secondary schools. Indeed, already is, because we are currently, or we are now running with feeder primary schools as a result of these reforms having got under way. But that is not likely to be possible indefinitely if the current model is put into this
540 kind of holding pattern.

I think the other problem with the holding pattern is it really implies that everything is pretty much okay at the moment. Apart from all the structural considerations, everything is not okay at the moment. Our performance at GCSE Level is slightly above the English national average and there are areas in England with all kinds of social and economic and other community challenges
545 which Guernsey faces to some extent, but not to the same depth or breadth. And yet we are achieving only slightly above the English national average and when we compare ourselves to comparable parts of England, in most years, we are substantially below in terms of our performance.

Now, that is uncomfortable, but it is the truth and it is not the fault of schools which are doing
550 their best. It is the fault of the structure and the constraints within which we are requiring our schools to operate. I make no apology that our reforms are, to some extent, based on trying to speak to the need to raise standards, broaden opportunities, raise aspirations. These are the things on which the reforms should be based. So, sir, the Requête presents the prospect of maintaining this current compromise model indefinitely, so that the next States, like its two
555 predecessors, could endlessly review countless models which have already been considered and rejected either by previous committees or by the States.

In 2016 the previous Committee was elected and inherited a very simple direction: to report to the States with the best three-school model. They spent 18 months studying the issues, considering various models. Deputy Dudley-Owen has said herself that no stone was left unturned by the previous Committee in the search for the right model. They produced a policy letter, which referenced various education models which they had considered and explored and they explained why they had dismissed them and they proposed their preferred secondary and further education model.

This process of review and consideration started five years ago. This is the third Committee undertaking this work and I think this is the eighth or ninth States' debate on the subject. There are thousands, literally thousands, of pieces of paper analysing every possible model up, down and from side to side. This is not a problem of a lack of information or a lack of research. If anything, this is a problem of a lack of conviction, a lack of courage to make strategic policy and to see it through. It is a problem of not knowing what one wants, not a problem of not having enough information to know what one wants. It is a problem of indecision. And yet, the Requête proposes nothing more than putting the States and the education system back two years for further rounds of reviews of models.

Briefly, I want to say something about 11-18 education. The current Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre benefits from more favourable pupil-teacher ratios in the 11-16 phase than the 11-16 schools because it has sixth form provision alongside the 11-16 provision.

According to validated 2018 GCSE data, 80% of the 200 top performing non-selective schools nationally are 11-18 schools and the average size of them is 1,350 students. And we make no apologies for saying that we consider that sixth form students in a school help to establish role models and embed aspiration for younger students.

I suggest this is of particular importance in Guernsey when we are just moving from the selective system to the non-selective system because we are in a culture where it has been the case for decades that if you are judged to be sufficiently academic and to have high academic aspirations you are offered a place at an 11-18 school. If you do not meet that bar you are offered a place in an 11-16 school. That has created certain perceptions about the education offer, and if we are in the business of trying to capture in our new system the best of non-selective education we need to do it in 11-18 schools, not just because of what the data shows, but because of where we are and where we have been culturally in education for a long time.

I looked at two local education authorities which are very largely non-selective but are two interesting cases to look at, because one is predominantly 11-16 schools and one predominantly 11-18 schools. In Hampshire it is predominantly 11-16 schools, in Hertfordshire, it is predominantly 11-18 schools, and if you look at their Attainment 8 score, which is a measure of attainment, as the name suggests, and if you look at their progress scores, the progress that students are making from entering secondary school to taking GCSEs, it is significantly better in Hertfordshire, where there is a preponderance of 11-18 schools, than it is in Hampshire where there is a preponderance of 11-16 schools.

Now, school size: I read something this morning from a campaign group against the current reforms saying, 'We do not want giant schools in Guernsey'. Now, the number of students who will be in our two 11-18 colleges reaches its maximum in the next few years of 1,395. Within the next 10 years it is less than 1,300 and it does not go above that figure again for as long as you want to analyse it. In the end it falls to below 1,200 students in each of the schools. Now, although we are told now that Guernsey does not want giant schools, when the Grammar School and Sixth Form had very nearly 1,100 students in the earlier years of the 21st century, I do not remember any campaign groups being set up to close that school or remove students from that school. We are talking about school ... The average during the expected lifespan of our colleges, their average population will be 1,285 students in each college. That is less than 20% larger than the Grammar School and Sixth Form Centre was just a few years ago. So I think there are lots of misperceptions around about school size.

We are accused – Deputy Dudley-Owen said it when she opened debate on her Requête – of having not followed the appropriate processes in the development of these policies and reforms. Largely, I think, so it is claimed, because we did not do what is now being proposed in the Requête and have a comparison of multiple different models for delivering secondary education. But remember that the Committee was elected when the States were directing the Committee to establish two 11-18 colleges.

We consulted with the former HM Treasury official who is the author of the Green Book, which is the basis of the five case business model, and the advice was: under no circumstances should you spend any time carrying out detailed side-by-side comparisons with an option that had already been rejected by the States. The focus should be on the best way of delivering the States' decision to move to one school in two colleges.

So what we did, and we set this out in our Programme Business Case and we were developing it further in subsequent rounds of the business case, is we looked at different ways of delivering the 11-18 model. We had a preferred way and we had a do-minimum way, and we have set that out in the business case. We also, for comparative purposes, set it against the *status quo* because obviously that did not need very much research and analysis because we know the position with the *status quo*.

So the claim that there have been governance failures is simply wrong – well, it is wrong according to the advice that we took from the author of the Treasury's five case business model and according to the States' capital portfolio team. It might not be wrong according to Deputy Dudley-Owen, but it is wrong based on the professional advice that we received.

But we also, because Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Meerveld were asking us to before the September debate and now because this Requête has been submitted, we have also carried out a reasonably high level, but nevertheless I think quite informative, side-by-side comparison of different education models. And we published that before the September debate and we included it as an appendix to our letter of comment before this debate. That is the one 11-18, two 11-16s model; the three 11-18s model; the three 11-16s plus something else model and the four-school model. These things have been assessed on financial grounds and on educational grounds. But the current reforms are the only model the States have ever agreed twice. It is okay saying let's have an endless review of numerous other models, but previous Committees have analysed them and rejected them or the States has rejected them.

Now, I just want to refer to, before I sit down ... what is it in the amendment ... 3(d) and 4(c). These are the sections around space and the implementation of the current model. I do think, sir, that it is important to distinguish education models – that is, how many schools there are, what age range they cater for, where they are located etc. – and the implementation of any of those models, because there is a significant difference, and the operation of the colleges. Now, most of the concerns raised by teachers have been about the implementation of the changes. Sometimes about the speed of the changes, but only rarely about the model itself. Now, I acknowledge that now it has been wrapped up in this request to pause the model, but the actual core of the concerns, if you break them down, are about implementation.

The response of the Requête misses the point entirely. It might be responding to this short-term request to pause, but it is not actually dealing with the issues which have given rise to the request to pause. The concerns which have been raised are about the space standards at the colleges, they are about how the colleges will operate in practice – I am talking now about teachers' concerns. The response of the Requête is not to try to find a way through those problems, but to say, 'I know what we should do, let's have a review of models again, for the next year or two years or three years or however long it takes', and we know from previous experience that it takes a long time. That is displacement activity.

The issue, is how is the new model going to be operated; what is the day going to look like in the school; how much space is there going to be for sixth formers or students when they are at lunch or staff? The correct response to that cannot possibly be, 'Let's have another review of education models' because that is not going to ... I expect, if the Requête is successful, a

Committee will go to teachers and say, 'Right, let's have a review of education models', and in no time at all they will find teachers say, 'Well, no, no, no, really we want to have a discussion about space. We want to have a discussion about, what's the day going to look like?' 'Oh no, no, we're not doing that. We're engaged for the next several months or years in a further review of models which have previously been analysed and rejected'.

So the space standards will not change by adopting a different model. The space standards are a calculation of the space necessary for each student times by the number of students. If there is a three-school model which emerges, the space standards will just be lower, less ... or the space standards will be the same, but the space allocated will just be less than it is in the 11-18 colleges. If that is not going to be the case, if the space standards are going to be increased in a different model, then they can just as easily be increased in the model which has already been agreed.

There is time to address the concerns around space and the day-to-day operation of the colleges. These reforms are being introduced incrementally. There is an incremental increase in the number of students. The school populations are not going to reach their peak for another few years. Sixth formers are not going to be in the 11-18 colleges for another few years. That is why there is a transition period. Any set of reforms on this kind of scale requires a transition period and it last, under these reforms, until 2022-23. And the plans, not the model, but the plans, the way the model is implemented, can be, and always would have to be, adapted during the period of the transition model. That is what we should focus our efforts on, rather than reconsidering models of education which have previously been rejected.

The space in the two 11-18 colleges has been designed, and if there was an analysis of how many students could be accommodated in the two 11-18 colleges, the answer would be 1,700. That is the size the colleges would be designed to cater up to. Now, of course we are not proposing to put anything like that number of students in them, but that would be their capacity. So the position of our Committee is there is enough space in the two 11-18 colleges. All the classrooms in the extensions will be able to accommodate up to 30 students but there is no change in the average class size policy of 24. There is generous corridor space for circulation and ample refectory space and breakout areas. The PE and sports facilities will be able to deliver a full PE curriculum.

If you look at the space breakdown at the de Sausmarez College, the Beaucamps site, we are providing 445 m² above the national space standards, and at the Victor Hugo, the St Sampson's site, 798 m² above the national space standards. There is more teaching space at both colleges than the national space standards, there is more dining space at the two colleges than the national space standards.

Where there is a deficit of space is in outdoor space, although it is slightly more complicated than that because outdoor space is broken down into several categories: hard outdoor PE, hard informal and social areas, and soft outdoor PE. Now, actually, the space available at the two 11-18 colleges is consistent with or above the national space standards in all areas except soft outdoor PE. That is the case for 95% of secondary schools nationally and it is the case with some of our secondary schools today.

What that means is that you have to put in place mitigating measures or alternative measures. Essentially you have to make available outdoor sports space, soft sports space – it is fields, basically, playing fields – which are off site as close as possible to the site. Now, as it so happens, by coincidence, my Committee is also the Committee *for* Sport & Culture and has responsibility for quite a number of very generous and well-equipped playing fields at other education sites or at sports sites and they can be made available to the two 11-18 colleges. That is not foreign to us in Guernsey – Elizabeth College is doing this.

I had an exchange with somebody the other day who was critical of the lack of outdoor sport space at the two 11-18 colleges and I said, 'Well, how does Elizabeth College cope?' And I had a response, 'Well, you have completely missed the point because they have great facilities off site'. Well, yes, that is exactly the point: so do we have access to very high quality sports facilities off site. As it happens the outdoor space in total at Elizabeth College per student is significantly lower

than will be the case in our two 11-18 colleges. I am amazed at the number of people who pay quite large sums of money to send their children to the grant-aided colleges, particularly Elizabeth College, and who then say they cannot support our reforms because they do not think there is enough outdoor space.

So in 4(c) in the amendment we are proposing that there should be a review of space to determine during the transition period whether there should be further building space allocated. Now, this is perfectly possible to do during the transition period. Remember that the buildings proposed at these two sites are already themselves extensions and it is perfectly possible, during the transition period, while the schools, built for 1,700 students, while they have nothing like that number in them and they are still growing in the incremental increase of students, during that period to assess, to work with teachers and others, and to assess whether there is a case for additional building space. If there is, then the next Committee should be empowered to come back to the States and to propose it. If the States are going to be prepared to spend millions of pounds stopping now and endlessly reviewing models of education previously rejected, surely it would be better to spend that money, if the States are prepared to spend it, investing in education and, if there is a case, adding further space at the two 11-18 colleges. Deputy Gollop says he agrees with that, I am grateful for that. So that is 4(c).

In terms of 3(d), this is the operational issues. Look, the teaching unions raised very substantial concerns about previous models of education proposed in 2016 under the four-school model, proposed in 2018 under the three-school model and now they are in relation to our model in 2020. We have had an experience in the last couple of weeks where no sooner had one set of teachers written to Deputies to say, 'We would back two 11-16 schools and one 11-18 school' than another set of teachers are writing to say, 'No, no, that is not the model that we want. We want to have other models reviewed'.

The position of the teaching unions, when you boil it down to what they are really requesting, is essentially to say, if we discuss this for a few more years with hundreds of more people we might find a model than everyone likes, but not one of those currently suggested or previously proposed to the States or anything else we can think of at the moment. So despite all of the information being available, five years after this debate started, they are unable to come to a clear consensus about what the model should be. That is why the focus needs to be on the implementation of the model and not on the model itself.

During the transition period, the Committee, whether it is this Committee or another Committee, needs some space, time and flexibility to adapt the plans and to address the concerns that are raised by teachers. The terms of this amendment will provide for that space and time. The alternative of the Requête just is not going to address the concerns around space and operational issues.

Although the teaching unions have asked for pause, they have also said, crucially, they do not want any significant delay. Now, I understand that. I respect that is their legitimate position and their legitimate request. But we in this Assembly know that that is just not possible! We know it is not possible to have a short pause. The work to review numerous models previously presented and rejected will take a lengthy period of time. Then it will have to come back to the States and at that stage – because the purpose of the Requête clearly is to reject the current model, current reforms – the States will have to determine at a high level what model they want and then send the Committee away to deal with the implementation.

Now, that has taken our Committee 18 months, it took Deputy Le Pelley's Committee 18 months, it has taken every Committee who has tried to do this 18 months. I suggest that it would be at least 15 months from now, probably 18 months from now, before the policy letter would be back before the States assessing different models and asking the States at a high level to agree to a model. If the States did, then there would be another 18 months working up the details of that model. That is going to present the significant delay which the teaching unions are asking to be avoided.

So we are very confident that if this amendment is successful and we are allowed the time and space for the transition model to continue, we are going to be able, and senior leaders are going to be able, to work with teachers through their concerns. I accept that without the recent representations from teachers it would not have been possible to have factored in their concerns around space, as has been in this amendment. That is because we were essentially being corporate players. We were sitting in front of teachers and saying, in September and October, no, the budget that has been authorised by the States is the budget and we cannot go above it.

I am in no doubt at all, if we had gone to the Policy & Resources Committee at that moment, when they were themselves not aware of the concerns around space, they would have said, 'Yes, of course you were right to say that. The authorised budget is the authorised budget'. I think we are now in a different place and there is some willingness to consider anew some of the space standards. And that can be done without throwing out the model during the transition period while the student population has not yet reached its maximum. But that is a matter that the next States will need to deal with and it can do it early in its life as opposed to what is proposed in the Requête which, I am afraid, will take years.

The operational changes just need to be worked through with teachers. There are all sorts of concerns which are not in any way unique to this model. If we have a different model, it is quite possible we will have the same operational changes that will arise, because they are to do with the structuring of the day and some of the reforms around operations which are not unique to this model. So reviewing models is not going to deal with that problem. What is needed is some flexibility on our part and on the part of our school leaders and not just engaging, because there has been engagement, but setting up processes with teachers and unions to work in a more structured way through the operational concerns which they have. We are very confident that the vast majority of them can be addressed successfully through that process.

So, sir, the Requête would review models previously discarded, it would add millions of pounds unnecessarily to the costs, it would cause further uncertainty and disruption to students at La Mare, it would require hundreds more students to go through secondary education in inadequate facilities and most of all, if the States approve the Requête, they would be turning away from the benefits of the current reforms which I still believe a majority of the Members of this Assembly are in support of and recognise that if we are going to have a non-selective system this is the best way of organising it and promoting high educational standards, equality of opportunity, first-class facilities for all students and making the best use of the funds the States are prepared to invest annually in education.

Twice the States, by substantial majorities, have agreed that is the best model for the future of secondary and further education. My Committee suggests the States needs to stick to those reforms which are now in the second year of a five-year transition model, but to allow the Committee the time and the space and the endorsement of this amendment to go away and work with the profession on the implementation of the reforms which is where there has been the crux of the issue around the challenges.

This Requête though, sir, offers absolutely nothing but going back to the past and reviewing models of education previously discarded. There is no new information. This Assembly, by a majority, knows what the best model for the future of secondary and further education is. It has been endorsed twice.

Thank you, sir.

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

Deputy Graham: I do, sir, and will speak to it later.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen, is it your wish to be relevéed?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes please, sir.

815 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Very well, we will mark you as present and that gives you the entitlement to speak now if you want to exercise that right or later in the debate on the amendment.
Deputy Lester Queripel.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, thank you.
820 Sir, as we all know, seven of the nine Propositions ask us 'To note', and whether we decide to note them or not is completely irrelevant due to the fact that they tell us what we already know and any work associated with them will simply carry on. So they are all totally meaningless.
The other two Propositions are the ones we really need to focus on and as we all know Proposition 3(d) reads:

To direct the Committee to ensure that decisions about the operation of the school and its colleges shall follow an improved process of consultation with teachers and support staff and that such consultation shall proceed in a way which secures the maximum possible confidence of key stakeholders.

825 Well, ESC themselves have admitted that they have not placed enough focus on consultation and they have realised they need to up their game – and I commend them for that. I fully support that intention. However, I cannot support the Proposition, even though I support the intention, because of what we are told in the first line of the amendment, top of the page itself, which as we all know reads: 'To delete the Propositions and substitute therefor ...' So it is because I have no
830 desire to delete the Propositions of the Requête that I cannot support Proposition 3(d) or 4(c). The reason for that is that I have already said on several occasions I do not think the one school, two college model is the best model for our children, for their teachers, for their parents, for our infrastructure and environment, or for our community as a whole. I say that, sir, because I have not yet seen any conclusive evidence that a one school, two college model is the right model for
835 Guernsey. And it is because of that lack of evidence that I see no harm whatsoever in Members who previously voted in favour of the model to now change their minds.

Sir, there is poem by Yeats that relates directly to that issue and also to this amendment. It has the longest title I have ever seen heading up a poem. The title itself goes like this: *To a Wealthy Man who Promised a Second Subscription to the Dublin Municipal Gallery if it were Proved the*
840 *People Wanted Pictures*. I just want to read the first four lines of that poem, sir. As I say, it relates directly to this business of lack of evidence:

You gave but will not give again
Until enough of Pauden's pence
By Biddy's halfpennies have lain
To be 'some sort of evidence,'

Sir, suffice to say I want to see this amendment fail and I want to see the Requête succeed because the Requête, as we know, asks for further work to be undertaken and an evidence-based report then to be laid in front of the States. Because the reality is back in January 2018 and
845 September 2019 the majority of this States voted in favour of a one school, two college model without being fully informed. The States were not presented with the evidence on either of those occasions, yet the majority of the States voted in favour of the Propositions. So a vote in favour of this amendment would be a continuation of the approach adopted by the majority of the States in those two debates.

850 Sir, as I said earlier, I do not see a problem with any Member of the Assembly who has voted in favour of the one school, two college model in previous debates now changing their mind. That to me proves they have given the whole matter further consideration and they now realise that this Assembly really needed all the information in front of us in previous debates and because we were not presented with that information that we are now in this mess.

855 Surely, sir, we need all the information presented to the next Assembly in a composite report and a composite manner for them to be fully informed. So I would wholeheartedly applaud any Member of this Assembly who changes their mind. In fact, to me that would be an extremely

statesman- and stateswoman-like approach to adopt. So moving towards a close, I ask for a recorded vote when we go to the vote, please.

860 In closing, sir, Deputy Tindall told us last week in a speech that she and Deputy Oliver and Alderney Representative Mr Snowdon see no reason why they should not vote during this debate. But, sir, I want to put on record, I see every reason why they should not vote on this, unless of course they intend recusing themselves from the forthcoming open planning meeting due to a perception of bias. The DPA have been advised by officers to recuse themselves from the
865 L'Ancrese wall Requête debate and I cannot see how this issue is any different to that –

Deputy Tindall: Point of correction, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Tindall.

870

Deputy Tindall: The DPA has not been so advised in respect of the L'Ancrese wall debate.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel to continue, please.

875

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, on 5th August 2019 the DPA were advised to abstain from voting for fear of legal challenge. On 18th February 2020 this year, Law Officers advised us not to speak or vote and the last email we all received contradicted that or it advised but said can vote. So I do not see how this can be any different to the forthcoming debate due to a perception of bias, and I will leave it there, sir.

880

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

885

I will try to speak primarily to consultation in the States, because I do agree on thing with Lester Queripel, that we are asked 'To note' an awful lot of things in this amendment –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Lester Queripel, please.

890

Deputy Merrett: Deputy Lester Queripel – and also to note, we can note anything. So I do agree with him in that regard.

I feel quite strongly, sir, that we need to listen, to engage and to change and to determine and mitigate concerns when we can. However, engaging is not yelling at each other, it is not threatening each other and it certainly is not threatening dependents or each other personally.
895 Challenge the policy, but if you are, then at least state what it is about the policy that you oppose and what it is that you support. Or, if you oppose a policy in its entirety, then advise us of what policy you do support and why.

In a democracy, sir, good is a conversation, it is not a unilateral decision. We have to talk to each other, for the aim must be to constructively seek solutions. It does not need to be vitriolic,
900 but it does need to be constructive and respectful. Together we can achieve amazing things, but ripping chunks out of each other only causes destruction and discontent. We need to agree to disagree respectfully. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Some of us do not find change easy. It can cause uncertainty, a lack of confidence and fear. That is understandable. Some do not want change, some do. But rather than fighting the old, we
905 need to put all of our energy into building the new.

ESC need to work on the concerns about the implementation of the changes which have been expressed. The aspiration and the application have not been aligned and I fear that many are chasing a unicorn – attractive as they may appear to be, they simply do not exist.

Now, Proposition 3(d) of this amendment seeks to address consultation, improve the process of consultation. But how? What can ESC do differently? I spoke last week, sir, about it not being the quantity of meetings but the quality. It is not just about hearing each other but listening to each other. But how can ESC do this and what mechanisms can they use?

What I believe is that we are fooling ourselves if we believe that there is a model that politicians, teachers and our community can all agree on, or even agree by a majority. And that, sir, is the unicorn. Eleven-to-eighteen education appears to be the goal. Teachers and unions are aligned to a non-selective model. Some politicians are not, some politicians are. Some of our community are not, some of our community are. Whatever we decide, however we vote, we cannot and will not please all of our community – it is simply impossible.

So who should be at the centre of our deliberations? In my mind, it is not about the June Election, not about those who threaten to vote for Members who re-stand because they voted in a certain way. Surely, sir, our community want the Deputies to vote with their integrity and not under threat of not receiving a vote at the ballot box. It is not about my political career or anyone else's. It is about our children and young people. The parity of provision, offering our children and young people an equitable opportunity to achieve their full potential, to pursue their interests, choose their options from the broadest curriculum offer, to be educated in an environment which embraces diversity and inclusivity, to participate in a community that is tolerant of others.

I wish to live in that progressive, mature democracy that is capable of debating, deliberating, determining and delivering socially inclusive policies that have the health and education of our children, *our* children and young people ... That should be at the heart of everything we do, offering our children and young people certainty and consistency. Our current Year 7 children are the first in a non-selective cohort and their transition and our future generations, be that Year 6 or Year 5, currently know which school they will be going to and why and even what for.

So where has the engagement gone awry? Is it how we engage? Initially, the majority of concerns came from the teaching unions. They had significant concerns, and still do, regarding how the 11-18 schools have been presented. But crucially they *do not* want significant delay. They fear that the issues appear to be insurmountable, the concerns are the footprint of the buildings, they do not have detailed staffing structures and they have concerns over the structure of the school day.

Now, I have taken every opportunity to engage with them and I thank them for involving me in their ongoing discussions. What I do not thank them for is not inviting or including ESC in some of their meetings, or one of their meetings, with Deputies. So should I, sir, as a Deputy, only listen to those who shout the loudest? I am not one to do this. In an effort to engage with all teachers, I wrote to them all, care of the head teachers, at the end of January. I decided to reach out to them in the hope it would help me understand the various concerns. I was very worried that the teachers and support staff felt they had not been listened to. I wanted to be able to listen to them and really understand their concerns by having an opportunity to ask questions, to engage with them and to try to help each other come up with a constructive way forward that serves our children and young people. They have to be at the very heart of what we are doing.

I did this in the knowledge that a lot of colleagues, Deputies, felt similarly, specifically, Deputy McSwiggan, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel and Deputy de Sausmarez. We had already talked about what we could do to help. We all welcome the chance to meet with any teachers or support staff who would like to discuss their concerns further and to try to find solutions. I tried to reach as many teachers and support staff as I could and I was pleased to hear from them regardless of whatever their views were on the current plans or what their ideas are for the future. The important thing for me was to try to work out what the future looks like, and that is beyond this Requête, and making sure that it both serves students well and addresses concerns.

I contacted all of our secondary school head teachers and the head teachers of La Mare de Carteret Primary School. I wish to thank on public record the teachers and support staff who have contacted me, engaged and those who have been constructive in trying to find a solution. Their professionalism, informative and generous spirit in which they have engaged with me and

responded to my numerous questions will *never*, never be forgotten. The respectful manner in which the majority have communicated with me has restored my faith in our ability to communicate, to listen, question, query and to agree to disagree, but most of all to seek solutions. They took me on their journey and I am thankful that they did. Between us we have shot many
965 unicorns. It sounds harsh, but they do not actually exist. (*Laughter*)

So what were their concerns? Now, some, as I have said, were very concerned about any delay. Some were very concerned about speaking openly and honestly, and wished for our correspondence to remain anonymous. They do not believe that they have a safe and open environment to express opposing views to their colleagues. Some stated that some have
970 entrenched or militant views, and those, sir, are their words, they are not mine. It is truly dreadful that we have teachers and support staff who feel unable to express their views, their concern or their opinions to fellow members of the teaching profession. We do not want bullying or intimidation in our schools and that includes between our teaching profession. Our schools should not be battlegrounds.

Sir, in my correspondence, some are seeking to retain the Grammar School as a non-selective 11-18 school and two 11-16 schools. Some want three 11-16 schools and a separate 16-18 school. Some want two 11-18 schools, some want four. Some want a lower, a middle and upper school over three or more sites. Some simply want a guaranteed parking space. (*Laughter*) There was no general consensus on the model of education. Neither was there any general consensus on other
980 concerns, other than one which I will come back to in a moment.

Some did not wish to work longer hours. Some do not want to participate in any curriculum enrichment. Some do not oppose the model, but they *do* oppose, they do oppose, how it is being implemented. The range of concerns is wide, but the majority appear to be down to uncertainty. Now, this may be down to the point in transformation we find ourselves, this may be down to a
985 lack of confidence. But the one area of general consensus is regarding space. And for clarity, sir, because space is a vast topic, it was primarily two things.

Firstly, the configuration of space, be that libraries, refectories or corridors, and the potential timetabling of that space. We have not even got to the conversation or engagement yet regarding the tuitional standards in our schools, as it appears more important to discuss how many sittings they may or may not have. We have not got to the conversation or engagement yet regarding the opportunity or need to provide free school meals to our children who open the fridge or the cupboard at home and cannot find anything to take to school; those whose families struggle to find the cash on a daily basis to cover a meal at school. We have not got to that conversation yet, sir.

And secondly, it is the outdoor space. Again, it is configuration and timetabling, but primarily in consideration to existing facilities and future facilities. And why, sir? Because like us, they want the highest quality of facilities possible for their students. But I have come up against, as ESC have, the apparent brick wall of the cost envelope. You can have it all if you are prepared to throw enough money at it. But we have to balance the cap-ex and the op-ex with the other demands on the public purse. So in this amendment, sir, Proposition 4(c) does address the golden thread, and it does so by specifically referencing space. It actually deals with the cause of many concerns. It is constructive. So at last we have an amendment that has listened to the concerns, that directs ESC to improve their consultation process and to concerns regarding space. At least it is constructive.

What we need now is strong leadership and a commitment to deliver for our children and young people. I believe we are all united in our desire to do our best for our children and young people, and the unions have said that they can deliver whatever model we determine.

Sir, if we do not approve this amendment we will not be giving our first cohort non-selection a fighting chance. We will be shoehorning them into an Education estate that was designed for a selective system. We will not give any certainty to our children and young people. We will not be addressing the concerns that have been raised, be that space or how we all communicate, how we consult. So if the President of ESC can persuade me there will be an improved process of consultation, if he can persuade me that he can pro-actively engage with college leaders, teachers
1010

and support staff, if they will consider the Propositions necessary regarding further building space, at least those two Propositions start to address some of the concerns. So I will look forward to hearing Deputy Fallaize summing up, but I do need to be persuaded as to what they will do differently to engage and consult.

With the space Proposition, I have comfort that the Proposition is to direct the ESC, to have comfort and I appreciate them taking those concerns on board and I also appreciate very much that they are bringing that back to the States' Assembly. They are not just taking that back to Policy & Resources. This Assembly can make that decision. But I do need persuading on how the consultation will be done differently and I think we all have to realise that the consultation and engagement is not just between ESC and teachers and unions. It is also for us Members to have that consultation and also for the senior leadership to ensure they have got the mechanisms in place so that they are able to have the relevant consultation and engagement with teachers.

So I look forward to Deputy Fallaize summing up and it will be after his summing up that I will be making my final determination.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

I found that a lot of the speech of Deputy Fallaize with respect to this amendment was trying to convince the public with regard to the best way of going forward with a non-selective system of education. I think that is probably our role here: to find the best method of going ahead with the non-selective system. And it appears to me on reflection that the two-school college model tends to favour the academic stream, because what I want is a system as a result that provides equity, actually; equity in Guernsey between students that are opting basically towards the vocational, professional and technical side, as well as the academic side. So the two sides as I see, the vocational side and the academic side, should have equity in going forward.

To be quite honest with you, I find that the two-school college model tends to favour the academic stream because we have even had comments today through Deputy Fallaize with regard to the role models that are in the 11-18 school, the role models in the 16 to 18, the sixth form side of it, having an impact on the streams below: the 11 to 16 youngsters. And really that is geared to A-levels and the academic side, essentially.

So I think that the four-school model ... I should say, the three-school model that I put forward earlier, which would produce larger schools, we would have three schools of 850, basically, in size with larger staff teams to provide advantage to students, we would have the sixth form centre as a unit – one sixth form centre – and then the Guernsey Institute as a unit also, providing the technical and the vocational side of education. That to me is a preferred model, because all students would be educated to the 11-16 stage together and then at that stage, at 16, they would determine whether they are going out to work or they are taking a further vocational education, technical education, or whether they want to pursue the academic side and they would have that choice, everybody would have the choice, together, all working together and at that stage, at 16, they would choose their direction.

That was the option that I saw as a preferred option, giving the vocational side and the academic side equality. I think it is very important that we see that that is there. Whereas the two-school model essentially is almost an academic thrust through in terms of the leaning of the schools; having the teachers there that can teach A-levels and – I am not giving way – the teachers that can provide the academic side right through to A-levels, and IB and so on. So I think that the amendment here does actually recognise some of the limitations that have been drawn out of the two-school model in terms of consultation and certainly in terms of size/space requirements.

But I do not think it gets at this other problem, that in Guernsey we want to really push the vocational side and the trades and so on and so forth. We want to try and incorporate our youngsters into the workforce here in Guernsey and not lose perhaps so many in terms of going

overseas and taking the academic option, but seeing opportunity here and us providing that opportunity too, so that our youngsters can see that entering the vocational side will provide them with the skills to go forward and really incorporate their skills and provide the opportunity here in Guernsey for their future.

So I just make that point because I think it is an important one as we go forward, because as I see it, the dilemma in the past has been a little, with respect to the selective system, you are either going on or you are not and it just seemed to me that we need to address that particular cultural point in terms of the way we go forward currently. And this is one area that I think we have to concentrate on. We have certainly got it, if you like, with the Guernsey Institute, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) which will do the vocational, professional and technical education and provide a very important model there. But then on the academic side I would prefer that it is one sixth form centre which of course has the benefit of size and the benefit of having the breadth of academic choice, which is a bit of a problem when you divide it into two, and that has been recognised by the Committee.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

Deputy Le Clerc: Thank you, sir; I was not expecting that. (*Laughter*)

Sir, I have got up because I have to completely disagree with Deputy de Lisle's view on the 11-18 schools. I am a supporter of the two 11-18 schools for, as I say, completely different reasons to Deputy de Lisle, because I think with the larger schools there will be greater opportunity.

He has concentrated on the academic opportunities. I think, as President of Employment & Social Security, I also look at those young people that are less academic. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Before I became a States' Member, I was on Skills Guernsey for many years, and we have still got Skills Guernsey. And so, probably 12 years on, we are still dealing with the same problems that we had when I first started on that Skills Guernsey 12 years ago. That is dealing with young people not in education, employment or training.

If you look at our latest unemployment statistics at Social Security, the numbers are small, so let's put this into perspective, but we have got 40 young people between the ages of 16 and 19 unemployed at the moment – 40. So that means this wonderful education system that everybody is talking about that should not change is letting 40 of those young people down. When we go to the 20 to 30 age group, so that is in more or less my 12 years that I have been talking about Skills Guernsey and the 'not in employment, education or training', we have an additional 96 people unemployed in that age group. That age group is the biggest number of unemployed that we have. I would have expected our 55 to 65 age group to be larger, where people perhaps are struggling a bit with manual roles. But no, it is the young people.

So what I want, an education that is fit for purpose, that looks after *all* capabilities, I want to see not just academic; and I think with those larger schools, that we will be able to provide opportunity for those less academic people, for them to have the skills, the ambition and the motivation to go on and fulfil a role in our society that meets their needs. At the moment, so many of them at a young age are disadvantaged in the education system that we currently have. All we talk about is academic, academic. That is *really* important because we need those people to come back – to go off Island and come back. But we also need to look at the needs of everybody across our education and I still believe that the two-school model, 11-18, will do that.

Deputy de Lisle talks about mentoring and it is not just about academic mentoring, it is those soft skills, it is those leadership skills, it is nurturing of all abilities. And I believe in that two-school model, 11-18, that we will have that ability to be able to provide nurturing across all.

I was fortunate that I went to ... I transferred from a secondary school to the Grammar School on the old site. Now, if we are talking about space and we are talking about soft areas, there were no soft areas at the Girls Grammar School at that site. We had to trundle up to Beau Sejour and Cambridge Park to play hockey etc. But it was really important that when I transferred that I could

see, as an older pupil, I was able to provide some leadership and mentoring to some of those younger people in the school. So I see the advantages of that education and not splitting up the 11-to-16-year-olds.

1120 Sir, I do not think I can add much more to the debate, but I will, at the present time, be supporting the two-school model. It will take some significant persuasion for me to vote otherwise.

Thank you.

1125 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Paint.

Deputy Paint: Sir, I would like to thank Deputy Lester Queripel for providing me with the trigger I needed to come with this speech. Like him, I declared myself conflicted on anything to do with the school and to do with the DPA. I will go through why, if you would be kind enough to listen to me. First of all, I may be a Guernsey donkey of birth and lineage, but I am certainly not a nodding donkey sitting in the back of the DPA wagon or any other Committee. I will go for what I believe, not what other people tell me to believe.

Deputy Gollop asked me to join the DPA Committee when he became President. I will leave him to explain the details of what happened afterwards; I think he should, but that is his choice. 1135 However, I must say that it is not for the staff to pick and choose who they want on their Committees – any Committee. It is first of all for the President to suggest people and if there is not enough then this Assembly should do it as they have in the past. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

I think, actually, because I do challenge is why I was not really wanted on the Committee – on the DPA Committee. I do challenge and I will give you some examples later. I spent six years on 1140 the Environment Department which sat over the DPA and the planners. So I will give you a little explanation which might make you understand why I consider myself conflicted on any of this motion.

We were invited to see a brand-new building in Castel fully constructed. It was all made of glass and to me it did not look very good; and I know other people felt the same. So we returned 1145 to the office, Sir Charles Frossard House, and we had a discussion on it. I said that I thought that was the wrong sort of building for Guernsey. I said that should not be put in that sort of area, that type of building, all-glass building, should ... There was nothing around it that was similar – nothing. All other houses were cottages or chalet bungalows or something like this, and there was this huge thing. And I was told then that if one comes in front of the Committee you will have to 1150 consider yourself conflicted. Well, the DPA cannot have it both ways.

Locally, the Committee of the DPA, in my opinion, are just fall guys for the planners and that just cannot be right.

Deputy Oliver: Sorry, sir, point of correction.

1155

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: That is not correct. I am not a fall guy and if I go against something I will ... if I disagree with something, I will go against it. I do not just agree with everything the planners say.

1160 Thank you.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Paint, I think –

1165

Deputy Paint: Well, I find myself –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Paint, just a minute, please. I fully understand that you want to explain why you feel conflicted in relation to what is before the States at the moment, and by all means give one example, but one example only, of other instances where you have done it. This is –

Deputy Paint: Well, that is all I have given, sir. Yes, right. So –

The Deputy Bailiff: Please continue.

Deputy Paint: Can I continue, sir?

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, but –

Deputy Paint: Thank you. If you do not like what I am saying, well, I am sorry. But it has got to be said.

Also, by following UK principles on Rule 14 questions presented by Deputy Lester Queripel, there is not a code of what the relationship between the planners and the DPA should be, and there should be some sort of code that draws a line between who does what. There is no code.

Deputy Tooley: Sir, point of order.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of order, Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: Sir, while I have no objection whatsoever to the content of what Deputy Paint is saying, and I actually agree with him, I do not think it actually has anything to do with the debate at hand.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, that was the point I was trying to make to you, Deputy Paint. There is a Rule that says:

Debate must be relevant to the matter before a Meeting.

The matter that is before the meeting at the moment is whether –

Deputy Paint: Sir, I was just trying to explain –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Paint, please do not interrupt me when I am speaking to you. The matter before the meeting at the moment is amendment 5 and whether we should accept the substitute Propositions in that or whether to leave in play the two original Propositions from the Prayer of the Requête.

As I have just said, I am quite happy for you to explain why in the light of what has been said you feel that you are conflicted –

Deputy Paint: Okay –

The Deputy Bailiff: – but it now has to be brought into the relevance of are you supporting or not supporting this amendment and if so why?

Deputy Paint: Yes, sir, I will do that and I will return to it in general debate.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you.

Deputy Paint: I will return to this in general debate.

I cannot and would not ever support the one school on two sites model. I have felt it bad from the start and I will not support it. I will go with the Requête, simply because it is not what people want, it is not the right way to go about things. So many things have come out that were never discussed or brought forward before. It has been drip-fed. So I will not do it.

But on a lighter note, the way this could be done is to get all the people that are involved, lock them in a building, and I mean stakeholders, the requérants, the school committee, the general public, lock them in a room and take the key away and let them come out with a ... Because we have heard all these different things and you hear all these different things, but it is always the Deputies that have got to take responsibility for it – always the Deputies. So take them there, but I would advise that perhaps you get an ambulance or perhaps even a hearse standing outside in case.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

I think I would just like to touch on something that someone said at the opening of this debate today. I think we all in this Assembly and the majority of the Islanders are all looking to do what is absolutely best for our children. I do not think anybody particularly is aiming for the lower ground, I think we are all looking for the higher ground and what we think is best for the children, not only now, but also for the longer term. So please, I do not think it is very fair for Members to think that they have the moral high ground. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think we are all looking for that particular Holy Grail.

Now, when Deputy Fallaize crafts an amendment and he is on my side, I am usually quite happy. On the other hand, when we are in opposition, I start to go through it with a fine toothcomb. So let's see what this worthy tome actually brings us.

So Proposition 1 is to note. So that is neither for nor against. So we go no steps forward, no steps back. Proposition 2 is: 'To note that in September 2019 ...' Again, no steps forward, no steps back. And for 3 – we have got a theme here – (a) and (b) are both 'To note'. So again, we are not actually going forward, it is just telling us what we already know. However, on 3(c), we also have 'To note', and finally we get some real meat: (d), 'To direct the Committee ...' But when you look at what we are directing the Committee to do, it is very difficult to find out what is different from tomorrow than what was yesterday.

To direct the Committee to ensure that [the] decisions about the operation of the school and its colleges ... follow an improved process of consultation ...

How objective is that? I mean, you can run a coach and horses through that. Is it an extra one meeting? Is it 2? Is it 10? Is it 20? Is it until they agree? It is a nebulous piece of extra writing. (*Laughter*)

Number 4(a), again, 'To note ...'; 4(b), 'To note ...' – so we are still not forward or backwards. And then finally, 4(c) – another little bit of meat – 'To direct ...'. But I have read it so many times, I still cannot ... This, 4(c), directs the Committee to do further consultation and then maybe, if it feels like it, possibly return to the States asking for increased areas. But they can do that as a Committee any day of the week! They do not need us to tell them that.

So what does this amendment do? It is basically, from a point of view of the requérants, it is a wrecking amendment that basically just takes away their day in court (*Interjection*) and replaces it with the *status quo*. So Deputy Fallaize was just as able, and to save a couple of trees, to have said that he will vote against the Requête.

So I am sorry, sir, I do not think I will be able to support these proposals. But a very nice try from Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Graham to push us down a different path.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Smithies.

1270

Deputy Smithies: Thank you, sir.

I thought for a horrible moment that Deputy Brouard had just pinched my speech, but although there are areas of overlap I think we are on a slightly different tack.

1275

This amendment fails to convince me because of the seductive way in which it tries to lead the Assembly down the primrose path of accepting 4(b), which I do not. We are invited to note Proposition after Proposition, and this has been brought out nicely by Deputy Brouard, which we note various things until we actually reach 3(d), when we are directed there that the Committee does need to improve its communication skills. Well, what an admission of failure? They are admitting in 3(d) that they have not communicated very well, which is not a good place to be.

1280

Then we reach 4(b), and we are in to the heart of the problem. With no evidence presented, we are led to believe that disaster is looming. If the States proceed to review alternative means of delivering the reforms, which we have already embarked upon, the Assembly is asked to agree that:

stopping the reforms to secondary education ... would cause new and unnecessary uncertainty and disruption ... [etc.]

1285

Well, I am not going to come down in favour of any particular model because, simply, I do not know. I have over the course of this debate listening to and considered several different suggestions of ways to deliver education for the future, all rejected, as has been the extant model by many of the stakeholders, but not yet by this Assembly.

1290

We now have an opportunity to review the options and I do not accept the assertion that these are unmanageably numerous. We have repeatedly been told that accepting the Requête will lead to years of delay and I cannot accept that. Evidence for this is presented as, 'Experience has told us that it will cause a huge delay'. But vast amounts of work have been carried out already on the three-school model and the two-school model.

1295

The President of ESC referred to 18 months spent by Deputy Le Pelley's Committee and the 18 months spent by the current Committee. Well, this is not wasted time; it feeds into any new review and business case. To me, we have the current model and a few, a handful, of alternatives. As I said, we have an opportunity to review the options through a full business case with costings.

Please, reject the whole of this amendment to avoid us going down a road which will lead to an almost inevitable re-examination of the whole secondary education reform process later this year. It is not unreasonable to review where we are before a final commitment is made.

1300

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

1305

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

1310

I have to say I have never been passionate about a particular way of organising education in Guernsey, except for being completely convinced that a selective system was definitely not in the interests of the majority of our children. That is something I felt deeply for decades. Indeed, ever since I went to the Guernsey Grammar School and saw primary school friends who seemed at least as bright as me fail the 11-plus, be quite traumatised by that outcome and then be given more restrictive sets of choices than I had available to me. Now, I respect that others feel equally passionately the other way. It is a polarising issue, it always has been and it still is today.

1315

The only other aspect of education organisation that I care deeply about is the need for stability and certainty. That was why, having lost the selection debate in 2001, despite being bitterly disappointed I respected the outcome and I did not seek a rematch. Because there is nothing more destructive to educational outcomes than an ongoing policy void, constant U-turns or uncertainty over what comes next. And sir, alas, uncertainty has now surrounded education in Guernsey for the last seven years.

Early on in its term, the Sillars Committee brought a vision document making clear that during its tenure they would be looking again at the vexed question of selection. Now at that point all
1320 bets were off on how education would be organised in future, for the very simple reason that if the States decided to scrap selection then the only sensible path was to deliver education in a different school structure. It is. Non-selective education is different to selective education, the current structure was designed for selective education; it cannot be sustained.

Sir, this vortex of uncertainty has now been going on since 2013, making everyone, children
1325 and parents and teachers, unclear about their futures and hampering recruitment. Now, three years later, in 2016, the first piece of the jigsaw finally fell into place, when four years ago to this very month the States voted to move to an all-ability system of education. Did that bring greater certainty? Sadly, no. Why not? Because unlike the Ozanne Committee back in 2001, there were no firm proposals put forward for the exact system of schooling in which to deliver the now approved
1330 policy of comprehensive education. So in some ways the uncertainty actually deepened at that point.

The task of delivering the new system was left to the new ESC Committee elected in 2016. However, rather than cracking on with it, they decided that they should first revisit the whole question of selection with a majority of the Committee recommending a U-turn. The States rightly
1335 rejected that recommendation and that Committee then, and only then, went away to draw up proposals for a non-selective system, despite its President saying that he thought the decision was a complete disaster.

Now, what did I expect at that point? I really was not sure, but I sincerely promised to support them in whatever way I could with their difficult task. I had disagreed strongly with the majority of
1340 the Committee over the issue of selection, but now it was all about achieving a good outcome and as soon as possible to at last achieve some certainty and stability.

To be honest, I suppose at the time I was slightly stuck in the past. As a survivor of the 2001 debate, I expected the answer to be three 11-16 schools and a tertiary college, just like that other relic of that bygone age, Deputy Le Tocq, who thankfully is not in the Assembly as I say that.
1345 *(Laughter)* I even advocated such an outcome. But I quickly learnt that I was pretty much a lone voice. I tried to persuade the Le Pelley Committee, I went to see Deputy Le Pelley and his officers but it was firmly dismissed by them. Indeed, that Committee described the option of a tertiary college as the worst possible option. I sounded out those who were coming at the issue from a completely different angle, including, but by no means exclusively, the so-called gang of four. The
1350 idea got no traction there either. So I was obviously backing a loser.

Personally, I still think that the tertiary concept has some strengths at post-16, rather than completely splitting A-level provision from more vocational courses. However, I have come wholly convinced that in respect of secondary education, 11-16 schools with integral sixth forms, not co-located ones but integral ones, have huge advantages over the 11-16 schools.

But anyway, tertiary was clearly dead in the water 25 months ago. So I was faced with a fork in the road and two very different choices, as were all of us in this Assembly. There were the proposals from the Committee, which clearly made no sense at all and were completely unworkable at the post-16 phase, or there was the very well tried, tested, proven and highly successful model of organising education into two comprehensive 11-18 colleges of circa 1,250
1360 people.

I think we need to remember, it has been mentioned by Deputy Fallaize I know, but the long-term projections for pupil numbers in our schools are actually lower than that. There will be a short-lived peak around 2025, but the numbers are predicted to fall quite quickly to about 1,200 and in the longer term 1,150. These will not be big schools. 'We do not want big schools in
1365 Guernsey' – you are not going to get big schools in Guernsey! They will be only very slightly bigger than the Grammar School once was.

Now, sir, I had not been involved in developing either of the options that we were faced with two years ago. But faced with that choice in January 2018, I did what two thirds of this Assembly did and I voted against the Committee's madcap scheme and in favour of the proven model. Now,

1370 this Assembly later decided to elect me to ESC as part of the team charged by the States with
delivering *their* – and I stress *their* – very clearly approved policy. It was not *my* policy any more
than it was the policy of the other two thirds of this Assembly who supported it in January 2018.
People like Deputy Ferbrache, Deputy Green, Deputy Oliver. We are all responsible. It is as much
their policy as it is Deputy Roffey's policy. In fact all of us are responsible for the course of action
1375 we adopted two years ago, not just the gang of four.

Anyway, I regret it has taken more than two years to get from that point to this point because
the longer this dratted uncertainty goes on, the more and more damaging it is. Alas, I have to say
that States' procedure for the various stages of approval for a big capital and transformation
project sometimes feel like wading through treacle. (*Laughter*) So urged by this Assembly to get
1380 on with it – 'Get on with it' we were told – we have been making haste slowly. Yet some backing
this Requête have accused us of rushing the process. Good heavens! If this is rushing, I would hate
to see a go-slow. (*Laughter*)

Procedures have prevented all sorts of steps which would have been genuinely helpful in
calming nerves and achieving buy-in, such as the appointment on a designate basis to far more of
the leadership positions inside the new structure. Still, we are where we are and more than two
1385 years on we are now absolutely at the cusp of really moving forward and providing some
certainty.

Planning applications are about to be determined, the tenders for construction will be
delivered tomorrow, and as always ... Also, actually, the staff structure is due to go out for
1390 consultation for every single post inside the new structure by the end of this month. And sir, as
always with big changes, that is the point at which fear, uncertainty, cold feet and opposition
really kick in. It always happens with big changes, as certain as night follows day. But in this case it
has been considerably exacerbated by the fact that procedure has hampered our ability to provide
the levels of certainty that we would have liked to provide.

Now, it really upsets me that so many of the staff have such strong reservations. That is not a
comfortable place to be in. But as I said on Friday, I think the level of the opposition to the model
per se has been greatly exaggerated. Had it been the concept of one school in two colleges which
they disliked, the opposition would have manifested itself two years ago, not a few months ago.
Teachers are generally not slow on the uptake. (*Interjections*) So it is not the concept. And contrary
1400 to some claims, ESC has had a large number of meetings, not only with teaching unions, but they
have also consulted teachers through other fora as well. We have heard their concerns loud and
clear.

Now, some we have addressed already, others we can address going forward and some we
have said no to. That is how it works in the real world. And while there are obviously some
1405 teachers who are completely against the concept of a two-school model *per se*, the overwhelming
majority of the concerns we have listened to have been over particular aspects. Some do not like
the idea of enrichment and the longer school days and simply do not seem to be taking on board
the fact that this will be entirely voluntarily from the staff's point of view, nor the idea that the
enrichment element within the Programme Business Case brought with it £1 million in extra
1410 funding and many more teachers, both of which will be lost if it does not continue.

And I am afraid that the concept of enrichment is a red line for me. I do not mind being sent
back, if this amendment is successful, to negotiate with teachers. But the provision of enrichment,
for me, is a red line. I am happy to talk to them about how it will work, or the speed at which it is
introduced, or the year in which it is introduced, but the concept is there for a good reason.
1415 Indeed, it was central to the case put forward to the States in favour of the new model originally.
There would be efficiency savings certainly, but the proposal was not all about saving money. A
proportion of those savings would be ploughed back into educational provision to improve the
experience of pupils.

Enrichment was central to that. No longer would 30% of Guernsey children, and very largely
1420 those from the 30% of the poorest families in the Island, lose out on such things as extracurricular
sport, music, drama and other enrichment activities. I am not going to back away from that. That

is absolutely core to these proposals. Now, if some teachers want no part of that, so be it! No one is making them be a part of that. But I am afraid they cannot block it for others.

Now, some do not like the idea of changes to the lunchtime arrangements and a whole raft of other operational issues, none of which are insurmountable, although frankly, these are really not political matters. The other thing we approved two years ago was LMS – local management of schools – delegating the governorship to boards of governors, and will tell you what, when that has happened – unless we are going to do a U-turn on that as well – these matters, these operational matters, will be a matter for the professional school leadership team responsible to those boards of governors. They will come nowhere near us as politicians and yet they seem to be central to our consideration today.

That said, we are in the present system at the moment and the pledge to work through these issues with the profession contained in this amendment is no sop. It is not an attempt to sugar this amendment: it is very real.

Deputy Inder: Point of correction, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Deputy Roffey has suggested that under an LMS system nothing would come back to the States. But his 4(c), when we are talking about capital expenditure, now unless the governors have got the money themselves, all the extension or any space extensions, any purchase of land or possibly the church down at Les Beaucamps, would, with the exception of delegated authority, does have to come back to the States. So it is not true that under LMS issues regarding the schools would not come to the Assembly. It is just not true.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey to continue.

Deputy Roffey: Sir, if Deputy Inder had been slightly patient, I would have come on to the issue of space. I was talking about the operational issues, about the school day works and how the schools are organised. Certainly, obviously, capital expenditure has to come back to the States and I will move on to that. *(Interjection)*

But as the moment it falls ludicrously on politicians to work through those practical things about how the school day works and we pledged that we would do that and we will engage willingly and in a listening mode, but we will not promise that the unions will get everything they want. We are not handing over the management of our schools to unions. I am sorry, if other Committees want to do that in respect of their mandates, that is a matter for them. It is not what we are going to do.

Actually, we always intended to work through these issues diligently and collaboratively over the remaining years of this transformation project anyway. And Deputy Brouard said, 'Well, they can do it anyway' – yes and we were intending to. But we want to give the comfort to this Assembly that if they have directed us to do it ... and of course it may not be us in a few months' time, it may be a totally different set of people that the States have actually made that Resolution and it has to happen.

Sir, I am happy to formalise that undertaking through this Resolution because no one wants to be at war or even at odds with their staff. I believe that these operational issues can be worked through with good will on both sides. But if we are spending all of our time just looking at models again we will just never get on to them.

But the real facer, the real facer which is more difficult to resolve, is the general feeling amongst local teachers that the buildings need to be bigger. Now, there is plenty of room on both sites to do that, but we do have a dichotomy here. On one hand, we know that the existing plans are for buildings which significantly exceed national space standards for the number of pupils that they are planned to accommodate. On the other hand, there is no denying that they

are smaller schools in terms of space per pupil than Guernsey has traditionally built, because in the past the local space standards, including so-called Guernsey factors, have been absolutely off the chart. Now, I do not blame teachers for wanting to maintain that position and as a Committee, ESC has absolutely zero reasons for arguing with them. But on the other hand, all of us as a Government have a general duty to the taxpayer to provide cost-effective facilities. So I am torn, I am torn over that dichotomy.

But there is one matter on which I am 100% certain. We have heard this morning from Deputy Fallaize: the professional advisors within the project team have estimated the cost of the delay which will be caused by voting for the Requête unamended and if we are sent back around that mulberry bush comparing models again and again and again. There has been *no* political input into those estimates and the figures have been verified by officers at P&R. Now, there are a range of costs, but basically, the cheapest realistic estimate is £5 million. Yes, it is £2½ million if the States have done all of the detailed comparisons and then decided exactly what they are going to do this calendar year, despite the Election and everything that goes with it. But that is just so away with the fairies it is not even worth considering.

So in reality, we are talking about £5 million if we end up doing exactly what we are planning to do anyway – that is great, isn't it? – to maybe £10 million to £11 million if we go to any other educational model. And those are just the specific costs caused by delay. Most of the other possible models are actually also more capital and revenue hungry as well. So the actual added cost would be *much* higher than that.

So, sir, the one thing that I am very certain about is that *if* this States, if it really does have an extra £10 million to spare, which is basically what it would be saying if they vote for this Requête unamended, then it would be *far* better being spent on the additional facilities which the teachers say that they want, rather than completely wasted, completely squandered, on delay. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Delay which will not only be very expensive, but hugely damaging in extending the period of uncertainty from the current seven years – and that seven years is shameful, that we have actually allowed it to go on that long – to the full decade. Truly disruptive.

Sir, we have a choice today. The States can stop all progress on the current model, meaning the planning applications being withdrawn, the tenders due to be open tomorrow being aborted and send ESC away to look again at other models to compare and contrast (**Two Members:** Pour.) to a drawing board that is already *covered* with those former models. They are all ready to pick over the aborted attempts to reach a decision on those previous models because we know that they are inferior. Yes, we can do that and Deputy Lester Queripel says Pour. Fine, that is his stance. It will add years to the programme, cost many millions, because for the comprehensive, and let's look at the wording in the Requête, the 'comprehensive comparison' the Requête requires to be done in proper depth, it will really need competing outline business cases to be drawn up on each of those cases/situations.

Now, I know that was exactly what the rejected –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Point of correction, sir.

Deputy Roffey: – Dudley-Owen sursis called for in September –

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: This is a sincere point of correction. In conversations with our director of the capital process department, he stated that an economic case was sufficient to provide the comprehensive details requested within the Requête. Therefore it is misleading to state that anything further in terms of one of the three business case scenarios would be needed.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey to continue, please.

Deputy Roffey: Nevertheless, for each model we will need to take into account not only the build costs but the revenue costs and those revenue costs could only be determined once a detailed staffing structure was known for each option. That in turn could only be worked up once a detailed curriculum offer has been surmised for each option.

1530 We are talking about millions of pounds and very long delays and Deputy Dudley-Owen can shake her head all she likes, that is the firm reality and it is not just a reality as put forward by the politicians but by the highly skilled and experienced project team that have actually been working on this programme.

1535 How much better to take the option contained in ESC's own amendment, which would mean the States giving us the amber light to move ahead but subject to the additional procedures contained in that amendment. To decide that if we are going to add cost to this project, then that money should be put to good purpose instead of squandered on delay for delay's sake.

1540 In making that decision, I really would ask Members to bear a couple of things in mind. The first is – and I am not going to labour this point because it has been said several times – what other model should we be working up in detail, at great expense, to compare with the one that has already been twice agreed by this Assembly? Are any of them really serious contenders or are they just very useful vehicles for delay? Well, the signatories to the Requête have steadfastly refused to say what models they think should be worked up in detail saying that is a matter for us. Do not ask for an alternative, just stop progress on the improved model. Hugely irresponsible and

1545 a costly way to go about government. But so be it.

There really are probably only about five real possibilities, most of which have been considered and rejected previously and some of which are technically ruled out by the Requête simply because they have not been considered and rejected previously. I am not going to labour it, because we have heard it the last few days, but the three 11-16 schools and a tertiary college, preferred model of the Ozanne Committee, well, that was dismissed by the Education Committee on which several of the signatories sat as the worst possible outcome. What is more, any reconsideration of this model will immediately require us to stop all progress on the new Guernsey Institute because if the tertiary model ends up being adopted then obviously we would need a very different post-16 provision.

1550

1555 Then there is the model which the previous Committee preferred, after giving it deep thought no doubt, and put to the States. They took 18 months deciding that this was the very best way forward, so presumably they want it considered again. Only two problems: it has already been overwhelmingly rejected by this Assembly and once again it would require work on the Guernsey Institute to come to a grinding halt.

1560 Then there is the option of two or three 11-16 schools with a separate standalone sixth form college. It has been said yesterday ... not yesterday, we did not meet on Sunday, it was said on Friday that a completely standalone post-16 college, A-level college, has been dismissed by successive Education Committees as utterly unworkable with our numbers. Of course it can work if you have got 900 sixth formers.

1565 The fourth option is the one 11-18 school and two 11-16 schools. We have heard all about replacing selection by ability with selection by postcode. So deeply unfair I would refuse to even consider it; and actually roundly dismissed as unfair by the previous Education Committee on which several of the signatories sat.

1570 And then the last real option is the three 11-18 schools instead of two. Well, we talked about this on Friday. Of course it could work, but it is clearly sub-optimal both educationally and financially and it did not get much buy-in on Friday.

1575 So at the moment those are the only ... Maybe in the course of this afternoon's debate we are going to hear all these marvellous other options that have previously been considered, because that is the only ones we are really allowed to look at, which are really goers; which are really not just a way to put the two-school model back to the other side of the Election, but are actually serious contenders for becoming our approved model. I will wait with eagerness to hear what they are, particularly from the signatories to the Requête.

Sir, lastly I want to say something about the impact of two to four years delay which goes way beyond money or even the damage of yet more uncertainty, and that is the impact on the children already in the transition phase. We are not talking about a pause, we are not talking about a pause on the cusp of starting to implement the transformation, we are talking about a very considerable delay midway through the implementation ... no, not quite midway through, but partway through the implementation of an improved transformation programme which started in 2018. If we suddenly slam on the brakes today, it will be the pupils partway through that transition who will be damaged most.

Now, I should declare an interest. I have a grandson in Year 7. He was therefore one of the first cohorts of all-ability children to enter our secondary schools. He has gone into one of the smaller all-ability schools in Guernsey. Is that a handicap? Well, yes, it is a slight one, but nothing dreadful. However, if it is still the same size when he and all of the rest of his cohort move on to GCSE selection, then their choices will be incredibly restricted. If we delay for years, and we are talking about years, the same will be true for the current Year 6 coming behind, the current Year 5 and even the 4's. Not only that, but suddenly the certainty about which school they will be attending in future will be blown out the water and replaced with complete uncertainty.

Can we just go away, beaver away, and replace the old transition model with a new one? So, okay, what we told you first time round is not true, but do not worry, here is the new transition model, at least now after a few months uncertainty we have given you certainty again. Well no of course we cannot. If there was a year's delay through a planning issue or something similar, but where we still knew what the eventual model to implement was going to be, then we could do that. It would be very far from ideal, but it could be done. However, trying to provide a new transition programme when you have not a clue what model you are going to be transitioning to would be utterly impossible. 'What road should we take?' 'I do not know, it depends what your destination is.' 'Well, we do not know that yet.' 'Well, don't start off on your journey yet then.' Well, it is too late for that, we started two years ago. It is farcical, *farcical*, and a hugely damaging strategy, or rather, lack of strategy. We would be leaving parents and children completely in the dark over their future – completely unforgivable.

I think it is striking that amongst the many letters of support that I have received not only do then tend to be extremely articulate and well argued, but very many are from parents with children in the system and either already in or about to enter transition. Their simple question to me has been: 'How on earth can you even think about doing this to us?' And, sir, I really do not have an answer to that. By contrast, I would say about 80% of the emails I have received from members of the public supporting the Requête have been from those making clear how deeply they regret that Guernsey ever decided to scrap selection. (*Interjection*) Now, Deputy Graham Gill was quoted I think sometime last week as saying – I can quote the exact phrase – 'What it is about is not what it seems to be about'. Sadly, I think this is very much the case here.

While we have gone much slower than I would like to have done due to clunky procedures, but have perversely been accused of rushing things through before the next election, that is completely untrue. We have simply followed the programme. But conversely, I strongly suspect that this Requête is all about delay and deliberately pushing the key decisions to the other side of the election in order to make the question of secondary education, and that will inevitably include the issue of selection, the central question during that election campaign. You can just hear it now, can't you? 'They spent four or five years trying to find a good way of doing unselective education, they could not find one and therefore it logically follows that you go back to selection, don't you?' That is really what it ... Actually, the one honest man, I think ... No, that is accusing my ... (*Interjections*) The one man who has been very up front about his views on that has been Deputy Ferbrache. I wish a few more people would take a lead from that. No matter that it will cost millions, cause years of damaging delay or leave thousands of local families completely in the dark about their educational future. How irresponsible.

Now, sir, it is not that I mind fighting an election where one of the key issues is education generally or selective against comprehensive. But we had one of those in 2006! I enjoyed fighting it! But how many more do we want to have before we actually move on?

Sir, I have spoken – I see the time – for quite a long time, but I cannot help feeling that maybe I have concentrated on the disaster which this Requête being passed would represent without reminding Members of the huge advantages of the model that they have had the courage to approve twice. It really is a great news story. Far more curriculum choices, certainly far more combinations of choices; far more teaching by specialist teachers; far better special needs provision; improved pastoral care; smaller tutor groups; far more resilience in our schools; enrichment for Guernsey children, with the 30% from the poorest families no longer losing out on the precious opportunities; better recruitment; and better, yes, better, sports facilities; more equality across the schools; better opportunities to set when that is required. The list goes on and on, not least revenue savings – not least revenue savings.

Now, when I mention that the cynics tend to say, 'Well there we are, now we have the real reasons for the change: it is all about money'. Well it is not, but money is very important. Why? Because just like every other States' Committee, we have been told to make savings to allow Guernsey to balance its books. Now, either we make those savings without reforming the way we deliver education, which is what would have to happen under Deputy Dudley-Owen's infamous 'holding pattern', in which case those savings will have to come straight off frontline services, or we do it in a way which allows us to actually improve educational provision by making the way it is delivered more efficient. It is no brainer, or at least it should be.

Now, sometimes States' Members have a tendency to compartmentalise their thinking, so they take entirely different logical positions in different debates. When we are discussing public finances, they opine that we have to deliver services more efficiently. Nobody can be excused, every Committee must contribute to those savings (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and that includes you Education, Sport & Culture. Well, I hope I do not get any lectures from those that tend to call me a 'tax and spend' politician if they are going to vote for this Requête as it stands. Because when it comes to a debate on education, suddenly all of those considerations conveniently disappear from their minds! Well, I can tell them, they may not be thinking about those harsh economic realities today – 'Any amount of money to make our system work' – but that wishful thinking does not make those economic realities go away. They still exist: it is an inconvenient truth. But luckily, in the two-school model, we have a way of making efficiency savings while at the same time actually improving educational provision in Guernsey.

Members, this is no experiment. This is a well proven and successful model. Moderately sized schools – a bit bigger at first and a bit smaller in the future, but – of around 1,200 are the gold standard. Now, I know Guernsey is not England – you do not have to tell me that. Guernsey is not England. But do you know what? If I drop a stone from the top of Victoria Tower exactly the same thing happens as when I drop one from the Tower of London: they fall to the ground. Now, why? Because the law of gravity is the same in Guernsey as it is in England! We would like it to be different, we are all proud of our different gravitational fields over here, but it not true! (*Laughter*) Well actually, just like gravity, Guernsey children are pretty much the same as English children when it comes to learning. We can and should be informed by what works well elsewhere.

Sir, this Assembly has an unenviable but justified reputation for indecisiveness, wobbliness and procrastination. I think the right way forward today is obvious. I am not sure whether or not we will take it, but if we do not, I think it will be purely down to a lack of backbone.

Now, I am very happy to accept that there are *many* Islanders, thousands of Islanders, opposed to these twice-approved plans. There are; many of them stridently so. Sadly, a small core of them very abusively and angrily so, to the point at times where I have half expected to see pitchforks being carried. Now, I am a proud Guernseyman and I would never normally denigrate my own community in *any* way. But some of the tactics we have seen over the last couple of months have been nothing short of shameful; (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) the actions of an angry mob. Now, used

against elected politicians, they would be bad enough. But used against families, they are truly wicked. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)**

The way our political system works, Committee Members have as much power as Presidents *(Interjections)* – as much power as Presidents. But it is always the President that tends to be the identifiable figurehead. So I want to put on the record this morning before I finish that some of the abuse that Deputy Fallaize has had to endure has been truly shameful. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)** Let me also put on the record that the restrained and polite way in which he has responded to all of that abuse is a testament to his temperament and to his character. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)** I suspect that very few of us including, sadly, I have to say me, could have remained quite so gentlemanly under those circumstances. **(Several Members: Hear, hear.)** It has been a real low point for Guernsey and its political discourse.

So the question is, are we as a States ever willing to be resolute in those circumstances; ever willing to use our best judgement on behalf of those who elected us to pursue what we genuinely believe in our community's best interests despite being harangued and harassed from the side-lines, or are we so scared of any sizeable lobby group that we prefer to go around and around and around never taking difficult or controversial decisions for fear of upsetting a significant proportion of Islanders? If it is the latter, then Guernsey becomes ungovernable and we will have no one to blame but ourselves. We will have proved ourselves simply too weak to govern.

Sir, there is one thing we must all know, surely, whether we like the two-school model as I do, are lukewarm about it like some others, or absolutely hate it, we all know that at the end of this long debate, we cannot *possibly* vote for the Requête as it stands. No responsible government could do that because it is so destructive and negative. Never has the word pause been used less appropriately. **(A Member: Hear, hear.)**

Deputy Meerveld used to describe the referendum Island-wide voting as a 'wreckerendum'. Well, this is nothing more than a 'wreckerête'. *(Laughter)* There is no way we can vote for it as it stands. It would represent an absolute nadir in the government of Guernsey. It will be us being scared of our own shadows and deciding to go around the mulberry bush continually.

But what is the alternative? I suppose we could vote against this amendment and vote against the Requête, maybe approve some of the less contentious amendments in the meantime, but basically walk out after four or five days debate and the media out there saying, what did you decide? 'Well, absolute nothing' – absolutely nothing, whatsoever! *(Laughter)* We rejected all of the meaty amendments that put something in the place of the Requête and we rejected the Requête, 'So there we are, aren't we great? Five days, absolutely nothing decided'. I hope we do not do that. I hope we do not do that, but there is a good balanced listening way to move forward. Yes, it is only a nuance. It is changing slightly the position that this States has approved twice before by two-thirds majorities. But it is a nuance that I think sends a message to those people who have sweaty palms over it, who are really worried about their personal and professional future, that we will engage and engage properly.

So, sir, please, I ask people to vote for this amendment because I think the only other reasonable alternative is to vote everything down and I think we are going to look like a bunch of chumps if we really do that. Of course, I respect that people who intend to vote for the Requête unamended, they will take no notice. They obviously think that is a responsible way forward. I think the vast majority of us know it is not. Those that have always been against the two-school model will think it is because it makes it go away for a while. But those who have always been in favour but just worrying about the level of opposition and particularly the timing, I ask: gather your courage, do what you think is right – do what you know is right.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

My speech may go over into lunch. Are you content that I continue?

The Deputy Bailiff: You have stood up, Deputy Prow, and I have called you.

Deputy Prow: That makes it very clear, sir; thank you, sir.

1735 I rise because I will not be supporting amendment 5. Can I start with saying that I agree with Deputy Merrett in her opening to her speech about seeking to be constructive and respectful, and Deputy Roffey has spoken about that in his speech. So in doing this, I will respond to comments made by Deputies in the debate so far, all of whom, sir, all of whom I do respect.

1740 Sir, it was not the aim of the Requête to facilitate an options comparison debate on the floor of the Assembly, but to be a catalyst for Education, Sport & Culture to do the work together with teachers and other stakeholders and come back in short order with worked up comparators from the information already researched and available to them. Deputy Roffey will be disappointed – I have made it clear, sir, in all the speeches that, where those amendments seek to remove the Propositions of the Requête, that is not what the Requête aims to do.

1745 However, sir, the amendments laid have now unfortunately opened the spectre of continuing an off-the-hoof option debate with ESC, now amending, and only prepared to aggressively continue and champion their model exactly as it is and in the amendment wanting the Assembly to simply reaffirm the one school on two sites; and Deputy Brouard has outlined that point very powerfully. Sir, this will not be productive. The one thing I believe for certain from debate is that their model has divided this Assembly, the professionals and the public, so that the outcomes it seeks to deliver are now unattainable.

1750 One other important point with regard to the purpose of the Requête: it is not a vehicle to rubbish the ESC Committee themselves or to sink into personal criticism. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) In my view, sir, the requérants have been very careful to conduct themselves appropriately, limiting themselves to providing robust challenge to ESC and have been actually economical in the exchanges by trying to explain the need and aims of the Requête. For the avoidance of doubt, sir, I respect Deputy Fallaize for his passion and commitment, and the research and work that has been done on the one school, two school model that he believes to be the best. However, sir, it is, in my view, the language used in the ESC letter of comment and some of the language in this Assembly which has unfortunately made it necessary for the requérants to defend their right to challenge.

1760 Sir, my late mum was a school teacher at St Martin's School and she always told me not to overuse descriptors. I found this very helpful advice when in my professional life I wrote up evidential case files. In the first substantive paragraph of the ESC letter of comment, the Requête is described as 'unnecessary, ill-considered ... damaging and destructive'. Sir, from then on in that letter, and the stance that ESC have put over, colours in my view all that follows.

1765 P&R, Policy & Resources, by way of contrast, in their letter acknowledge:

that within the community and the teaching profession there are strongly-held concerns relating to aspects of the proposals ...

– but emphasises that:

it recognises that [the] parties involved with this matter have the best interests of our children at heart.

1770 I thank P&R for providing that balance and, sir, I believe that the descriptors used by ESC are unjustified and, as I have said, they taint that letter. Again, sir, I also believe the P&R amendment and other option amendments were a genuine attempt to find a way through what is now a terrible mess. Sir, in my view ESC are not doing this, by sticking rigidly to their plan and this is demonstrated all the way through the amendment 5.

1775 Bringing some balance, the requérants have been overwhelmed by the public support in that challenge, and in their challenge, and I thank all those who have articulated that support, literally in their thousands. And again, sir, I echo Deputy Roffey: there is no place for unpleasant social media, but I would point out that although not many, the requérants themselves have received such types of emails.

Sir, we have spoken throughout this debate about the five case business model. We have spoken about the process, but could I just say that where we talk about the business case it is in that context that the Requête and its Propositions need to be read. And the way that the five case business model has been handled by ESC is one of the fundamental causes of the Requête and why it had to be laid.

Sir, this is because we have not got the full business case, and we did not have when we made our decision in September, and we do not have one now. So when this Assembly granted delegated authority to P&R back in December, we did not have the information that would have been important for us to make that decision now, sir. I accept that the process of our business case model may be perceived by some to be overcomplicated and I also accept that different policy letters, when they are brought to this Assembly, that the business case is sometimes in a different stage, and I think that that is possibly a debate for another day. But the fact that we did not have all the information we needed when we passed this matter over to P&R back in September, and it was pointed out in what I thought was an excellent letter of comment from the Scrutiny Management Committee, and by those Deputies who supported the sursis, that the business case was far from complete and in a shape that would have given us the information.

I believe, sir, that many Deputies gave ESC the benefit of the doubt that the one school on two sites model they put forward was viable, well thought out. Sir, in my view this has proved itself to be a huge mistake. The five case business model, sir, and this has been outlined throughout debate, calls for a full business case containing the strategic case, the economic case, the commercial case, the financial case and the management case. But as Deputy Dudley-Owen has pointed out, I think in a political context the economic case is the most important.

In developing this, an outline business case is required crucially using the words contained in the relevant guidance model – and this is crucial, sir – it says:

the key stakeholders are engaged earlier on and can challenge and assist in shaping the direction of ... [this] project.

Sir, in my view this is where this project has gone completely pear-shaped and what I find frustrating is that ESC just do not appear to be getting it.

Deputy Dorey rightly pointed out that ESC have indeed produced volumes of documents and put on many presentations, particularly when it was clear that this project had gone off the rails. I do not think that has ever been in dispute. Well, certainly not from me, sir. But vitally, this is not stakeholder engagement. What we have been subjected to is PowerPoint, chalk and talk, much of it far too late. The Green Book referred to in many of the speeches explains that stakeholder workshops involving the end users is the recognised vehicle for professionals to challenge. The overwhelming evidence, in my view, is that this vital part of implementation has failed.

Sir, I think the requérants are asking ESC to smell the coffee. The outcomes are described in superlatives in the policy letter and in the volumes of glossy presentational material. But, although this is disputed, I would say over 90% of teachers are now challenging whether they can be achieved within the only model on offer. Clearly they cannot if the vast majority of professionals on the coalface believe the one school on two sites is flawed.

Sir, I also need to address what I believe is a misrepresentation of the views of the professionals coming from ESC. It is no helpful waving around very old newspapers and clearly I irritated Deputy Roffey by referring to the letter of 25th February, as he interrupted my speech with, 'Oh the unions again'. Deputy Roffey and other Deputies have in my view unfairly, in this debate, shown hostility to the unions. (A Member: Hear, hear.) The reason I have quoted this letter, and I believe Deputy Inder has referred to the letters from teachers individually signing and not under the union auspices, is for an extremely important reason. I want to quote in this Assembly, and put in *Hansard*, their views in their words and also for those words and indeed those articulated by Deputy Inder to appear in *Hansard*. I have heard so much about what Deputies believe the professionals are saying and unfortunately with their spin. So sir, that is why I have quoted directly from the letters.

I would like to wrap up the point I am making around the views of professionals. It is nonsense to suggest the requérants are suggesting that professionals should take over the decision making. Nobody at any time has suggested this, including the unions themselves. Do not bash them or their unions. At the presentations to Deputies, I have referred that their view is completely the opposite. They are the professionals, they understand budget constraints. They understand this is a political decision and they also understand the need for compromise. Sir, at that presentation they made it clear. They do not crave to take this over and they know they cannot.

I refer to Deputy Merrett's comments from that meeting, where she queried the exact wording of the presenter's assertion that the problems were insurmountable and she added the words 'appeared unsurmountable'. So I took detailed notes and vitally the word 'insurmountable' was used. But importantly it was the words that followed which drew my attention. They said:

Teachers are more convinced plans will not work and ESC have lost the workforce, this is unfortunately the position we find ourselves in whether we like it or not.

Sir, one other factor that has been touched upon is around the haste from the September debate until now. And the haste I refer to is in the ESC now driving through this model, going out to tender and doing a lot of the things that Deputy Roffey outlined that he wishes to get on with in his speech. But it is the realisation of exactly what the ESC model actually entails has only really emerged after this delegated authority was granted and has met with public dismay.

I do of course perfectly accept there is support for the ESC plans in this Assembly and within a small minority of the emails I have received. I completely respect those views, I completely respect their passion. The problem is, however, whatever view held, the reality is the more crunchy information has been hastily fed to all of us in a piecemeal fashion. We as an Assembly need to pause and listen to this public challenge and to then review and cause a report using the available, well-researched material. Furthermore, we must directly involve the professionals and we need this to happen as soon as possible. Everybody in this Assembly needs to get behind that. As, again, my late mum would have said, where there is a will, there is a way. This is where we must take up responsibility – all of us – to get us out of the position that we are in now, and very quickly – as quickly as we possibly can – put us in a better position.

Sir, just by way of closing, the ESC amendment asks the States for reaffirmation of its model. They call it the one school on two sites and they are determined to drive this through. But, sir, it contemptuously ignores the challenge from educationalists and the public, apart from unrealistically requesting a direction on more building space funding on their two sites to come back to the States. This amendment does not go anywhere near touching the unprecedented public and professional challenge with regard to education policy. I would urge the Assembly to throw out this quickly and for the sake of democracy turn the debate into something that moves this impasse forward.

Sir, whether Deputy Roffey likes it or not, whatever the outcome of this debate, whether this amendment is passed, whether the Requête Propositions fail, it is as certain as night follows day, if this amendment succeeds, that the one school on two sites will become an election issue.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, we will now adjourn until 2.30 p.m. When we resume at 2.30 p.m., I will test your appetite for sitting late and also moving into debate tomorrow should it be necessary, just so that if that is your wish then everyone knows where they stand.

So 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.48 p.m.
and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

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

1870 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Who would like to go next? Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

1875 In his opening Deputy Fallaize asked whether requérants would be willing to stand for the Committee. I am not as adept at political games as he is, and it took me some time to realise what he was trying to imply: that the requérants are pursuing the Requête for personal political advantage. This could not be further from the truth.

1880 I have consistently fought for what I believe is the best education system in Guernsey and will continue to do so and I would like to put on the record this conversation has been had with other requérants, who did say, what will happen if the Requête wins and the current Committee, to use an expression, throw their toys in the corner and resign? Although it is worth noting the Requête does not call for the two-school model to be thrown out. It calls for it to be compared against a baseline of other options.

1885 Now, do I believe in my heart that, if that happens, it will be thrown out? I believe it will. But the Requête actually asks the Committee to present their homework to be marked against other models for a true comparison to be done, which has never been done so far. Having said this, part of what I want to put on the record happened with other requérants of what would happen and, of course, I think other requérants would also be willing to step up to the plate and commit themselves to trying to sort out the debacle that this States has got itself into because of its own actions.

1890 Although I will say what I said to them, I will stand and help to do that work, but I will not be standing as President or Vice-President of that Committee. I would simply be putting my shoulder to the wheel to try and get the right outcome.

1895 Now, Deputy Fallaize, in his opening speech, also said there are thousands of pages of information analysing this up and down, left and right. There is no new information and there are no other viable models. I take issue with that, particularly the fact that there is no new information.

1900 I have in my hands here the traffic impact study for St Sampson's. This is not for the Beaucamps and St Sampson's, this is just for St Sampson's school site. This was published on 3rd December, several months after we voted, this Assembly voted, to give delegated authority for funding of the two-school model.

1905 The fact is there are hundreds, if not thousands, of pages of information that have come into the public domain since that decision was made in December to continue proceeding the two-school model. In fact, it is only when that information has become available that we have seen the public outcry and the teachers *etc.* coming out and saying that they would want this to be paused and reviewed because they are concerned about the information that has subsequently become available.

1910 In fact, there is more information that should be available and Deputy Roffey mentioned earlier that there is more stuff coming out before the end of this month. The Requête says pause and review and compile all the information in a side-by-side comparison. All of this information has not been available. This Assembly has not seen it and the public have not seen it and the teachers have not seen it.

1915 It needs to be compiled and presented so that all of it can be looked in the round to decide whether or not this is the best option. In fact, when we talk about viable models, at the end of the day, we need to decide whether the two-school model, as sold to this Assembly, is a viable option. And we are highlighting new issues every day. In the traffic impact study it came out – Members will be aware of an email exchange overnight – that Oatlands have said that they are not willing to allow their property to be used in the way that is described in the TIA. And yet the TIA says:

In the with Sustainable Transport Interventions scenario, the traffic impact arising from the development is principally a result of the proposed Drop & Stride facility at Oatlands. Given the existing traffic constraints at Oatlands, assuming all Drop & Stride trips from the north will use this facility is considered to provide a robust assessment.

Basically, that is part of the mitigations. The Oatlands drop and stride location is a key part of the mitigations and further in the report it says that they expect the traffic to go down Vale Road, Le Murier, Baubigny, to approach from that direction. And yet, Oatlands' management have said that they have clearly stated that the front car parks, the existing car parks of Oatlands cannot be used, not just because it conflicts with the businesses there, but because the largest area of parking, the field, which has an interweaved cement mesh with grass growing through it, has a weight limit of four tonnes. That means anything larger than an SUV cannot use that area without sinking into it. So there are physical constraints why it could not be used as well.

There is a suggestion that maybe –

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

Deputy Meerveld is creating the impression, in fact I think he may have said, that Oatlands have said that their land could not be used as a drop and stride location. That is incorrect. There have been discussions between officers and Oatlands and Oatlands have told us that they are very happy to continue those discussions and, if they can, to assist with the provision of a drop and stride location. It may be in place X on their land, rather than in place Y, but if that is the limit of Deputy Meerveld's argument, then I think that much of what he is saying is incorrect.

Deputy Meerveld: No, sir, it is correct, Deputy Fallaize. I said as was planned and described in this document. This document has the traffic approaching from the Vale Road, through Baubigny, and that is part of the traffic mitigation. The discussions with the owners of Oatlands, they have said that possibly the green field to the rear could be tarmacked or concreted and could have a new driveway put onto the Braye Road. But the problem is then the traffic does not go via Vale Road and the Baubigny anymore; it would go down Route Militaire and through the Baubigny junction and then eventually, ultimately, possibly through the Oatlands junction.

Those junctions, according to the traffic impact study, are currently the Baubigny nearly 119% of capacity during the morning rush hour and the Oatlands junction, at Route Carré, nearly 113% capacity. That means that this document is based on false assumptions and inaccurate numbers. The plans that have been published: I obtained a set of the plans that have been supplied as part of the tender process and I am now aware that the tendering process, which is being completed today, with the tenders being received and open tomorrow, is based on architectural drawings.

These are concept drawings, layout of rooms, elevations to the sides. My brother is building a house. The plans for his house, for his personal use, are twice as thick a pile as the ones for this entire school. It certainly is not the size of the schools.

I know from companies that have been part of that tender process they have been given architectural drawings and been asked to guess where the steel work goes, where the electrics goes, where the plumbing goes, what materials to use, and give a guesstimate of the price. The whole planning process, in my opinion, is in question, and the danger is, if contracts are signed, on a design and build basis without proper quotations, without proper specifications, then you are just opening yourself up for massive cost overruns.

It is nonsense to say there are no other variable options and we have a school system functioning now. The issue that needs to be addressed is whether one school on two sites is viable itself and we have to take a step back and do this properly, apply proper governance principles and do that comparison with all the information available, to make sure that we are getting what this Assembly was sold.

1970 In January 2018, this Assembly was sold a Rolls-Royce education system by a very consummate salesman. However, it now appears we are being delivered a Robin Reliant and we are not sure the engine works. This may be an exaggeration, but it is absolutely true that what is being delivered is very different from what this Assembly was sold; and it keeps changing every day, as the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture try to address the ever more obvious deficiencies and issues with implementing the model.

1975 I will finish with another quote from Deputy Fallaize's opening speech, when he declared that supporting the Requête would be an unprecedented abdication of responsibility. I would respond that not supporting the Requête is truly an unprecedented abdication of responsibility.

Thank you, sir.

**Procedural –
Extension of sitting hours and into next day if necessary –
Propositions carried**

1980 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, before lunch I said that on resumption I would test your appetite to extend your sitting hours, whether that be today or into tomorrow, should that be necessary. I will start with the latter, if I may, and simply put to you the motion that if debate on this article of business, not this amendment, but this article of business, the Education Requête, is not completed by the time you rise today, is it your wish to adjourn until tomorrow morning at 9.30 a.m.? So the motion is to extend the sitting into tomorrow, those in favour –

1985 **Deputy Dorey:** Is it possible to ask who would not be present tomorrow morning, because that might help people make the decision?

1990 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I did ask that last week, but let me do it again, just to remind those who have slept over the weekend, will those who are unavailable if the States sit tomorrow please stand in their places? Thank you all very much. So I will now put the motion to you that if the business on this article does not complete today, that the States adjourn until 9.30 tomorrow morning.

Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: I am going to declare that carried.

1995 No, I am not going to take a vote on that. If anyone wants to request a vote then they can but I am satisfied that there was a sufficient –

A Member: I was going to ask for a recorded vote, please, sir.

2000 **The Deputy Bailiff:** A recorded vote. Then we will go a recorded vote on adjourning until tomorrow, please, Deputy Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 17, Contre 14, Ne vote pas 4, Absent 4

POUR

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Trott
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint

CONTRE

Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Langlois
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Mooney
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Graham
Deputy Dorey

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Brouard
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

ABSENT

Deputy Le Pelley
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Le Tocq

2005 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, the voting on the motion I just put to you about adjourning from today to tomorrow, there voted in favour, 17; against, 14; 4 abstentions, 4 absentees. So, for the time being, there will be an adjournment from today to tomorrow, should that be necessary. I simply remind you at this stage the effect of Rule 6(4).

Can I just test with you while we are doing it, whether or not you are minded to sit later today?

2010 **Deputy Roffey:** Can I ask for a clarification? Are we limited to 6.30 p.m. or could we just self-isolate and keep going tonight until we actually finish this debate? *(Laughter)*

The Deputy Bailiff: I have not actually put to you anything about this afternoon yet, Deputy Roffey, which is what I am just about to do.

2015 This was for tomorrow, first, because obviously, depending on what we are doing tomorrow, might depend on what you want to do later today. But I was going, in the first instance, to simply invite you to extend the sitting hours to 6.30 p.m. and we will wait and see where we are to later. If you do not want to extend beyond 5.30 p.m. then it is simply a vote Contre.

So those in favour of extending the sitting hours today; those against?

Members voted Pour.

2020 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I declare that carried and therefore, come 5.30 p.m., we will not simply adjourn, we will see where we get to, but no later than 6.30 p.m. for the time being. Thank you for that, Members of the States.

Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Debate continued

The Deputy Bailiff: Who wishes to speak next?
Deputy Inder.

2025 **Deputy Inder:** Just briefly, sir. I will try and keep to the amendment. I find it fascinating over the – and this is the only comment, which might sort of head towards general debate ... that on three separate occasions when we have been talking about buildings and structure, we have

heard from, I think it was Deputy Fallaize, Deputy Dorey and Deputy Roffey, I will make a quote, 'highly skilled project team'.

Now, we have got highly skilled professionals that are teaching our children and I find it quite interesting that the highly skilled project team building the site seem to have more import than the highly skilled professionals that have problems with the two-school model. Deputy Brouard, possibly who stole Deputy Smithies' speech, has gone through all the noting parts and the only bit that I think I am going to comment on is ... What is it? It is 4(c), 'To direct' – a direction one. It goes on to say:

in which it shall set out its opinion on whether further building space should be added at the 11-18 colleges for the time when they have year groups in all seven years and in order to provide the best possible facilities ...

– and we have all read the rest. But it is fascinating. I ask you to cast your mind back. The previous Committee ... I know much has been said that the current ESC have spent what was £90,000 developing the alternative model, but that is not strictly correct. The previous Committee agreed the £90,000 to allow the then four, and I will leave it at that, to develop their alternative model. I think it ended up being £72,000 and, just for the record, certainly myself and Deputy Dudley Owen did not vote for that. You can imagine my response was, 'Come and get me', the fact that he did is irrelevant, but I certainly did not vote for that on our Committee.

But when this was presented by Deputy Fallaize, if I remember correctly – and I do not – it was fairly well costed and we were sold that the capital expenditure was going to be roughly the same, if not cheaper, and the revenues were certainly going to be cheaper. But what this does, in 3(c), this befuddles the initial promise, because if this is agreed, it is likely that this, or what is likely to be a future Education Department, is likely to be coming back to the States for more money. But that is not what you were sold.

If you want to change the space, you will be asking for more money unless ... And we have already spent £1 million buying basically the two opposite sites of Delisles – an extra £1 million – and I do not particularly remember that being mentioned in the alternative model. So there is £1 million there. Now, if anyone thinks just spending £1 million on probably a site across the road that, if it is not Grade 2 listed, or whatever the equivalent, it is likely to be in the future, is cheap; think again.

Anything you do to those sites, whether you just reduce the barn on one side of the road and turn it into a car park, is going to cost you hundreds of thousands of pounds. If you want to develop what is likely in the future to be, certainly on the outside anyway, a listed building, it is going to cost you millions of pounds. So already we have moved, in terms of capital expenditure, a lot further than was the original promise; the costed promise.

In that regard, and I said it would be a short speech, I would actually like to hear from, sir, we have not heard much from Policy & Resources and what their view is on this or what a future Policy & Resources might think. Because when this was presented to this Assembly and when our model was comprehensively defeated, I think it was something like 13 to 27, I do not remember us being told that we were going to spend an extra £1 million buying the Castel Methodist Church's land. I do not remember it being costed for development of the land and I certainly do not remember any conversation about upping the space.

That has actually changed everything. It was not what was previously sold, and I am not going to drift into general debate because I think I probably drifted into general debate earlier. So, for the purposes of this amendment, to keep it nice and short, I would ask Members to reject this, because again we are in a position where we are voting for something where we have no idea what the financial outcome will be. None whatsoever.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, I think States' Members ought to realise that this is really the main event of the afternoon, in connection with these proposals. Because if this amendment is passed, that is the end of the Requête. And then if people wake up and realise, 'My goodness me, that is the end of the Requête, therefore I might vote down these as the main Propositions', you end up with the two-school model. That is what is the likely result of all that.

Anyway, I am going to take that gamble and save my main comments, if the amendment is unsuccessful, to general debate. But there is an old adage: a short cut is sometimes the longest way around, and that is exactly why we are here. Because, in March 2016, the States decided to vote down the selective system, without any idea of what would replace. In November 2016, the States upheld that decision without any idea what was going to replace it. Then came forward the three-school model, which was voted down, and there was a significant vote on two occasions in favour of a two-school model.

Now, what Deputy Inder said to a degree is that we do not know all the detail. I agree with him in part, I disagree with him in part. I agree with him that, when you are going through this kind of proposal, you should have as much detail as you can. But to expect full detail, with every 'i' dotted and every 't' crossed is ridiculous, because you would never get anything done.

You have got to trust the people that are doing the job that the States have said. But against that, there is such a public outcry, concern, and from the teaching profession, as to these proposals. So it needs to be considered further and, by that, nobody should take heed as to what I might vote when it comes to, if we get that far, if we get the substantive Propositions of the Requête.

Where Deputy Roffey – who has spoken very eloquently in relation to this – is right, is that the delay will be much longer than is proposed in the Requête. The cost will be upwards of £10 million or £11 million. They will be much nearer the upper limits, rather than the lower limits, and what is being asked in the Requête is for detail, effectively. I can choose whatever words you like and I have spent a lifetime choosing words and getting reasonably well paid for it. You can choose whatever words you want, but effectively, the Requête asked for detailed proposals in relation to a number of viable options. I do not know what 'viable' options means. Does it mean economically viable, does it mean educationally viable, does it mean a mixture of the two?

So, in relation to all of that, again the way forward, I would suggest, is to vote this amendment down – I am going to vote against it – on the basis there will then still need to be a full debate on the Requête itself and, if the Requête is voted down, then we have a two-school model in any event.

So it is premature to vote in favour of this because if we do ... sorry, sir, if Members of the States vote in favour of this, the Requête is dead, the full debate has not taken place, and I think many people out there will feel that they have not had a fair airing. But we are collectively – not you, sir, the States' Members are – like a headless chicken. We are floundering around because we have started from a very bad place, with a mixture of ideologues – as I say my phrase, nobody else's – Hampstead socialists, in voting down the selective system in March 2016 without having a bloaney idea as to how and what was going to replace it.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: Thank you, sir.

I am going to try not to speak on too many different subjects. I want to concentrate on just a couple of areas, although there are some responses I would like to make to some of the things that have been said already. We have heard the suggestion during this debate that this amendment does not do anything, that it is just 'To note'. Firstly, despite the comments of some of my very much respected colleagues, this is not true.

There are Resolutions here, which bring forward additional promises. Proposition 3 directs the Committee to ensure that decisions about how the school and its colleges should be operated should be made via:

an improved process of consultation with teachers and support staff ...

Surely everybody wants that?

2130 Proposition 4 promises a further policy letter setting out proposals for any further space considered necessary, considered as a result of the consultation – not considered purely by ESC – to be built ready for when each of the colleges contain seven full year groups, covering *inter alia* recreation, social time, sport, including for Le Murier, library and sixth forms.

2135 What these Propositions also do, though, is set out what the current situation is and that is important, because it has often been lost in this debate, both here and in the media and on social media. Perhaps the most important of those is that it corrects the notion that we can stop all this now, before it begins.

2140 The States, the Committee and Office for Education, Sport & Culture, and most importantly the students, are not at the beginning of this process. We are already two years into the programme. If the requérants were looking to call halt at the last minute, then they are a long way too late. Students in Years 7, 6 and 5 in particular, are already in the new system and it is the impact of this Requête on those students – 459 in Year 7, 430 in Year 6, 543 in Year 5 – that I want to speak about. That is 1,430 students in those three years alone, 1,432 lives that will be affected if we decide to throw indecision their way at the end of this debate.

2145 Deputy Smithies has said that he does not accept that the unamended Requête would lead to years of delay, but that is unrealistic. It is unrealistic to think that a meaningful ‘comprehensive comparison’, to quote the Requête, of several other models will not introduce a significant delay. In fact, Deputy Meerveld’s comments seem to suggest that he thinks there should be traffic impact awareness studies done on each of those models as well. Believe me, you are not doing any of that in a hurry.

2150 It will cost millions of pounds and will introduce delay, which will mean our students will continue to have different education experiences depending on where they live. I want to address what that delay will mean to those students, because much of the delay that this will create affects students, even if that delay is the briefest it could be, even if all that delay does is cause a review to happen, which brings us back to the model that we are currently working on.

2155 Delay to the building will have direct impact upon the pupil transition model, which has already been shared and begun with parents and students. Both the Beaucamps High site and St Sampson’s High School site are due to increase in population from September 2021, when both will receive a double Year 7 intake for the first time. Bear in mind, if this Requête carries on and goes forward, and if we continue with the transition model we have got, a delay is still being inserted because building work has not started.

2160 Following that, in 2022, all remaining students at La Mare de Carteret site will move to the Beaucamps High site and to de Saumarez College and all except Years 13 and 14 will move from the Les Varendes site to the St Sampson’s site, Victor Hugo College. If the extensions are not completed then, then the transition model will become unviable. Of course, that could be revisited, but it does mean that the certainty provided to parents and students is removed and we continue with the unsatisfactory *status quo* for longer.

Deputy Oliver: Point of correction, sir.

2170 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Building work cannot start until the planning decision has been made.

2175 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Tooley to continue.

Deputy Tooley: Absolutely. Deputy Oliver is absolutely correct. But if the Requête leads to a situation where all work has to stop now, that pushes back the process. It pushes back planning, it pushes back everything.

2180 Even a year's delay would lead to Year 12 having to move midway through their A-levels or IB courses. Or we could really draw the transition out for those students, but that would mean continuing a system which was sub-optimal, both educationally and economically, and the two colleges not becoming fully operation until 2024. And that is under the shortest of possible delays; the delay which would occur if, following a review, the two-school model was again proposed. Any other model would create an additional delay.

2185 Deputy de Lisle talked about modelling from sixth form being about the academic, but it is about so much more than that. Role model is as much about behaviours and attitudes and maturity as it is about post-16 options, and larger cohorts mean a greater opportunity and ability to offer courses tailored to different aptitudes and interests, even within the subjects. So, for example, PE could be offered at GCSE or as a more vocational PE option. Functional maths could
2190 be offered alongside GCSE maths and so on.

In smaller schools, limited numbers often mean that only one of those could be offered. Let us not forget that our College of Further Education students, who will be students in the new Institute, do complete vocational courses and then go on to university or to live and work here or elsewhere in the world.

2195 Delays will cause curriculum issues. Delays continue the postcode lottery of Key Stage 4 curriculum choice. The first comprehensive cohort is spread this year, and at least next year, across four small schools, with all the challenges that brings. Under the current transition model, they will be in the two new larger colleges by Key Stage 4, but in any holding pattern that will not be the case and this will be detrimental to all students of all abilities, as there are simply not enough
2200 students in each of the four schools to offer the curriculum breadth required.

As Deputy Fallaize has said, eight students in each of four schools is not enough to run a GCSE or BTEC group, but 16 students in each of two is. Any delay means a delay to sixth formers being in each school. Clearly that would have applied equally to Deputy Le Tocq's amendment yesterday and if you, as we do, agree that 11-18 schools are what we should be providing for our students,
2205 then any delay to that programme delays that being the case for all our students. Realistically, any delay means that you will not see sixth formers in each college until around 2023 at the earliest.

Delay will affect those students who most need extra help. Delay to the programme will cause delay to the development of communication autism intervention support bases and co-location. It is really very challenging at present to spread resources so thinly as we do across four schools.
2210 Having a CASS space on each secondary school site will positively benefit staff and students by having the expertise of the service on each site. This is not currently possible across four.

The benefits for students in having health and care services co-located means that students would be able to access, for example, CAMHS appointments on site, and would lead to much better joint agency working for professionals like teachers, school nurses and so on. All of these
2215 benefits will be delayed if there is a delay and these are about more than improving curriculum outcomes, but about delivering real-life benefits. Why would anyone want that? As a parent of children with additional needs, let me tell you I absolutely do not want that.

I want to talk briefly about enrichment and its value, and I am going to give you a Guernsey example. One of our schools, with the assistance of the Sports Commission, started a gymnastics
2220 club. 60 children have joined that club and of those children 55% are in uniform allowance; 68.1% are not involved in any other club at school or elsewhere. In some year groups, it is about 80%. The vast majority of those students are girls and, bearing in mind that we know it is harder to get girls' participation in sporting activity, that too is very relevant.

It is okay to say, 'What about activities children already participate in?' The market will move to
2225 accommodate that. But what about the children who do not get the opportunity to participate in any additional activities, the children enrichment will most benefit? All this uncertainty and negativity and delay is having a massive impact on the morale of the profession.

Some will say that it is not the uncertainty but the plan which is having this effect. But the way that certain individuals are encouraging this to play out so publicly is undoubtedly putting people

2230 off applying to Guernsey. This deterioration in the number of applications dates from the laying of the Requête –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sir, point of correction.

2235 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Dudley-Owen. You are supposed to sit, Deputy Tooley, when there is a point of correction, please.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you sir. Thank you to Deputy Tooley.

2240 The union surveys for the NASUWT, the biggest teaching union in Guernsey, being representative of mostly members made up of the state secondary school sector, stated in November last year that a very high proportion of staff were dissatisfied, not only in their jobs but also with the current States' policy. That was well before the Requête was laid. That was well before the plans were submitted to the Development & Planning Authority. Therefore, for Deputy Tooley to lay an assertion that it is a current debate that we are engaging in with today that is causing staff dissatisfaction and having a negative impact is absolutely incorrect. It was already *in situ* before.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Tooley to continue, please.

2250 **Deputy Tooley:** With respect, sir, that is not what I said. I am speaking about the deterioration in the number of applications. The natural turnover is no different this year than it has been in previous years. It is a deterioration in the number of applications to begin work here and that dates from the laying of the Requête.

2255 This will have a direct impact on students and schools will need to use more agency staff and there will be quality issues. That is not a criticism of agency staff, but a result of having temporary staff and sometimes not having subject specialists in place. This will impact on student outcomes. We have to coalesce in order to ensure that we do not affect students. We need to work through the issues over the next few years, with the staff – and many of those issues are operational – to find solutions which put children's issues at the heart of what we are doing, something I know staff want to see.

2260 Staff are rightly involved and interested in the future of secondary education. They should be. Staff are at the heart of our schools and we need them to continue to put children first and to concentrate on what they do best, which is teaching their subjects and ensuring the best for our children. It is natural that teachers have lots of questions and concerns.

2265 All good ideas – all new, good ideas – always raise many questions that cannot be answered with 100% certainty because the idea is new. History will never provide data that leads to 100% certainty that a new idea will work, and a need for 100% certainty would lead to the destruction of many ideas which would benefit us. In fact, we would never come up with new ideas, as we could never be certain of them.

2270 The ongoing uncertainty will continue to impact on our teachers, which will undoubtedly impact on our children and our young people and what this Requête calls for is ongoing uncertainty. Before I finish, Deputy Lester Queripel quoted Yeats and challenged my response and I am a little bit confused by the poem he chose, which is a response to a demand for yet more evidence, when the benefits are obvious. Yet more evidence that the right thing should be done, because it is the right thing.

2275 I am reminded of Schrodinger's famous cat that was in the box and could have been alive or might have been dead. What we have here is a situation where people are telling us that there are lots of boxes and they have got lots of cats in and that they are absolutely convinced that the cat in the box that we have got in front of us is dead. Some people will not believe the evidence that it is not, even though the box is open, and the cat is meowing and are trying to suggest that, maybe, it is undead.

We will not be serving our young people ... well, if we accept this Requête, with its inevitable uncertainty, and we will not be serving our Island well, either. The students of today are the drivers of our future economy. This Requête calls for uncertainty. This amendment is not a huge amount different to the *status quo*, but it is different in critical ways that people are calling out for and I urge you to support it.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you sir.

A number of poets have been namechecked during this debate and a number of poems have been recited at least in part or in full. Some have been of quite dubious quality! (*Laughter*) I know the intention was to try and lighten the mood somewhat, sir, (**A Member:** It didn't work.) and I am not going to read lines and lines of poetry. But my hero amongst the poets is Samuel Taylor Coleridge and, in my opinion, he was as much a visionary and a prophet as a poet. He is famous for poems like *Kubla Khan* and *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, which I would not advise reading, because it is 25 pages long in my book.

But my favourite Coleridge poem, sir, is one entitled *Limbo*, and in that poem Coleridge superbly describes what an awful state being in Limbo is and how unsatisfactory and how almost surreal it is. It is a place that none of us really wants to be in, and we are in two states of limbo, really. One in regard to the issue and one in regard to this debate, because Deputy Roffey said something this morning that I absolutely agree with. We have been debating this issue for days and days. I know we have dealt with other items, but this issue has taken days and days. It has all been academic, really, because, as Deputy Roffey said, Members have come into this debate, the vast majority of Members have come into this Chamber with a fixed position.

It does not matter how much Members say, whether they are –

Deputy Roffey: Point of correction, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Deputy Queripel says that we have been debating this for days and days. Actually, we have been debating it for seasons. When we started this debate it was winter. It is now spring!

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Laurie Queripel to continue.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: Thank you sir.

Yes, during this sitting we have changed from one season to another. But in reality it has been days. But, actually, Members who have spoken in support of the current policy, because that is what it is – it has been approved by the States twice – I can understand the frustration of ESC and that is why they have been defending their policy and promoting it so rigorously. Or Members are against the policy and have been speaking against it and drilling down to some quite minor detail actually. None of that matters, because most Members are talking to avoid, because most people are coming to this Chamber with a fixed position and this debate could go on for two weeks and they would still vote the same way at the end. There might be one or two that might change their mind, but that does not really give much value to days and days of debate, I do not think. (*Interjection*) I am about to tell you.

I am not enthusiastic about this Requête and I am not an avid supporter of it. But I cannot support this amendment, sir, however well-crafted or well put together it is, and I understand that it is, because Deputy Fallaize is behind it. I just think I need to explain that. Even if this amendment succeeds and even if it survives the final vote, it is delusional to think it is going to put the matter

to bed. I do not believe this holding pattern, unfortunate and undesirable though it is, can be avoided.

Even if this amendment prevails, even if it becomes the Propositions, it will only provide short-term certainty and by definition, sir, short-term certainty is false certainty. This is where I agree so much with – he is not in the Chamber now – Deputy Le Tocq when he spoke on Friday. Many of the words that he used, the terminology he used, I had in my notes in the days leading up to this debate and I will touch on those in just a minute.

It gives me no pleasure to say this, but anything other than the Requête prevailing, largely unamended, resolves nothing. It just puts matters on hold until after ... it will be an election issue, but also until after the election, when there is a new cohort of Deputies in this Chamber. In a way, it kind of prolongs the agony. If this amendment is approved, it will mean even more work, effort, time and money being used to progress this model and then early in the next term efforts will be made, and I believe successfully, to put it on hold anyway.

Now, grim as that may sound, and it is grim, I think that is the *realpolitik* of the issue. I do not speak as someone with much skin in the game. I will not be here next time. I am not standing in the next election. In a way, these are almost neutral observations.

When I spoke about Deputy Le Tocq's words on Friday, I was thinking back to when we had the selection debate in the last term and that decision was reaffirmed in this term. When I voted to move away from selection to all-ability, I felt it was a blow that the community could ride, especially as it seems anyway the vast majority of teaching professionals, of education professionals, were saying it was the right thing to do. So I felt that those people in our community who were extolling the virtues of selection, who were protesting against its removal, I felt ultimately they would ride that punch in time and the view of the professionals would somehow moderate their protests against removing selection.

But I was also very mindful of what the next step would be, and I really felt that going with a three-school, three-site, whichever configuration we are talking about – three colleges with one sixth form, whatever it was going to be – I felt that was another decision that the community could, by and large, live with, even though the teachers clearly would have some concerns about whatever kind of school model was put in place. So I agree with Members who have said that.

So this is where I think the gang of four, which eventually became the famous five, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture – seven, actually. There is no famous seven, I do not think. There is a 'magnificent' seven, of course. This is where I feel that the gang of four and the Members that eventually became the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, and the States, by a majority, made a mistake. They made a mistake because, as Deputy Le Tocq said on Friday, Guernsey, by and large, does not do revolution. It does evolution. It does things step by step.

Now and again of course, for a small community, we can move quickly and nimbly, if we need to. But by and large Guernsey does things step by step. It does things via evolution and, if you look around at our community and our history, you can say that, in the main, that has served us well.

I think however well-intended the current Committee were and however well-intended the majority of States' Members were that voted for that model, I always felt it was going to bring this kind of situation down upon us and it has. As I say, I take no pleasure in that, but I just do not think anything other than the Requête prevailing, perhaps slightly amended – there are some amendments to come which I will very likely support but – other than it prevailing as it is at the moment, pretty much intact, it will not put this issue to bed, it will just delay it.

If this amendment goes through and it becomes the substantive Propositions, it will give the illusion of having things sorted out. More work, more time will be spent, more money spent, and yet the States, in the next term, will bring this all back again. So, on balance, I feel like I have to support the Requête and reject this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, I think this Requête has resulted in a record in terms of the length, if not necessarily the quality, of amendments. And I have to say, when I first managed to get through this amendment, which gives a nice history lesson – interestingly similar to the P&R amendment but ever so slightly different – I was not sure what to make of it.

2390 However, as time has gone on and, importantly, having spent two hours last Saturday – actually I wrote that little bit before the weekend of the Saturday before last – listening to the Committee and its senior team, I can understand why this amendment has been laid. But in reality, it should not be needed.

2395 I was really impressed listening to Peter Marsh, he of Peter Marsh Consulting, who has many years' experience of schools and their buildings – and I think it is important to remember that knowledge of buildings. He was able to respond to questions that those of us there raised, including over the width of corridors, size of classrooms, dining rooms and outdoor space.

2400 It was clear from what he said that there is more building space than under the Building Bulletin 103, by nearly 1,000 m², with classrooms enabling an average capacity of 31. Using staggered lunch breaks, there is 228 m² more space and, on that front, I do struggle to understand the concerns over staggered break and lunch times. Surely that is a better use of what would otherwise be dead space? Staggered break times happen in primary schools now, so I am not sure why there is an objection to do this for secondary schools.

2405 There can also be different approaches to lunch breaks themselves. Why do they have to be an hour or more long, not split during the day? I was particularly interested in the layout changes to St Sampson's. The corridors, we all know, have been an issue from day one, but it was useful hearing how there are particular pinch points and it was clear that this had been taken into account when designing the extensions and how the new building layout was designed to enable the flow to change and therefore mitigate any impact an increase in numbers could potentially have.

2410 Finally, in terms of outdoor space at Les Beaucamps, yes this is less than the UK, but then we have less space than the UK, so it really should not be a surprise. You could have fitted the whole PEH site in the land that my school sat on, with room to spare, but that was not in Guernsey. We have primary schools without any green play areas too. However, it is clear that while such grassy areas look wonderful, they are not greatly utilised for a variety of reasons and, with change, could be so.

2420 As I say, that session took place over a week ago now and was really helpful to me. It confirmed why I supported the two-school model two years ago and why I said four years ago – just four years ago, when we had the debate on selection – that if Members voted to get rid of the 11-plus, the best model for a non-selective system would be a two-school model. That is what I said as someone who wanted to retain selection at the time. The whole debate was about equality of opportunity. If that was what Members wanted, two schools was the best way of achieving it.

2425 On that, as I came into the Royal Court today, one of the campaigners said to me, 'It is not too late to change your mind.' Which I think demonstrates that there is a clear misunderstanding here. The Requête is not throwing out the two-school model. It is not proposing any alternative model. If it had been, I think the debate may have been far easier. It would have been easier for me anyway.

2430 What we are really debating here is whether we have a delay to review various models, and potentially start all over again, or go ahead with the two-school model. What is a challenge for me is: to what extent we need to pause because we understand a large number of teachers have reservations and whether the reservations are more to do with the model or the implementation? That is a quandary for me.

2435 Now, a lot of time and effort goes into producing business cases – a lot. A lot of very expensive Civil Service and consultant time, to write pages and pages of stuff. We have PAR reviews to make sure that what those consultants and officers write makes sense and an internal quality assurance team in P&R who check all that makes sense and, if it does not, it all goes around and around. Literally millions are spent in this little bubble of assurance. This internalisation comes at the

expense of understanding the impact of change, the uncertainty it brings, the need not only to get the messages out but to get feedback throughout the process.

2440 It is made even harder when timescales are short. And the timescale that ESC has set itself is challenging. A lot of change in a relatively short space of time. It is very difficult, without the time and resources available, to get people onside, especially where they see their jobs may change and the environment within which they work. As they say, change and uncertainty are difficult to manage at the best of times, but even more so when you are working at pace.

2445 So does that mean that we need to pause and review? Deputy Ferbrache says it is an important debate and we should vote this amendment down to have a debate on the Requête. He is correct, this is an important debate. But this is a debate on the Requête. This amendment kicks out the Propositions of the Requête to replace them with completely different Propositions.

2450 I was disappointed with Deputy Ferbrache's speech, because this is such an important amendment. I was expecting a pearl of wisdom there to explain why he could not support the amendment, which might have influenced my thought process. But we have not benefited from his thoughts and we will have to wait until main debate.

2455 Now, I have really struggled with this amendment and struggled about the Requête. I have struggled about all of it, because I have not an ideological viewpoint on any of this. I want what I believe is in the best interests of the children and I have struggled with this, ever since the Requête came out and beforehand. It is difficult to put across quite how much, but I certainly have not come into this room, even this morning, knowing exactly how I am going to vote. But I had thought, just over the weekend, and it has kind of grown – I thought about it at lunchtime – and that is how much the issue of secondary education has been Guernsey's Brexit, but more so.

2460 Selection was ended as a result of a very tight vote, but the decision was made and there was even a confirmatory vote. We have voted for one school on two sites and also had a confirmatory vote. But there are clearly many people who are against how things have turned out and want to wind back the clock. It is totally understandable. In the UK it took three years to get to the point, but certainty finally came, and during that time the atmosphere clearly became febrile and divisive.

2465 If we vote for the Requête, it will lead to years of delay, ongoing uncertainty and upset. It was thinking about Brexit that has decided how I will vote with regard to this amendment. Two phrases sum it up, for me, and were used last year. No more dither and delay; let us get education done.

2470 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Langlois.

Deputy Langlois: Thank you, sir.

2475 I just wanted to respond to something Deputy Ferbrache said. I have heard it before from him that we got rid of selection without knowing what we were going to replace it with. I was not in the 2012-16 States. I have read the *Hansards* and I did look at the policy letters and the narrative there was that the Education Department came to the States with plans to rebuild La Mare in a selection-neutral way. It was supposed to work with selection or whether we got rid of selection.

2480 That just triggered a series of very long debates, independent reviews, as some Deputies believed that, rather than rebuilding La Mare and having a four-school system, it would be cheaper, sorry, more cost-effective, to expand some of the existing schools and have a three-school system.

2485 This debate went on, the three schools, four-school model, until somebody said we should not be having this debate until we decide whether we are going to retain selection or not, because that is the important factor. You do not design the estate before you have decided whether you are going to retain selection or not. That is how that term ended, with the States having a big debate, before they decided what to do with the estate, about whether to end selection. The term ended with the ending of selection, with the idea that, now that decision had been made, we

2490 could now move forward and look how the education system was going to organise and how the estate was going to be developed.

I think the two options on the table at the time were the three-school model and it was a tertiary college model. Then the term ended and the new Committee for Education, Sport & Culture was formed. On that basis, they then moved that forward. Let's forget about their attempts to bring back selection, to do a U-turn on that, but they looked at this for 18 months, looking into various models which would suit the non-selective system that we, the previous States, had voted for and we did earlier this term.

They did a very thorough job of it and they came to the conclusion, I think, reading their policy letter, that their ideal would have been a tertiary college system, but for various practical reasons, that could not be their preferred option and they came up with the system they did, with full-time vocational training, amalgamating with the academic sixth form, which was then rejected by this States.

There has been a process, we cannot now say we should have not got rid of selection before we decided what was going to replace it, when in the last term we decided exactly the opposite. We cannot decide on the estate before we have decided whether we are going to retain selection. That ding-dong could go backwards and forwards, very unhelpfully, forever. We are where we are. We decided to get rid of selection, now we are looking at how the estate can best accommodate that and inevitably the question is what do we do with the sixth form? If you have got a selective system, you do not really have to worry about the sixth form – it is there, stuck on the Grammar School.

The moment you move to a non-selective system, you have got to try to decide what is the best configuration of a sixth form, to benefit not only the sixth formers but students up to a school leaving age and people following alternative post-16 educational pathways. That is where we are and the idea that somehow, if we have taken a wrong turning and if only we retraced our steps at whatever cost financially, or in terms of disruption, we might find another path, hand in hand with teachers and other Islanders. Deputy Laurie Queripel used the word 'illusion'. I think he is right. I would say it is a false hope, because the truth is there are very few viable models on the table. We have explored most of them. I will not go through them all. Basically, we have got a sixth form attached to each of our 11-16 schools, or a sixth form attached to just one of our 11-16 schools. Realistically, those are the two options on the table.

The idea that somehow we are going to go back, it is worthwhile going back and somehow something else, some other route, is going to be found is a false hope. The idea that the teachers have rejected this two-school model and if we ask them what they really want they will show us or give some sort of indication of an alternative. But in the unions' letter which, I think, I read this out a couple of days ago, they might not be very keen on a two-school model, but they also wrote – this is a joint letter from the teachers' unions – that they are 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 on just one 11-16 co-located school.

So the unions might not be all that keen on the two-school model, but they are not very keen on the alternative three-school model either. That is what I mean by it is an illusion to imagine that anybody, apart from us, the Government of this Island, is going to be able to make that decision. You are not going to get the Island, all the teachers, on board. You have got to consider their concerns, which is what this amendment 5 is attempting to do, and that is the only way forward. It is an absolute false hope to imagine that we can go back and somehow end up in a better place in the future.

We have followed a route. We have made this whole series of logical decisions, based on copious amounts of information, provided by both the former Education, Sport & Culture Committee and this one. So it is not a question of us charging ahead, it is just logically moving forward and developing the scheme that this States has approved twice already this term; and we

will come out the other side. Eventually, everybody will come to terms with it. It is always the same when you have something radical coming to the States. My other Committee has just lodged the discrimination legislation policy letter. We are going to end up with the same backlash that Education, Sport & Culture has done, and it is going to take a long time for it to settle in and for people to come to terms with it.

And they are going to get used to it. It will not have this massive detrimental effect on everybody's lives that they imagine it is going to have and I can almost guarantee, in five or six years' time, everything will have settled in, as long as we do not interfere with the current process. This is what this amendment is all about, asking us not to interfere, to have some trust and have some faith in our own judgement and allow this project to proceed as it should do.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

Reading this amendment, which others have picked up as well, there is nothing in it. There is nothing in it at all, really. As has been said, there are seven 'To notes', which means absolutely nothing at all. I thought of John McEnroe when I read 3(d): you cannot be serious, to actually ask your own Committee to be directed by the States to improve consultation. You do not need the States to be telling you to go out and do more consultation with teachers and support staff. What was missing on there, as well, about parents and the public, because I think that it is vital that it is not just the teachers and support staff, there must be consultation with parents and the public. That is not actually worded in there.

But I just do not see where it is needed anywhere. You do not need the States to tell you to improve consultation. Equally, I would have liked to have heard this morning that a lot of improved consultation has taken place and we know it has not taken place, because we are hearing from the public, and indeed from the teachers, that this has not happened, as much as what it perhaps should have been.

Then we move down to the last one, which is 4(c), and this is an interesting one, really, because this is Education's own pause. They are criticising the Requête for a pause, but actually this is their own pause, because they are asking here that they will go away, and they will look at whether further building space should be added to the 11-18 colleges. Well, that is not going to happen just overnight. They are going to need to consult on that, then they are going to have to, possibly, change their plans that are already submitted to the DPA. Again, they will not be drawn up overnight.

Then they are also talking about the best possible facilities, which the States are prepared to fund. Well, what is the different definition of what the States are prepared to fund? Will there be options when they come back, sort of a gold-plated or bronze-plated? This, for me, does not say anything at all. All it says is, actually, 'P&R, you have got a bill coming', and 'We want more money from P&R'. Because there is not anything in here that gives me comfort for moving things on. If anything, there is a delay which has not been explained because it needs part of this consultation, it needs part of all this extra money coming from P&R, or indeed from the States.

Again, where there has been this sort of criticism about the Requête for the pause, if Education, Sport & Culture are that confident about their one school, two sites – which is still on the drawing board, it has not been removed by the Requête – they should be saying, 'Yes, fine, no problem about the Requête, we will support it. Let us go out and fill those gaps because we are quite confident that they will come back after all the consultation with one school, two sites, once we have addressed all these other issues and maybe looked at the plans.'

There was also the traffic impact study, which Deputy Meerveld mentioned. One thing he did leave out of there: that traffic impact study was taken on one day only in September – one day only. I just do not know how you can do a traffic impact study on just one day's worth of traffic.

2590 But equally it does raise issues here and I think it raises issues for Planning. So I hope Planning are listening and pricking up their ears for this one.

When the GFC, Guernsey Football Club, and the Guernsey Football Association asked to have a pitch down at the track and to be able to have it as a dual use, and to have their clubhouse and things built down there, the condition was that on match days no traffic must go down Victoria
2595 Avenue, because it is too tight and it has too much of a zigzag and it is not appropriate. So every fortnight on match days, traffic going to the football, we are not allowed to go down Victoria Avenue. And yet, what is being suggested, twice a day there will be traffic going down in the morning and coming back at night.

So if I was the GFC and the GFA, if this is going ahead, I would be putting an appeal in
2600 straightaway to DPA and say, 'Please change that. Ours is just a fortnightly.' You cannot have your cake and eat it. If we are going to allow traffic to be going down for the school twice a day, well, traffic once a fortnight for the football would be absolutely great. I would support that one.

There is also, I have said it before and I am going to say it again because I think it is so important, and I know we are talking about education and education is the key for me, but of course different people have different areas, which they have raised with us, and we know that
2605 there has been quite an issue about the traffic and about the safety. We have put in, at Home Affairs, our own letter as well to Planning on that. But added to that, I still go back to – I despair really – we have got previously the protests by most, if not all, of St Sampson's Deputies for Pointues Rocques for a development going on there and about the traffic and the impact going
2610 on over there. I think that was around 50 developments. Yet these same Deputies are supporting, for having, an extra 700 going down to St Sampson's School, only a short distance as the crow flies, using many of the same roads that had been opposed for the Pointues Rocques.

So on that point, sir, I then move to, we have spent money on it and it is not good if we have spent money already. It is certainly not the way to go but, of course, as has been said, there were
2615 no details before. This amendment here from Education, it is exactly the same: the States are voting blind, because there is no detail. So if they are going to come back, Education, and they want these extra funds for these areas that they want to look at here, what are the best possible facilities? Not possible facilities, the best possible facilities the States are prepared to fund. Again, the States will be actually voting blind on a report to come back with potential for more money.

Of course we do know that they have got an awful lot of work to do, Education, to get the trust
2620 of the teachers and the teaching staff, because that trust is not there at the moment. But we have been there before with the waste debate and, of course, that came to the States on more than one occasion, with the incinerator and the various other schemes. Now, that is not saying that is the ideal thing to say, it has cost us money so we are going to stop. But there again, this is not
2625 setting a precedent and if that is the way that the States needs to go, so be it. As a States, we will have to go.

Deputy Soulsby actually mentioned about this is Guernsey's Brexit. There is a big difference with Guernsey Brexit to the UK Brexit. Brexit, they had a referendum. Brexit, in the UK, they asked the public. Guernsey Brexit, we have not done anything. We are dictating over what should be for
2630 the Education system, because we are not going back out and asking the people, and indeed the teachers and the support staff. So I cannot see where you can actually look at that and say it is the same as Brexit because there is a huge difference on that one.

There is also another point that was made by Deputy Tooley and it was about the extracurricular activities, with many that will stay after school for these activities who do not
2635 already, and how the private sector will have to fit around that. But again, there is no doubt about it that ... why make it for everybody to have to stay behind to four o'clock to do that; and make it compulsory? There are lots of activities that take place now in the lunch time and indeed after school, and that can still remain. But to change it to four o'clock every day and make people stay there, which will then roll into meal times for others, for the clubs that would have to change their
2640 times, I do not think that is acceptable either. So that is that point there.

I think what I would like to see and I do not know if it is going to happen or not, there is an amendment that is going to be placed against the Requête. And I think it would be helpful if that was circulated before the vote on this one, sir, because it may address some of the areas that some of the Members have been concerned about. I do not know if the proposer and seconder would like to consider that, by asking if it can be circulated before they have a vote on this amendment, but I just say to States' Members, I really believe that this amendment of Education's really ought to be rejected if, again, it is another where you will be voting for a potential open cheque. Because we have no idea what it will come back with, how much it will cost and who is going to decide what is right or what is appropriate, which will come before us for the best possible facilities, which is being proposed in this amendment. I do not think it is a healthy or a good amendment and I suggest Members reject it.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

Just replying to the point, we are not voting blind on 4(d), 4(c). It will come back to the States and the States will make a decision when it comes back to the States, just like any other Proposition to look at something. You are making a decision to look at it, but when the proposals come back they will make a decision.

This Requête has been called a pause and review, but it is not a pause and review: it is a stop and rewind. If you pause something, you stop it for a short period, with the intention of continuing on from where you paused. This is clearly not the intention of the signatories. They want to rewind to before January 2018, when in the report from the then Education & Sport Committee, whose Membership included two of the signatories and another who joined before the report was debated, they had a review with different options, including two schools, four schools and three schools.

The four-school model has already been rejected by the States in a March 2016 debate on the Education Department report. The four-school model was then, again, considered by the then Committee for the January 2018 report and rejected. We know that because the four-school model and five other models were considered at the workshop which was held for States' Members in January 2017.

So the four-school, non-selective model has been considered and rejected by two different Committees, effectively, and also by the States. Yet the children entering state schools from September 2019 onwards are in a four-school, non-selective school model. The whole point of the Committee's transition schedule and construction programme is that pupils move to a two-school model as soon as possible and pupils will start their secondary education in a two-school model from September 2021, if you support this amendment and to ensure that all non-selective pupils will be in two schools before they start their Year 10 GCSE courses.

The calculation done by professionals working on this project expect that there will be at least a two-year delay on the construction programme if the Requête is not amended. And that is if we carry on with a two-school model after the review period. That is not from politicians, that is from those professionals that are employed by the States to manage these projects. So the four-school model has been rejected by two Committees in different States, yet the unamended Requête will continue that system for at least another two years. This cannot be the right way forward if we want the best for our pupils.

The previous Education & Sport Committee also considered a number of other three-school models and after, presumably, what was a comprehensive review by that Committee – I presume that is what they did – their preferred model was debated in January 2018. We were reminded yesterday on the unviability of the preferred three-school model that they proposed in the letter emailed to all States' Members by one of our current school leaders, where he explained it just was not viable. The outcome of that January debate was effectively a comprehensive comparison between the preferred three-school model proposed by the former Committee and the two-

school model amendment, and it was overwhelmingly in favour of the two-school model, by 26 votes to 13.

2695 So, sir, I am trying to explain why I have called the Requête stop and rewind, because we are just going back to repeat the comprehensive comparisons which have been done previously all over again for no reason, other than to seem to cause delay and substantial other costs which could be up to £11 million, as Deputy Ferbrache mentioned in his speech. There will be no benefit to our pupils, because they will continue in a system that we have all said is not the ideal system for our pupils to be in: a four-school, non-selective system.

2700 Prior to the September 2019 debate, three of the signatories of the Requête, Deputies Meerveld, Prow and Dudley-Owen, asked for another comprehensive comparison, a side by side review of capital, revenue and curriculum across the four different models. This report was available to all States' Members and emailed to all States' Members. The models compared were:

2705 four schools, non-selective; four schools, selective; three schools, non-selective; and one school, two colleges, non-selective. With that information, Members again voted, in that September 2019 debate, for the one school, two college model. I just cannot see the point of doing yet another comparison, as demanded by the Requête.

2710 If the signatories believe there is a better model, with all the information that is available, then they should have proposed a different model. Three of them were Members of the previous Education Committee, just like Deputies de Lisle and Le Pelley did with their amendment, and Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Brouard did.

Other Members have referred to the concerns raised by teachers. We started work on these proposals for the two-school model in August 2017 and there has been extensive publicity given to that model leading up to that debate in January 2018 and it has continued ever since. So while

2715 I fully respect the teachers' concern, I see their primary concern being the implementation of the model, rather than the model itself, because if it was the model, then surely they would have made their concerns known at a far earlier stage? It was over two years before their concerns were made public.

2720 So that is why the amendment directs that there is further consultation with schools and college leaders, teachers and support staff, regarding space, recreation, social time, sport, libraries and sixth forms. I believe that this is the right way forward and not to stop and rewind and repeat all the comparisons that have been made previously, for which the Assembly has made its policy decisions. We should look at the areas which are of concern to the teachers, not at the basic

2725 model itself.

A lot has been made of number of people that object to the two-school model but there have been recent petitions which have had far more signatories than the 5,800 who signed this petition in relation to this model. We already know that a significant number were not even residents of the Island, perhaps up to 600, 700 or 800. Over 8,200 signed a petition for cheaper flights;

2730 *(Interjection and laughter)* 6,400 signed a petition to ban plastic bags. These are very different issues, I fully accept, but it illustrates how people have signed petitions for other issues and the number compared to this issue. It clearly shows that the petition has gained less support than these other issues, which the public have had concerns about.

A lot has been made of the green ribbon campaign. Well, you drive around, there are not that many to be seen, apart from quite a lot tied to road signs and lampposts, which belong to the States and not any particular individual. I think it is very wrong for them to use States' property to say their political views; it can be anybody. *(Interjection and laughter)* A family member who readily walks around the Delancey and Bridge area at lunchtime tells me that there are practically no houses with green ribbons, although last week there was a 100% increase: instead of only one

2740 house with a ribbon, there were two.

There has been reference to the meeting, or I would call it a rally, at the Grammar School. I was involved in the Right to Vote Movement, which campaigned to get Conseillers elected by the public at the start of the nineties. We had a similar meeting at Beau Sejour in the Dave Ferguson Hall. I think there were about 450 people who attended that, which is twice the number who

2745 attended the meeting at the Grammar School. A Member for Education counted it, there were 220 people there. There were of course four or five times more people who protested outside the building for the incinerator debate.

I would like to remind Members, the transformation of education was a policy priority area in the Policy & Resource Plan; Government policy, which should be owned by the States and P&R Committee. The capital portfolio, which included the Education programme, was agreed by the States and it was highlighted in the debate on the Fiscal Policy Framework in January, the lack of capital expenditure and the few capital projects which have been progressed.

2755 Members often focus on overspends and are critical of the States of that. But significant underspends on the portfolio are damaging, also, to the economy. There is no point just taking money out of the economy and not putting it in a bank and not ploughing it back into the economy for the good of it.

2760 I sit on the Scrutiny capital allocation panel. One of the points we have looked at is the negative economic effect of the lack of activity on the construction industry. There needs to be far more focus on the capital portfolio going forward, ensuring that we renew our infrastructure, save the negative effects of running buildings which are past their useful date and on the economic and social benefits of renewing our infrastructure. I urge Members of P&R and the Assembly to take ownership of that capital portfolio which includes the redevelopment of the secondary sector and not delay the project. Let us have the benefits of a one-school, two-colleges, and not the failure of delaying yet another capital project.

2765 Deputy Queripel said in his speech there was no evidence, he mentioned, but there was a 100-page alternative report. There was a 130-page report that we debated in September and there was an over-170 report on the Programme Business Case. Surely that was enough information as well as, subsequently, the traffic studies, which Deputy Meerveld showed us. That Programme Business Case was approved by P&R and their independent reviewer.

2770 Deputy de Lisle talked about the two schools will be more academic. Large schools – and I think Deputy Tooley touched upon this – have the opportunity to have more sets in a year. So in fact you would get, because you have got a larger number of sets, a smaller academic range in each set, which actually is beneficial to all.

2775 Also, these schools will continue with a link course, which is run with the Guernsey Institute, for 14- to 16-year-olds, which they can continue with practical studies, as they do now at the College of FE. Also included in that side-by-side review which I mentioned before, were the details of the IB Career-related Programme. It has been introduced in conjunction with the Guernsey Institute. This programme would allow students to combine a vocational technical qualification, studied at the Guernsey Institute, with the relevant IB courses studied in the Sixth Form. So that gives an example of not only there are practical courses, there is the opportunity to mix practical with academic.

2780 Deputy Smithies talks about delay and he did not believe the amount of delay. As I said, this timetable has not come from us as political Members, it comes from the professionals of the States employed to manage these projects.

2785 Deputy Inder spoke about the unknown cost. Well, the cost is known because we have given delegated responsibility to P&R by the Resolutions that we made in September 2019 and, just like with the incinerator, if we go over that amount it would have to come back to the States.

He mentioned about the Delisles purchase, and as I said, in the previous debate, I declared an interest: I am a member of the Delisles, a member of the Methodist Church –

2790

Deputy Inder: Sir, point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Inder.

2795 **Deputy Inder:** It is still an unknown cost. Only recently on the radio one of the senior executive team was talking about purchasing new land around Beaucamps. Right now we have no

idea what those costs are. The space extension, which is going to cost umpteen millions I am sure, is an unknown cost. The purchase of the Delisles is an unknown cost. There are no costs attached to what appears to be this amendment's desire to spend more capital. They are unknown costs.

2800

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dorey to continue, please.

Deputy Dorey: Thank you.

2805

I was going to go on to say that I declared an interest and I did not participate in any discussion. But the £1 million for the purchase of Delisles was included in the numbers where we gave delegated responsibility to P&R in September 2019. So that number was known and it was included. As I said, if we go outside that limit it will have to come back to the States, as I am sure P&R will do, just as they did when the incinerator went outside limits.

2810

In relation to (c), that is for a decision of the States in the future. If the States in the future does not want to add any more space – and we have heard from Deputy Soulsby about the amount of space that is available – if they do not want to add any space, there will not be any cost. But it would be for the States to conclude at that time.

2815

Deputy Meerveld talked about the car park at Oatlands and about the weight limit. But it is not for buses. The whole point is that buses will use the school. This is for a drop and stride. It is not for buses to use. That was never the intention.

2820

He mentioned about the architectural drawings. Well, it has been a policy of the States for a considerable amount of time. I was on the T&R, going back to when St Sampson's was built. We used design and build, therefore the detailed plans are not done at this stage. We based the approach to the project on the advice from the capital portfolio and procurement teams in the States. It is not a decision that we have made. They said this is the right way to go ahead.

2825

The traffic impact assessment. We will work with residents. The whole point is that it is an initial assessment. We will work with residents. We will have drop-ins and we will particularly want to have focus groups. But, primarily, we want to encourage active travel. That is where the States is going. We had the protest from students last year that they want a greener world, greener Island, and it is interesting, in the young people's study which was published, the question was: if you choose, how would you like to go to school? Fourteen percent said walking, 22% said bicycle or scooter, 8% said bus, only 24% said car or van, 27% said motorbike or moped, 1% taxi and 3% other. So there is a demand from the pupils to choose active travel and it is for us, through the traffic impact assessment, to have the infrastructure to encourage that active travel.

2830

Deputy Laurie Queripel said about, 'We will not put the issue to bed'. But I do not understand how he thinks that doing yet another comparison, which as I said is stop and rewind, and repeat a lot the comparisons and spend an awful lot of money doing very detailed comparisons as is demanded by the Requête will produce –

2835

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

Actually, I could have said point of correction, because I did not say that. What I actually said was, this is all pretty much academic, because whether I think that or not does not matter; this will be an issue for the next Assembly anyway. That is what I said.

2840

Deputy Dorey: I wrote down that you said, 'will not put the issue to bed'. That was the actual words that I wrote down.

Deputy Laurie Queripel: I did say that, but I did not say ...

2845

Deputy Dorey: Just doing another review will not put the issue to bed. It will be as keenly debated with people with different issues, the different views, then as now. He almost seems to be saying that we might as well pack up six months before an election because there is no point in the States making any decisions because it might be overturned by the electorate, by a new

States, after an election. If that is where we want to go, let us have a six-month period before an election and have nothing to debate. But what normally happens is we have a lot of significant issues to debate just before an election and that is obviously where we are going with the level of business that we are having.

I would like to finish up by reminding Members of the words I read out on Friday from our current school leaders. And remember, those are the people who have responsibility and leadership through our schools: 'Guernsey cannot to be paralysed ...' – and I will read again:

Guernsey cannot continue to be paralysed by indecision while seeking the Holy Grail of a model for secondary and post-16 education ... [that] can gain unanimous support ...

Because there is not one that will gain unanimous support. But what we do know is that every other method/model for secondary education has been rejected. This is the only one that has been supported twice. There is a time to debate and there is a time to make a decision and there is a time to implement the decisions made. We are there now, to implement the decisions.

The States and Committees have made comprehensive comparisons, as I have shown, hopefully, in my speech. We have twice made a decision. Now is the time to put the pupils in our system first, not leave them in a four-school, non-selective system for any longer than necessary, and put our own political views to one side and implement the decision for the benefit of the pupils of this Island.

Respect the decisions made by the Chamber, the millions that have been spent, the time the construction industry has spent in preparing their tenders. Do not let us lose the confidence of the construction industry yet again, because that is what we did with the incinerator and we paid a heavy price. Let us move forward with the challenges of implementing one school, two colleges model, and working with stakeholders to address their concerns. Do not stop and rewind this project, otherwise, we will end up exactly where our sister island has with their hospital: debate after debate and spending millions and millions and making no progress. This is a time to implement our decisions.

Sir, in conclusion, I urge Members to please support this amendment. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.

Well, I kind of want to stop and rewind. Yes, I have been feeling a bit wobbly the last few days. We have had outstanding speeches this morning from Deputy Roffey and a *tour de force*, really, from Deputy Fallaize and so on. But the thing is, if you take some of the more interesting contributions this afternoon, Deputy Soulsby put across lots of thoughtful points, but to take her analogy with the Brexit debate, Guernsey's Brexit – or Jersey's hospital debate, whatever – the Brexit is actually a very interesting parallel, because they went for a referendum – maybe we should have an education referendum – (**A Member:** Contre.) and that actually, to be serious, there have been places like Ripon, I believe, in North Yorkshire which have in the past had indicative voting on selection and that kind of thing.

The problem that we have is back in 2015, in the UK, as always, a government was elected for a five-year term, but in that period we have had two subsequent general elections. The argument about getting education done, paralleling getting Brexit done ... was not finally resolved by robust parliamentary discipline or party discipline. It was weirdly enough resolved by an early, premature general election that the Prime Minister, twice, two different Prime Ministers, talked the Commons into.

On the second occasion, we had an unexpected general election, which has not really been possible in the Guernsey constitution. Well, it might be possible, but it has not been done. It led to a change in the flavour of the composition of the Chamber, we should say. That is perhaps the difficulty we are in because Deputy Laurie Queripel has warned us that the issue is not going to go away and we could come out of here supporting the Requête or supporting this amendment

or some other amendment and the reality of the situation is, we are 10 weeks away, more or less, from candidates getting nominated, and it is likely to be an election issue, because Deputy Inder and the whole Committee have worked very well, so far, at persuading people to go on the Electoral Roll.

Now, what is the point of voting? We have not time to go into that, really, but the point I am trying to make, it is likely, superficially at least, to be the public expressing their views on the candidates and many other issues, including issues of the day. And if I or anyone else knock on any door and say, 'I am sorry, whatever you think about education, it is now sealed, signed and delivered and it is going ahead regardless' they would not be very pleased.

We cannot for certain, today, predict that there will not be dozens of people in the next Assembly who want to bring back selection, although I would not want to see that. We might, as Deputy Roffey interestingly enough earlier suggested that we might, see – unlikely but possible – lots of people who want a different model of post-16 education, such as a tertiary college. The reality is, I think we know from all our lessons, that one States generally cannot bind a successor. That is not an argument to do nothing, but it is something that has to be borne in mind given the fact that we have had delays on this.

Because Deputy St Pier ... I thought it was an interesting history lesson he gave us about how we are all to blame and I could add to that share of the collective blame for votes and decisions and past positions and so on and so forth. The reality was that we made a decision with an amendment in 2016, then a new Committee came in and initially wanted to rewind back, you could say, on selection, after a few to-ings and fro-ings. That did not happen. Then there was a vote of no confidence in the Committee, which did not happen either. But all of that gave a difficult political and social context. And there were workshops as well at the time and people said, 'Oh, we do not want workshops to look at the model.'

But the reality was, if you look back at the mood, the previous Education that the then Minister, Deputy Robert Sillars, presided over, and Deputy Green was a Member, did an opinion poll or a focus poll or whatever you call it, and they got something like 60% of respondents – very limited pool – saying they wanted selection to continue. That might not have been accurately reflecting the population; who knows? But it was a fair number.

The point I am coming to is the States in our wisdom twice rejected that majoritarian view, for all sorts of good reasons and progress, and I felt, where I have been consistent, is when I decided to vote with the narrow majority to end selection – against my manifesto pledge, I have to say, which I regret a bit – I did that because I felt several things were happening at the time. The first was that the community were coming together with a new model. It was obvious that the younger age ranges in our society, both within the Chamber and externally, were much more keen on a more egalitarian and a more modernised education system than perhaps the older people.

So although the majority may have wanted selection to continue – we know not; we do not know for certain – the States went in a different direction. Were there marches in the street afterwards? Was there a mass campaign? Were there blue ribbons or yellow ribbons or whatever from the disappointed half of the electorate, maybe more than half, who wanted selection to continue? No there was not. The people trusted Deputy Le Pelley's Committee to get on with the job and despite having diverse pupils within it, the Committee or the Members of the Requête group always wanted to rewind or bring back selection ... Well, one of the leading Members, Deputy Meerveld, voted clearly against the others.

But there was not a mass outcry from the public, even though there was clear disappointment three years ago. What changed the game was when – I do not like the phrase gang of four, but – four very able and diligent States' Members, with other people supporting, went ahead with a new model and convincingly won the day in the Assembly and the old Committee resigned.

That may have been a better model. Deputy Roffey was quite right, there are passionate believers on both side of this debate and there is also a lukewarm middle; and I would describe myself as 'luke-cold'. I consistently voted for the three-school model over the two-school, but I think it is finely balanced. I think the two-school model is probably easier to deliver on the

breadth of curriculum matrix basis, but has many other disadvantages, ranging from size, scope, traffic, parochial buy-in, teacher buy-in and planning issues, space issues and other constraints.

But where the delay has come in was when we elected a new Education, Sport & Culture Committee who suggested, in their early days, they would take a few months. And it did take longer than that and we ended up pushing much nearer the Election – and we had a referendum in the middle of this period – than perhaps we would have all liked.

I actually thought we had put this finally to bed in September of last year. I supported Deputy Dudley-Owen, Deputy Prow and Deputy Meerveld when they raised the issue. They had their day in the sun. They have worked in the summer on this. It did not happen. Again, maybe a few people switched their positions, but we were coasting along. But, from the autumn onwards, we saw a change of pace. We saw more and more snags emerge about the new ... The plans became more detailed, the more detailed they became the more worry there was for many Parish Constables and Douzeniers.

And the two deciding factors for me – because I was still very iffy about getting involved in anything like this at Christmas, because I was really concerned about the pressure on young people, on families, on the disruption, on the cost, on all of those issues – but the two deciders was not only the really large number of people who have expressed dissent. And I think, given that we have more of a social media society than the historical examples Deputy Roffey and Deputy Dorey have given, you have to bear that in mind because it is now going to be more online rather than old-style mass meetings and mass rallies. But that was one decider.

The clincher was the letters we had from St Sampson's teachers and other members of the teaching profession because, if the teaching profession, for whatever reason, have significant reservations about the implementation of this model, the correct view is to pause and reflect. Because I come back, actually, a strict reading of this Requête, and this is an amendment to the Requête, is not against the two-school model. People are inferring that. It could well be, as we had a letter from a leading educationalist only the other day, that we might end up with a two-school model which was significantly different in some respects, maybe on different sites, because I think the two sites chosen are part of the problem, personally.

But we need to pause and reflect about the desirability of all this, given the professional disquiet. Somebody said that recruitment and retention has been difficult in some schools. I was shocked to hear about the geography example in one of our schools, because people had been stirring it up a bit. I would say that is a very partial picture, because we have all kinds of reasons why we have recruitment and retention: the cost of living on the Island; the cost of transport; the population management laws, which do not apply in English counties, for example; the length of time it takes to recruit people; the centralised educational system; the lack of management of schools. I agree with this educationalist, who has written to us as Deputies, but many of the issues ... It goes back to Mr Mulkerrin, from a previous States' Committee, who was a Member of the previous Education Committee. Inspirational leadership, inspirational teaching, quality of teaching is as important as models and buildings.

We actually need to be aware of the bigger picture. This amendment, as former Deputy Gillson has cogently argued, is mostly about noting progress and has relatively few proactive policies or gestures. And the issue on space is not entirely in our gift, because obviously there would have to be planning and design work on that, planning permission. But it also implies buy-in by the States in general, and Policy & Resources in particular, of extending the capital budget, which brings me to another point.

When Deputy Fallaize successfully won the debate two years ago with his model, he did give the impression, if I can be forgiven for saying so, that one of the reasons it was really going to work brilliantly was that we would strive, within limitations to have the best educational system for our size anywhere. And that implied a lot more financial resources. But maybe Policy & Resources has not opened up the purse as far as they could have done and that is another reason to pause and reflect. Because many of the complaints, whether it be about staff contracts perhaps, or about traffic or bus systems, let alone space or facilities, has to do with money. Money and access to

resources and how we can make education more efficient by perhaps using our capital costs more on the children and less on central administration is another part of this.

3005 What I do not understand, and I thought Deputy Ferbrache was really on the money today, but the one area I think I did part company with him, was his opinion that Deputy Roffey had put forward, that it would lead to delay after delay after delay. We have been discussing models for a week here. I do not think there is a parliamentary problem. There might be a problem of structure in the Civil Service, but I cannot see why we could not allow the present Committee to go away, pause and reflect, go out to consultation in March, April, May. They might all stand again and be
3010 re-elected. They may continue in office, or a new Committee with different people might take over, obviously, in July. But that Committee really should and could be in a position to come back to the States by October because, as has been said, there are only three or four realistic models out there.

3015 The wording of the Requête might be flawed in part, but it is pretty obvious where there is potential buy-in. You go out have public meetings, public workshops, with teachers and other stakeholders and see where you go. Let people own the process. So for all those reasons, I feel this amendment goes so far in looking at space, but does not go nearly far enough and we would end up with a complete fudge if we support this amendment today.

3020 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: Thank you, sir.

I have got a prepared speech, which I shall give later on. I had it written out because I was
3025 dead scared that, if I winged it, I would find myself in trouble with you sir, or, dare I say, even another code of conduct. That will come a little bit later. In the meantime, I wanted to pick up a few fag ends that were still smoking from the debate so far, so that my colleague, Deputy Fallaize, does not have to pick up every single point in responding to the debate.

I remember, with some clarity, Deputy Brouard expressing a pretty low opinion of the current amendment, amendment 5, because of its nebulous quality. I thought that was a bit rich, coming
3030 from somebody who cannot wait to vote for a Requête whose very essence is nebulous. It flies the flag of nebulous, not so much in Proposition 1, which is relatively unambiguous, but in Proposition 2 it is nothing if it is not nebulous. It talks about 'viable models' previously seen presented to committees and a 'comprehensive comparison' of them. I attended with the Committee, we finally persuaded Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Prow to come and meet the
3035 Committee, and we had what I can only describe as a Kafkaesque meeting. We said, 'What models have you got in mind? Which ones do you want us to do a comparison on?' The voice came back, saying, 'That is up to you.' So we said, 'Okay, do you mean those that have been presented to this Committee, the previous Committee or all Committees?' 'That is for you to decide.'

3040 So we said, what do you mean by viable models? The same answer came back. It was sort of Pavlovian in its response, really. I think, finally, we said, what do you mean by comprehensive comparisons? We have been under sustained criticism about the lack of detail in our policy letter and in our Programme Business Case. If a 174-page business case and a 132-page policy letter, and all the appendices that go with it, was insufficient, I think we were entitled to know to what level we needed to develop all these other models. Not that we knew what the models were,
3045 because that was up to us to decide.

3050 So Proposition 2, sir, is nothing but nebulousness itself. So I wonder whether ... Deputy Brouard will not change his mind about where he is going to vote, I do not think he is even listening at the moment, but I do hope he might have cause to reflect whether really the reason that he cannot wait to vote for the Requête and the reason for his criticism of our amendment is nothing to do with nebulousness at all.

I would like to comment on an interesting aspect that Deputy de Lisle introduced, this business about the academic and the vocational. Now, when Deputy de Lisle – last winter we can now say, can we not, thanks to Deputy Inder, but it was some time last week – when Deputy de Lisle

brought his amendment and in the advance of Deputy Le Pelley, it was to rebuild La Mare de Carteret and have two other 11-16 schools with a detached sixth form centre. I made the remark then that that was really a model for the last millennium. It did not work then and why should it work in this millennium? Of course, Deputy de Lisle and I are the Assembly experts on the previous millennium, (*Laughter*) because we know more about it – we were there for most of our lives.

But you see the language he was using this afternoon was exactly the language that we were brought up on, the sort of remnants of the Butler Education Act, where on that side of the room are all the brainy blokes who are going to go to the Grammar School or to a public school and so on, and they are going to be going on to university and they are going to be our doctors and our lawyers and all that sort of stuff. And over there, on that side, are all the chaps who are going to bang plumbers' pipes and they are going to spend their lives with their heads buried in the car bonnets, wielding spanners and all that sort of stuff.

So we used to send the brainy ones, like me, (*Laughter*) to Grammar School. So there I was, a poor lad from a poor family, going to Grammar School. My young brother, he was in that corner. So he went to the secondary mod just down the road. He did brilliantly, but not thanks to the school he went to, I have to say. He is now a very successful engineer in New Zealand. But that is not the point. I would say to Deputy de Lisle, we have moved on. I can tell you that if you speak to the leadership at the Guernsey Institute, they are not saying, 'Look, send us a lot of future plumbers and electricians and car mechanics; it does not matter whether they have not cracked English and maths and the sciences and so on.' They are not saying that. They want those youngsters at 16 arriving at their institution having been pushed to the very best level that they can achieve in all the core subjects.

One's practical experience tells you why. All the plumbers and electricians and so on that I have used on my house in the last 10 or 12 years have all been bright, articulate men – they happen to be men, it could have been otherwise. They do not only bang the pipes well and put the wires in right. They go back in the evening and they do all the paperwork and all the accounting, and then they are writing out very articulate tenders for jobs here, there and everywhere or they are picking up the phone. All the skills ... And to say that they do not need them, to tuck them away in a corner, and I would say this to Deputy de Lisle also, the proposed new colleges are there for the very purpose of bringing on not only the very brightest academically, but also those who need the most help. That is the beauty, or one of the beauties and one of the attractions, of what we are trying to do.

I am not quite sure where to start ... Oh, I am being asked to give way, I think.

Deputy de Lisle: Can I just make the point that in fact all I was saying was that the vocational area with technology and B.Tech. and so on and so forth, is a very important area and a very important sector and that I just wanted fair play between the academic side and the vocational side and to see that both were actually given the same prominence. I just felt that, with having the Guernsey Institute on one side, it needed then to have the academic side also on one side. If you separate one lot out, then surely to goodness you should fairly separate the other side out?

So I would just like to make the point that I am really for promoting the vocational and the technical side, because I think it is extremely important for the wellbeing of not only our students, but also the future of Guernsey.

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Graham: Well, Deputy de Lisle makes the point. I would merely reassure him that the sort of 11-18 comprehensive schools that we are trying to see introduced here, the aim is not to have academic porcelain houses in any way. The aim is really to enable – and it is almost a cliché – every student to reach his and her potential, whatever that might be. I think the breadth of the curriculum in these larger institutions specifically addresses that aspect.

3105 Deputy Smithies. I am not quite sure where to start on this one. He is confident there will be no delay. I do not know on what evidence he justifies that. But I am intrigued, because he must know something I do not know. He must know something the rest of the Committee do not know, he must know something that all the officers who have been looking at this do not know. I would be grateful if he could make himself available to hand on his wisdom to those who – it may be this
3110 Committee or it may be another Committee – might have to wrestle with the problem of no delay when there is going to be a delay.

In front of the whole Assembly, I offer Deputy Smithies a bottle of champagne, if by December this year, whether he is a Member of the new Assembly or not, he can have a bottle of champagne off me if by December next year the States are debating a new model and merely
3115 waiting for approval so it can be passed on to P&R for funding. He does not have to offer me anything other than the prospect of an apology when he gets it wrong.

Part of the reason why I am pretty confident of this bet, there are many reasons, subsequent speaker Deputy Prow provided it. I may have misread Deputy Prow totally, but I think what he was saying is no Committee should bring a major policy letter in front of the Assembly without a full
3120 business case already having been made, or if not a full one, an outline business case or whatever. Now, okay, well, if there are three/four/five/six models, all of which between now and the latest date for putting a policy letter for consideration for the States before December is October, I know what happens to the educational world in July and August: virtually nothing moves. So if Deputy Smithies reckons that five/six/three/four models are going to have the outline business
3125 case done for them in time for October this year, for debate by December, I am pretty confident that I am going to win.

Deputy Smithies: Sir, a point of correction.

3130 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Smithies.

Deputy Smithies: I certainly did not put a time limit on it. I just said that the four-year timescale which has been put forward, I consider to be far too great. Deputy Graham has come up with his own decision that it should be next December. I never said that, and I am not going to
3135 put a time limit on it. I am not going to be bated into putting a timescale on it. He can have his own ideas about what timescale we are working to, I am not rising to that bait.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Graham to continue, please.

3140 **Deputy Graham:** Sir, it is not my idea. Those who know better than I have calculated that, in fact I think the Requête itself – I will not give way, even to my colleague, I am only going to get confused if people wave pieces of paper in front of me. I will deal with this one. The key point is I think it is in the Requête itself, but also, even if it was not, it is generally recognised that unless this States and the next States cracks on with this with real haste, and that means getting
3145 something to be debated in December next year, you are inevitably going to be in yet one more year's delay on top of any other year's delay that we might have. I did not hear Deputy Smithies qualify his denial of delay by a four-year figure, but if he says he did, then he did. But there we go.

Deputy Prow also said you should not bring a policy letter with its business case, without having things like stakeholder workshops. Now, I do not know how many Members of the
3150 Assembly have tried stakeholder workshops. I am not quite sure precisely what they mean, I think I do. But if every model that is going to be presented and examined by the States is going to be subjected to stakeholder workshops and immediately the stakeholders coming to mind are the teachers, the parents, the douzaines these days – I am on a douzaine, we do not reckon we should be political in the Castel but there we are – the propensity for multi-stakeholder workshops is
3155 enormous. These are all going to be done in September/early October next year, whilst the policy letter is being written. I just do not believe it.

I understood what Deputy Laurie Queripel was saying about evolution and revolution, and I do not think Guernsey is particularly on its own in being averse to revolution. The problem that the gang of four had was, if you on the one hand say we are not doing well enough in the current system, and the reason we are not is the system itself, we need another system, where is the best system for doing better, and if, on the evidence we saw, in our opinion it was 11-18 schools, it is very difficult to move from what we are now to 11-18 schools by degrees. It is almost like, I hate to bring the pregnancy metaphor, but you cannot gradually become pregnant, really. Can you? No! (*Laughter*) So there was no question really of saying, 'Okay, for one year, we will be 11-18 in four schools and in the following year we will be 11-18 in three schools and then bring it down to one school and two colleges.' To be honest, I do not think that was an option available to us and we did not take it.

If that is considered revolutionary, okay. It may be too much for Guernsey. But look at what is proposed for the further education and higher education sector. That is pretty revolutionary. At the moment we have got three separate institutions on five different locations, many of them substandard and the intention is to bring them all under one roof, although the one roof is not the important bit. It is to integrate them all, put them under one board of governors, which the new Education law will enable us to do completely, and almost separate it from political day-to-day intervention to get on with such an important sector of what we do in the educational world.

That is pretty revolutionary and there has been scarcely a whisper against it. I do not think it is necessarily the magnitude that will change. It is, I think, the impact of what we are proposing to do in the 11-16 and post-16 bit is inviting some key stakeholders to meet challenges, which some of them are not prepared to take on.

Ah, Deputy Lowe. Her main complaint was there was nothing in this amendment, no substance in it at all. There is not a lot and there should not be a lot, because two years into a transition programme there should not be a lot. We should not be changing all the furniture in the sitting room at this stage. It would be so counter-productive. I do not take that as a criticism, but for what it is worth, there is more in our amendment of substance than there is in her justice policy that we are still waiting nearly four years to see.

Now, Deputy Lowe also talks about restoring trust. It is true that there is a certain amount of restoration of trust in the teaching community in the Committee. But I have to say trust works both ways. I am very close friends of three previous headmasters of our primary schools. They retired just in very recent years. They are all, to a man, in favour of what we the Committee are doing. One of them the other day took me aside and said, 'I am thoroughly ashamed of some of the antics of some of the members of my profession'. So there is a bit of trust to be restored on both sides.

Deputy Lowe ought to know all about this because she, I hope, is being successful in restoring the trust enjoyed in the Home Affairs Committee by Law Enforcement and the Probation Service and the Prison Service that we lost in the first two years under her leadership. So I hope that she believes in the ability of this Committee to regain some of the trust that we may have lost from the teaching unions.

To my right, Deputy Gollop. As always, an interesting *tour de raison* and I am pleased that when he said pause and reflect he did actually give some stuff that he was going to reflect on. Too many people have been saying, 'Let's just pause and reflect' and leaving the reflect bit unsaid. And in my view, it is just the equivalent of pausing and reading from a book, you might just as well do that.

But he did have some interesting thoughts, though. I think I need, partly, to correct him on one thing, on teacher recruitment. The essential problem is not necessarily teacher retention, particularly in the secondary sector. The turnover, traditionally, I think is something like 10% or 12% and that is what we are on at the moment. I think that is generally reckoned to be a healthy turnout, in other words, new blood needs to come through. Whether I am right or not, I am not sure, but something around that figure is right.

The problem now is, and I do accept Deputy Dudley-Owen's point that it is not entirely due to the Requête being placed, but the fact remains that for some of the adverts for teachers to come and teach in our secondary sector now, we are getting no applications at all. One can well understand why, given the sort of febrile atmosphere that we have and the uncertainties of what is happening. And at the same time, the Committee, albeit P&R on behalf of the Committee, are going to be trying to recruit a Director of Education in this time. I do not know how successful that is going to be.

Members of the States, I now come to the bit that I prepared, and I am going to take head on this business, this sustained criticism, of the Lisia School model. Not of the model itself, and I accept, and the Committee accepts, that it is not everybody's cup of tea and there are other ways of doing this stuff and people are entitled to give it. What is difficult to take is the constant denigration of the process by which that model has been brought before the States, by which the States have been invited to make an intelligent judgement and then instructed the Committee, on behalf of the States, to get on with it. I need to tackle that head on.

Let us be clear about the facts. When the States met in early September last year, only six months ago, Members had the following available to them. They had, as Deputy Dorey has mentioned, the policy letter. That was 132 pages. It had been worked up by Committee Members and experienced officers. It offered 132 pages of analysis and factual information and the body of the policy letter covered all aspects of the transformation programme that could reasonably be expected in a policy letter.

Now, as Deputy Ferbrache pointed out, it did not tell you things like which teacher will be teaching in which class, which subject, every Tuesday, at 10.30 a.m. in three years' time, which is when the full complement of students will be in the new colleges. It did not do that. Equally, it did not go into the details such as where every single school bus for de Saumarez College was going to call at bus stops in the southern parishes in three years' time. It did not need to do that. But it did have all the stuff that was necessary for States' Members to make an intelligent judgement.

For example, it had 15 appendices, which backed up the policy letter and covered stuff that could not easily be part of the narratives. The 15 appendices covered things like outline plans, proposed extensions at St Sampson's and Les Beaucamps, professional independent assessments of the current five sites for further and higher education and scoring of options for their future siting, site and design options for the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret, details for the introduction of Attainment 8, the new performance measures for Key Stage 4.

There was a census showing States' pupil numbers in each of the schools; five separate pupil profiles covering the journey of five children from primary through to higher education and it also gave indicative transport zones for the school buses and it also highlighted where the policy letter and the programme had synergies with the P&R Plan, the Children and Young People's Plan and the Skills Guernsey Action Plan. There are also details of consultation and engagement.

Now, on top of that, for stuff that was not in the policy letter, Members had also access to the 174 pages, which Deputy Dorey has alluded to, of a Programme Business Case. That was published on 19th August. It fully conformed to the States' five case model for business case development. There were 112 pages making the five cases: strategic, economic, commercial, financial and management. There were a further 40 pages of supporting detail in its 10 appendices.

Now, why am I labouring this point? I offer three reasons. The first concerns the standards we set, with the guidance of the Presiding Officer, when debating controversial issues, certainly within the Assembly but also out there in the wider community. I do not know whether or not there is such a thing as a clear line between wilful exaggeration and deliberate deployment of dodgy stuff, but I think ... (*Interjection*) Well, let me ... I should have used the word false, but I think many of us have an instinct, which allows us to recognise when that line has been crossed.

I have lost count of the number of times, for example, that Deputy Lowe has claimed that in September 2019, the States signed up to a model that was designed solely on the floor of the Assembly. Twice, in fact now three times, she has claimed precisely that. Now, this is puzzling. Did

3260 Members like Deputy Lowe not read the 132-page policy letter and then the 174-page Programme Business Case? If she did, has she forgotten that she did, or did she read them both and not understand what she was reading?

3265 This is the key thing: precisely what detail was lacking in them that was so essential to be known in September last year, some four years before the transformation programme for secondary and post-16 education would be completed in September 2023?

I give way to Deputy Trott.

3270 **Deputy Trott:** I am grateful to my friend for giving way and he did not pose the question to me, so it does not fall for me to answer it, but I shall tell you what I believe the fundamental difference is, and it is the wholesale rejection by the teaching community, recently, of the two-school model. That has been the fundamental game-changer for many like I.

3275 **Deputy Graham:** That is a fair point in another context. It is not a fair point in this context. The context I am addressing is claims on the one hand that the material presented to the States was in insufficient detail for States' Members to make an intelligent decision. I agree with Deputy Trott that what has subsequently happened is difficult and it changes the terrain to a certain extent.

3280 Now, I was going to say that Deputy Lowe, of course, is perfectly entitled to dismiss both the policy letter and the Programme Business Case as inadequate and not up to the impeccable standards that I am sure we are going to get from policy letters from Home Affairs when we see it. Deputy Lowe is not alone in all of this. Several of the requérants have been at it too. Deputy Prow can scarcely hear the words 'Lisia School' without repeating the mantra: there was no business case. Only last week I heard him repeating it on the radio in a broadcast in the Town Church. I do not know whether it was the fact that it was in the Town Church that made it more or less reprehensible. *(Laughter)* But there he was, saying to the public, 'This policy letter was presented to the States with no business case'. Then of course there goes Deputy Meerveld, who seems programmed to cry, 'No business case!', 'Fag packet!', 'Back of the envelope!' at the mere mention of the current States' education model.

3285 Then there have been the accusations that the Education, Sport & Culture Committee have been cynically drip-feeding information ever since last summer. Now, Deputy Paint was making that point only earlier on today. Well, there were 130-odd pages of traffic impact assessment in December, but that scarcely answers to the description of drip-feed in my view.

3290 What has happened, Members of the States, is that some requérants and their supporters, ever since the policy letter and the Programme Business Case were published, have asked a series of questions of the Committee, to which many of the answers lay in either the policy letter or the Programme Business Case themselves and this is what genuinely puzzles me about the repeated assertions that the States did not have a business case to guide their assessment of the programme.

3295 I recall that during the summer holidays, Deputy Prow accompanied either Deputy Dudley-Owen or Deputy Meerveld to at least two Meetings with the ESC Members and officers, when it was pointed out to them that the answers to some of the questions they were posing were in either the policy letter or the business case, and in some cases their attention was drawn to the specific relevant pages and sections. So they were aware of the existence of the Programme Business Case, so why persist in claiming publicly that there was not one?

3300 I will give way to Deputy Prow.

3305 **Deputy Prow:** I thank Deputy Graham for giving way.

3310 I have always accepted that the Programme Business Case was available. What I have been referring to consistently, and the Requérants have been consistently referring to, is the full business case, and I outlined what that is. Is Deputy Graham saying that that full business case was available in September and is available now?

Thank you, sir.

Deputy Graham: I am certainly not saying it, and this raises an interesting point. I will be grateful at some point if Deputy St Pier or Deputy Trott could comment on the suggestion that any policy letter coming before the States should have its full business case in attendance with it. Because I think if that is indeed the case and that is how I had interpreted an earlier contribution from Deputy Prow, the paralysis by process has only just begun, because we are heading into very deep territory. Words fail me.

Sir, in my view, our critics are entitled to have been unimpressed by our policy letter and our Programme Business Case, but that should not license our critics to go around making false allegations about them and, in the case of the PBC, the Programme Business Case, denying it even existed.

Now, the second reason for the disquiet, why I am labouring this, is that the calculated tactic of dismissing the policy letter and the Programme Business Case either as of no value or as not even existing, is hugely disrespectful towards the highly professional officers who have spent countless hours in producing them over a period of 18 months. Now, my colleagues and I have seen at first hand that the Committee is served by some truly outstanding officers and to hear their work trashed in this way by some Deputies is deeply disappointing.

Thirdly, there is the aggravating element of double standards being applied to all this. Now, I assure Deputy Ferbrache, before he even begins to think, we are not going to get into the business of 'my business case is bigger than your business case'. I am certainly not going to get into that. But accusations have been made by those who themselves brought the equivalent policy letters to the States back in late 2017/early 2018 and one ought to point out that there is a certain amount of double standards going on here.

Let me make it clear: I think the previous Education Committee's 2017 policy letter was wholly reasonable for the overall purpose and for its 15 Propositions. It was not great, but it was very reasonable and certainly adequate. The basic policy letter was 60 pages long and had attached to it the 50-page overview, the Committee's own words, which that summer had served the purpose of a document for public consultation – so far, so good. It had a number of useful appendices which did not amount to a business case. It had one page on site development option costs; one page on the programme timeline; a one-page transition summary; eight pages on financial modelling; and four pages on transition assumptions.

Now, this was the sort of stuff that enabled any Deputy to decide whether to support or oppose the policy letter. But it was not a programme business case, and it certainly contained nowhere near the detail available in the current ESC Committee's policy letter and Programme Business Case. If there was a business case, it was never put before the States, unless for reference, either before or during the debate, and yet Deputies Lowe and Deputy Prow, they were quite content to support the policy letter that did not have the programme business case, the absence of which they are claiming is a criticism of ours. Nor was there any sign of a traffic impact assessment having been made or commissioned to support the proposed model. And remember, Members of the States, the model, which envisaged more than 1,300 pupils aged four to 16 arriving and departing each day via the narrow roads around La Mare de Carteret. It may be that the then Committee had indeed thought this through, but there was no evidence of it in the material before States' Members. I am making a simple point here about double standards.

Mr Deputy Bailiff, I finish on a general point, of which this whole episode, in my view, is symptomatic. I believe that I was the original author in this States of the term 'paralysis by process', but if I was not, I apologise to whoever was. I thought I had some allies, but at least one of them appears to have deserted me and joined the paralyzers and processors. It has been a bit of a crusade for me, to tackle this characteristic of Government, head on, whenever I could. But it has been a crusade which failed to get to the Holy Land, let alone to win a victory once there.

I do understand, I think as much as anybody, that the responsibilities of political and Civil Service office serve to nourish a culture of risk aversion. But even so, we see too many examples of where the inflexible demands of due process prevent us achieving the goal to which that due process is supposed to get us.

3365 I often hear colleagues in the Assembly quoting the *bon mots* or aphorisms of this or that famous person. My usual reaction is to say to myself, so what? That was him or her and that was then and there. But there are some wisdoms and examples worth passing on from generation to generation. One of those was provided by Winston Churchill. As a wartime prime minister, he was prone to summon his senior ministers and service chiefs and demand succinct papers on sometimes huge undertakings at very short notice. On one occasion – and it is a notorious one – he turned to his chiefs of staff and demanded, ‘Pray, let me have this day your plans for the invasion of Italy, on two sides of foolscap.’ (*Laughter*)

3370 An extreme example, I do admit, but I have to say if it had been some requérants, and their supporters, who accuse the current ESC of having rushed matters without due process, then the invasion fleets in the Mediterranean ports, 77 years later, would still be there! (*Laughter*) They would be worrying about congestion on the invasion beaches at Salerno; (*Laughter*) worrying if there would be enough packed lunches for the lads. And what would happen if it rained and they all got wet? (*Laughter*) Would the local residents complain about all that battle noise? And all the time they would sit there in the invasion harbours, waiting patiently for the arrival of bound volumes labelled, ‘Business case’, before daring to set sail.

3380 Colleagues, when a culture of paralysis by process is accompanied by a failure of nerve, I have to wonder if Government in this Bailiwick is capable of delivering anything but the simplest and least controversial of projects within a political term; perhaps even within a political generation. I do hope that my pessimism is not justified by the outcomes of the matter before us and I urge Members to vote for amendment 5, so that the thoroughly-researched and well-evidenced programme, which they have previously twice affirmed in this Court, may continue in the best interests of our young people. Fend off and set sail.

Deputy Leadbeater: Sir, I would like to invoke Rule 26(1), please.

3390 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Very well. I will therefore invite those Members who are still entitled to speak and who have not yet spoken to stand in their places, please.

Deputy Leadbeater do you still wish to put a guillotine motion to the States?

3395 **Deputy Leadbeater:** Please, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Very well. Members, this is a motion proposed by Deputy Leadbeater, under Rule 26(1), that debate be closed on this amendment, subject of course to the normal winding up, which would mean that Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Fallaize would be entitled to speak.

3400 Those in favour; those against?

Members voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: I will declare that lost.

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, could we have a recorded vote, please? (*Interjections*)

3405 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Yes, you are entitled, Deputy Lester Queripel, to call for a recorded vote once there has been a division.

Deputy Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, I will announce the voting in due course, but it is quite clear that that is why the motion to end debate on this amendment was lost.

3410 Therefore, I will call Deputy Green to speak next.

Deputy Green: Mr Deputy Bailiff, thank you very much.

I have given this amendment some anxious consideration over the last few days and the last few hours and, indeed, I was planning on speaking earlier this afternoon; and now we are at 5.05
3415 p.m., so I have certainly given this an awful lot of thought and it is quite obvious to me that the amendment is not perfect but the Requête itself is not perfect either – far from it. So that is the sort of situation that we are in and the amendment, clearly, is Education, Sport & Culture's response to the serious levels of unease that we have seen, and it is not a bad effort.

But in all honesty, sir, I do not feel I can support it because I do not feel it goes far enough. We
3420 are in the domain of *realpolitik*, as Deputy Laurie Queripel said earlier on, and I am afraid that there has been something of a material change in circumstances since we were here in September of last year and voted in the way that we did at that stage. The reality is that a big majority of rank-and-file teachers have made their views very clear and they have demonstrated, to me at least, that there is now a need to take a step back. That has been a material change in
3425 circumstances, from where we were in September.

We need to take a step back from any further progression of the current one school on two sites plan and that needs to be followed by a *bona fide* limited objective analysis and comparison of this two-school model, with the very best three-school models that are out there; for me, specifically the three 11-18 school model and perhaps, at a push, the de Lisle model.

I say specifically the three 11-18 school model because I am still persuaded of the concept that
3430 11-18 schools do deliver an awful lot of educational benefits, but the practical application of that, given the two sites that have been chosen, just has not persuaded enough people to come along and you have to take people with you. On major transformation programmes in the States, in this Island and anywhere else, you have to take people with you, and I am afraid that has not actually
3435 happened here.

I just want to pick up on a distinction that Deputy Fallaize and Deputy Dorey have referred to, which is the distinction between opposition to the implementation of the model and opposition to the model itself. Because if there are teaching professionals in the Island *en masse* saying that there are apparently insurmountable issues, with executing an implementation plan, which should
3440 be the primary means for delivering your policy, to me that actually becomes pretty close to imperilling the delivery of the model *per se*. That is how I see it and I do wonder whether this is actually a distinction without a difference in practical terms because in reality, those two things, the implementation of the model and the model itself, are merging into one in this particular instance, in my judgement.

Deputy Dorey – oh, he has just come back into the Chamber to listen to my wise words; thank you, I am grateful. He made the point ... he referred to the professionals' letter from the leaders who have spoken up in support of the model and they said – and it is a perfectly valid point – that we should not be seeking or trying to seek the Holy Grail, because we will not find a solution that has unanimous support. Of course that is the case. We know that. But we do need to actually find
3450 a model that has more than fairly minimal support and I think that is where we are.

Now, originally the speech I planned on making was going to be a kind of detailed and careful analysis of the amendment, but I think a number of Members have sort of got there already. So it is probably appropriate now for me to summarise all of that.

Essentially, the amendment is comprised of nine Propositions, seven of which are 'To note' and
3455 only two of them are more substantive Propositions. 3(d) is about an improved process of consultation, but I am afraid that is just too little too late, from the conversations and from the correspondence that I have been party to with teaching staff. I am afraid that the degree of stakeholder engagement so far has been poor and that is a very big part of why these current proposals do need to now be revisited.

I appreciate what the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture are trying to do. I think they
3460 are doing this from genuine motives. I would not seek to impugn anything to the contrary. I do

think this is fair enough, from where they are. It is their approach to dealing with the criticism that there has been and I think that is in good faith. But I do not think this is now enough. And the other point the substantive directions, 4(c), which is the point about space standards, again other Members have commented on this and my own view would be, the one point I would make is, that the cost of extra space could clearly end up being very significant indeed. And clearly, it is something that is going to be looked at to try to make the sites that have been chosen somewhat less imperfect. But I think that does, or will, represent substantial additional capital expenditure, if agreed – and that is by no means a given. But that will have a significant knock-on effect on the value for money assessment for this policy overall.

I think, as others have said – Deputy Inder and others – we are not in a position to know exactly what the cost of that may be today, but we know that this is not going to be small and it will be, potentially, a very expensive addition to an already very expensive programme and the proportionality of cost argument is something that we should never lose sight of, in terms of value for money matters. So all in all, I do not think any of this is really enough. I think it does come too late in the process. I do think, all things considered, sir, that it is a case where we do need to take a step back from where we are.

Now, as I say, I think there is still merit in 11-18 schools and I did indeed support the amendment that Deputies Le Tocq and Brouard laid sometime last week – that amendment was unsuccessful. There have been two other amendments, which I have also tried to support because I have been trying to find some sort of common-sense compromise solution in all of this, because I do think that there are particular dangers with the second Proposition of the Requête. But I will come onto that in a moment.

But I have been trying to find a solution to make sure that, when we eventually leave this Chamber, at the end of this debate, whether that is before the end of recorded time or not – we do not know at the moment, it is going to be a lengthy debate – nonetheless, we need to have something, not nothing. So I do hope that there has been a discussion about the possibility of an amendment to the second Proposition of the Requête. I think we need to see that amendment circulated ASAP, personally.

Nonetheless, I have tried to find some pragmatic solution in all of this, but I am afraid I do not think amendment 5 is such a solution and, in those circumstances, sir, I will be voting against this amendment.

Voting on Rule 26(1) motion:

Not carried – Pour 11, Contre 25, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Paint
Deputy Le Tocq

CONTRE

Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy de Lisle
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Smithies

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Deputy Le Pelley
Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Dorey

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting on the motion pursuant to Rule 26(1) from Deputy Leadbeater was 11 in favour, 25 against, three absences, and that is why it was lost. I will call Deputy Dudley-Owen next.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

It has been an interesting debate today but one that I do not really think has made us much progress in this debate. I have noticed that there have been common themes arising from the Committee over the period of debate, and repeated many times, perhaps in the hope that saying it, saying it again, and ending on it once more for good measure, will turn it into fact. So I hope that these assertions are not taken as fact by those listening because assertions are such and they are opinions and if they cannot be substantiated, they really need to be put right. And they can be summarised as follows.

There is an assertion that the Guernsey education system is underperforming, that the work in the Requête will take too much time, therefore much faster than a protracted period of uncertainty. But the previous three-school models were rejected, implying that the Assembly thought a three-school model was unsuitable; that there is a lack of parity across the schools; that policy decisions must not be challenged; and that concerns are based mainly around space or implementation.

So, I will just go back and I will deal with each of these in turn, but I will try not to take too long because I do realise that we are coming close to the 5.30 p.m. deadline where we will have to make a decision on whether to sit later in the day or adjourn until tomorrow. (*Interjections*) Have we decided that already? Gosh, it has been a long time since that decision has been taken. I do apologise, sir.

The assertion that the Guernsey education system is underperforming is actually really quite worrying coming from the Committee, given that they have been in position for the last two years and, actually, no responsibility for that underperformance has been undertaken yet. I think it is not very helpful to compare Guernsey to the UK, because actually it is the English education system that is being used as a comparison, not the Northern Irish system or the Scottish or the Welsh system, because they have their own systems of education.

Obviously we are adopting Attainment 8. But I am not sure that we have adopted all the criteria that they are using in the UK. For example, iGCSE English and Maths, I believe, are not counted in the UK but we continue to use this over in Guernsey.

Another issue with comparing us to England – not only are we culturally a little bit different, we are also economically rather different – is that we have a strikingly low unemployment rate in Guernsey, very low compared with the UK, and I am afraid to say, and people may not like me for saying this, but it has left us, as a community for decades now, since the 1980's particularly, I would say, a little bit less ambitious than we could be because our children can walk out of the school tomorrow with lower qualification standards than that of the UK, maybe we are not as hungry for achievement as our UK cousins could be. I think that this is an issue and therefore makes it unfortunate to try and draw a comparison between Guernsey and the UK, when we have a completely different type of employment market.

Looking at the work in the Requête taking too much time and therefore too much cost and leaving us with a protracted period of uncertainty, well there is a contradiction here because Deputy Fallaize has said lots and lots of work has been done. There are thousands and thousands of pages, which I absolutely agree and I know that there are. So Deputy Smithies, he dealt with this matter very succinctly in his speech earlier today and it is either that there is too much work that has been done or there is not enough work that has been done.

If there is too much work that has been done and lots of research and evidence in this area, then surely it cannot take too much time to gather this altogether and put it to stakeholder engagement and return it in the form of a report, in an expeditious way? I think that the basis on which some of the assumptions that have been made by ESC are ambiguous and is contrary to the advice that I have received.

In looking at the previous three-school models, there have been lots of implications that the Assembly have thought that any three-school model is unsuitable. It is not actually correct, because the Assembly never decided that a three-school system could not work. They decided that, with the very limited information available at the time, the two-school model was preferable to a three-school model. Now that the details of the two-school model have become known and more and more problems are becoming known, the Requête is an opportunity for the Assembly to make an informed comparison between different options before making a final commitment which is going to be in place for 50 years.

A further assertion that had been made is about the lack of parity across the schools and we have heard a lot about this in the last few weeks and this has been asserted by the Committee on many occasions. But I am really particularly concerned that this has been refuted by a head teacher in the public domain in a letter last week. He said that an article that was put forward in the *Guernsey Press*, which actually was from a media release from the Committee, gave the impression that students in Guernsey are being and have been let down and disadvantaged by the curriculum offered in Key Stage 4.

He goes on to say:

I don't believe that to be the case and would like to reassure students, parents and the wider community that the breadth and balance within our KS4 curriculum is comparable with the best schools in England and that where there are differences, they are mostly choices made by the individual school rather than limitations due to the size of the schools.

Now, this is in direct contrast to what Deputy Fallaize said to us today and has said to us in previous days of this debate. The head teacher finalised it in saying:

I believe the article was misleading, [and] drew conclusions from data without a full understanding of the data or its context and was completely lacking in balance.

Now, that is data that has come directly out of the Education Office and it is very worrying that one of our head teachers is taking a contradictory position to that of the Education Office. Who is stating the facts?

Now, Deputy Roffey earlier stated that policy decisions really must not be challenged. Those were not his exact words, but that was the implication. That we should be putting our shoulders behind this, that we should be supporting it because it has been twice agreed. I can only allow policy decisions to remain unchallenged if I absolutely believe in them and I can only absolutely believe in them if I have proof that what they are offering is going to be better than what we have today. We have not been given that proof. Therefore, I do believe it is our decision to continue challenging until we are given that proof.

Deputy Graham said that the requérants have sought to discredit the policy letter and the work done by officers at Education, and I am sorry if that is the impression that has been given. There is no seeking to undermine the work or the officers at Education. I did set that out in my opening speech.

At the time of the debate of the sursis motivé in September, it was not the policy letter in of itself that I was seeking to challenge. What I said was that ESC had presented work which is opaque, that there was a lack of evidence provided to support that their preferred model is the only way which we can achieve the benefits listed. I still maintain that. The presentation that we had on Saturday, a week ago, I still wrote down on my notes, 'Why are these benefits unique to the one school and two-site model?' That has never been proved beyond doubt.

I also noted in that September debate that:

the lack of meaningful consultation with key stakeholder groups ...

3585 – now, that is before we had been confirmed that by the profession, I said –

via open meetings and workshop events, the lack of financial information behind the annual costs, and where the savings are made; and a lack of detail about key logistical information ...

3590 This is not about looking to know where Mrs Le Page might be teaching her cohort in three years' time and in what classroom and what site. This is not about digging down into that detail. This is about being presented with proof beyond doubt that this particular model is going to deliver the benefits and why it can deliver the benefits when other models cannot. I think that that is at the key to the confidence in this particular proposal.

Also, please remember, Members, through you sir, that the Scrutiny Committee wrote a letter at the time, a very long and in-depth letter. They actually supported the position that myself and Deputy Prow, and those who voted in favour sursis motiv  , took at that time and I will just read from the conclusion, because they say:

Scrutiny Management Committee is concerned that the proposals lack sufficient detail to allow proper, effective consideration. We believe there remains an absence of vital information; and, that most if not all the proposals would benefit from further Scrutiny by the Assembly ...

3595 So it is not about the amount of pages you produce when you bring a policy letter, it is about the value of the content therein. I think that is at the heart of this.

3600 I was going to talk about the concerns about space or implementation. I think that has been covered very well by Deputy Green just now. But I will go back to a statement that we received from the NASUWT back in February 2017. This was in response to a consultation that their then committee had carried out with them and it was about the one school on two sites model. I will read from this, because it says:

The NASUWT urge the Committee to consider the significant drawbacks of this option extremely carefully, before deciding to progress this model in any way.

It has been questioned why, if therefore, the profession had a problem with the model at this time, they did not raise concerns at that time? So the NASUWT go on to say ... I do apologise; I got slightly mixed there, just bear with me. Okay, yes. They say that:

The one school on two site model would have the benefits that larger schools bring, namely economies of scale, easier recruitment of teachers, who would all have access to teaching at higher levels, plus a more defined career path within the schools. The drawbacks, though, are considerable. It is clear that creating two large schools in the place of four smaller ones would be a significant challenge.

3605 They say:

The mechanics of merging four schools into two would by definition necessitate a large-scale re-organisation, leading to enhanced uncertainty in the short-to-medium term. Given that none of the current four sites could easily accommodate a 1,500-place school and sixth form, the only way this could realistically be done without building two new schools on greenfield sites would be a multi-site approach, with each school operating on two sites. Effectively, each school would have a lower and upper school. Where schools operate on two sites it frequently leads to difficulties for teachers moving between those sites. The division between academic and vocational courses at post-16 would continue. A further drawback would be that although the schools themselves would be larger, the size of the two sixth forms would be relatively small. Smaller sixth forms typically offer a reduced range of courses, which is not in the interests of either learners or Guernsey in general. The NASUWT –

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

3610 **Deputy Fallaize:** Thank you, sir.

The sixth forms in the two 11-18 colleges will be in line with or slightly above the national average. That cannot possibly be described as small or smaller than ... whatever the wording was that Deputy Dudley-Owen used. They will be in line with or larger than average, nationally.

3615 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** I thank Deputy Fallaize for his point of correction. He does need to address that with the NASUWT rather than myself; these are their words not mine.

So the smaller sixth forms typically offer a reduced range of courses. The NASUWT, they conclude:

would urge the Committee to consider the significant drawbacks of this option extremely carefully before deciding to progress this model in any way.

3620 It is an inconvenient truth, I am afraid, that the current Committee have still not reconciled the union to that position.

So I will just look briefly at this amendment, sir. The ESC continues with plans to increase their space, but I think we need to ask ourselves: were they actually happy with these sites in the first place? I am confused whether or not they are because at the debate in September there seemed to have been contradictory messages and statements made about this matter, which cast doubt
3625 as to whether the Committee have been entirely comfortable with the space standards and whether or not these have actually been forced upon them by P&R.

I would like to know, sir, which it is, and I would welcome comment from P&R as to whether they stood in the way of the ESC aspirations to be more generous with the standards. If that was indeed the case and ESC were not happy with the space standards, surely that would have been
3630 apparent in the policy letter back in September via the Propositions? If there was conviction regarding the amendment, specifically Proposition 4(c), then why has it taken until now to bring this to the States?

One final comment regarding the amendment, in relation to 3(d), that has already been covered very well by Deputy Lowe and it is somewhat unusual for a Committee to ask the States
3635 to direct it to communicate with its own key stakeholders, many of whom work for their Department.

I will not be supporting this amendment and I ask Members to do the same. The Requête is quite simply to pause and review. It is not to debate and delay at all and it is very disappointing that themes have arisen and the extent of the impact has been exaggerated and unproved. The
3640 requérants have taken every care to approach this debate openly, objectively and in a straightforward way.

Thank you.

3645 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir. You will be pleased to know I will be brief.

Deputy Chris Green reminded me of my in-laws in his speech. They used to drive sometimes about 115 miles to save a penny on diesel. That is the problem we have with scrutiny these days, is: how much more money do we have to spend to see how much money we can save?

3650 If the delay, as I think Deputy Ferbrache, sir, through you, referred to the top end of the delay costing around £10 million, just how much money, if there are no money trees, how much more money are the States intending to burn, just so that one party can be proved right over the other?

Deputy Dorey made an interesting point about oppositions from outside the Assembly and how that translates to policy. In the early 1960's, the Fort George development, the people
3655 opposed to it ... I think, from memory, 10,121 opposed that development. In fact, interestingly, they did not oppose the development, they opposed a gated community. They wanted English people living amongst them, they did not want English people living separate from the community. But that is an aside. Nevertheless, in excess of 10,000 people, in the days when you

had to be out in all weathers, with umbrellas and clipboards, correlate the petition, bother turning up, handing it over to politicians.

Then of course we had, I think, 8,000 signatures or similar on seatbelts. But nobody, I do not think today, has mentioned St Andrew's School. You would have thought it would have loomed larger during the debate, the St Andrew's School closure. That was a big decision. That petition had, I think, 4,500 signatures on it. Remember, we were 'ripping the heart out of the community'. We were 'killing a parish', when now we know that those parents of children in St Martin's School praise the school it is in. They had obvious reservations, when you move outside your parish to a larger school, larger numbers of pupils, but so many of them talk up the benefit of being in a bigger school as opposed to a smaller one.

If we are saying, as I think Deputy Ferbrache did say, sorry for the repetition, if we are looking at the higher end of the compounded delay of £10 million then we really do need to stop ourselves, here and now, in jumping into this abyss of this unquantifiable number that the community will be asked ultimately to cough up.

Now, I have an idea. Let's imagine that I chose to build a school at the bottom of the Rohais and I just happened to call that school the Grammar and at the other end of the Rohais, at the top on the Gravees du Sud, I build a school, I happen to call it Ladies' College. Not content with that, I build another school down the road and I call it Elizabeth College and while I am there, I build a school in Vauvert, a primary school. Then of course I could just add Beechwood and Acorn House all in the mix and, of course, that would give traffic gridlock, wouldn't it? The Island would come to a standstill. Which, actually, it tends to, if Members have noticed.

I have a thing called a transport strategy, that States' Members have endorsed, to ease the burden of traffic problems. So please, if we are opposing the two-school model on transport and traffic-related grounds, please make it genuine. Please embrace Bikeability, please embrace the park and stride.

It was an interesting headline in the *Press* actually, which could have said something very different. It said there will not be enough buses to take these children to school. What a great problem to have. What a fantastic problem to have. We have always been aware it would take scheduled buses along with private hire vehicles. What a fantastic problem to have, not to have enough buses to take children to school and that is the way they should get there.

Deputy Lowe briefly touched on the referendum and, personally, I see it as a weakness of Government, of a Government not too comfortable in its own shoes, a Government that has lost a bit of direction and has to constantly want to refer to the election all the time to get its bearings. The main anxiety I have about not supporting this amendment and supporting the Requête, is probably the scars I have on my back through being on the former HSSD, when you go through so many Presidents; and I think at one stage half the Assembly had been a Member of the Health and Social Services Department. Half the Assembly had served on that Committee, and it was making very little process.

The situation we currently have with ESC is if the Requête goes through, I am assuming respectfully and to Members of the existing Committee, they may want to stand down. Are they not the Committee with some resignations in the mix with that too? So do we go to a nightwatchman committee before the Election, and then after the Election we go to another Committee to consider ... and all the lessons of history are there: if you do not have the continuity of people, you do not have the continuity of policy and you would get nowhere fast.

If the States' Members believe, I sat in the public gallery in 2001, Deputy Ferbrache referred to the Hampstead – I was going to say hamster, the Hamster Liberal Society! – the Hampstead Liberals or whatever. (**Deputy Ferbrache:** Socialists.) Thank you, socialists. Well, the States were of a different complexion in 2001; they were a conservative group of people. But they came within a whisker of removing selection. It was only on the promise of the rebuild of the three schools that selection was retained. and we had a schools programme that got completely out of synch. That is 19 years ago, and we are not getting very much further forward. It does worry me now to hear

3710 people talking again about the potential to reintroduce selection at some point. It may not be the class of 2020-24 that ultimately delivers on education and that is an extremely worrying thing.

Please support this amendment and reject the Requête.

3715 **The Deputy Bailiff:** As nobody else is rising I will ... Deputy St Pier. I will call Deputy St Pier, then.

Deputy St Pier: Thank you, sir.

3720 On Wednesday last week, in winter, I said that this was our Brexit issue and Deputy Soulsby built on that theme in her speech. As Deputy Lowe said, it is not a perfect analogy, but I think nonetheless it is sufficiently valid in the sense that it is an issue which has clearly divided the public, it has divided the teaching community, it has divided the States and indeed has divided Committees and no doubt it has probably divided families as well.

3725 Policy & Resources, of course, has no Committee view on this amendment. I am picking up a phrase, which I think Deputy Laurie Queripel was the first to use. I also am in a quandary on this amendment and, unlike Deputy Roffey, I do not think the answer is actually obvious, and I should actually just deal with one point. When Deputy Roffey spoke, he said that P&R officers had validated the cost of the delay. I do not think that is quite correct, to say that they have gone through a process of validation. I think it is worth putting that on the record.

3730 The key point is I do not think the answer to the quandary is obvious. And I think, as Deputy Soulsby said, one of the questions that we are dealing with is are we talking about the model or are we talking about the implementation of the model? I am with Deputy Laurie Queripel in that I do not like the Requête. I do not like its open-ended nature. But I do not like the amendment, with its nine Propositions, which I will come back to in a moment.

3735 I think the Requête has been built on a false premise, of lack of detail, and lack of evidence and poor governance, and I think Deputies Fallaize and Graham have both spoken to that in some depth in their speeches. There have been nine models looked at since 2012, by three different Committees and the policy choice on the model has been made, as we know. The governance is now all about the implementation. And there is a process running and I think we can and we should have confidence in that process.

3740 Actually, it is just worth speaking for a moment about the process, because this was something that was discussed by the States in the context of the Medium Term Financial Plan, in respect of large projects, what we put to the Assembly as Policy & Resources is:

It is suggested that States are given the opportunity to understand, influence and shape the scope of large significant projects ...

– that is anything over £10 million –

... at an early stage. Therefore, once the strategic outline case has been completed which sets out the strategic case for the project; defines the outcomes required and looks at a long list of options for delivery, a policy letter should be prepared seeking States' approval to proceed in the direction proposed. This should avoid committing substantial resources to projects before getting wide agreement to the proposed direction of travel.

The States would then also be asked to approve the developed project when it is ready to go out to tender for the preferred solution.

– i.e. the OBC stage.

As with the medium projects, it is anticipated that the Policy & Resources [Committee] would then be given delegated authority for opening the capital vote provided the value is within the agreed ranges ... [etc.]

3745 So I think Deputy Dorey is absolutely right about the process.

Now, I certainly do not want to be voting to waste public funds that have already been expended – £3 million already. Enough has already been wasted on the various aborted attempts in relation to the La Mare de Carteret High School rebuild, plus all the further costs of delay,

whatever they may be. And I cannot validate the numbers, other than to say, as Deputy Ferbrache has said, there will be a cost and it will be considerable.

But I do not like the amendment. There are nine Propositions, only two actually direct any action and I do not think that we can plough on regardless. As I said on Wednesday, in my opening speech on the amendment which Deputy Trott and I laid, it is a folly to ignore the teachers and the public, who do have genuine concerns that are not fully addressed by this amendment, I would suggest.

Now, the Policy & Resources Committee did attempt to give the States another option, within the amendment, including three-school model comparisons in the full business case as part of the process and we had, frankly, sand kicked in our face on that amendment. And it is tempting, when you have that experience, to vote against all alternative amendments in a fit of pique. But I think that would be spiteful, to do so. In short, I do not like any of the options. I think they are all ugly and we are very much in the case of the least-worst option territory, which is what I described as 'policy Russian Roulette', when speaking to our amendment.

I think the amendment is marginally less ugly than the unamended Propositions and I think forcing the resignation of the Committee, which was Deputy Brehaut's point – which I think would be inevitable at this stage – serves no one, least of all, most importantly, those that are in the education system. As Deputy Tooley says, we are two years into this transformation project. I think it is important that we do maintain forward momentum. A process was begun in January 2018 and will continue with Education, Sport & Culture continuing to prepare their full business case.

But the two direction Propositions, if they are to have any meaning, will have an impact on the process. There will be ripples from those directions. I am not entirely clear today exactly what those will be and Deputy Fallaize may have some comment on that when he sums up. But I did want to address Deputy Inder's question, in relation to what would be Proposition 4(c), in terms of the resource implications. If 4(c) became a Resolution of the States, the Committee would be required to work within its existing resources and the allocation in order to prepare that report, that policy letter, and bring that back to the States, that would then have the option to presumably approve or reject whatever proposals or recommendations they come up with.

If the project is moving beyond the authorities which have already been approved, then further authorities would need to be given. Somebody has already made that point – I think it was Deputy Dorey when he spoke – and that is the correct analysis. This is not an open-ended resource allocation, which I think is what Deputy Inder was fearing, that the controls do exist.

In relation to the space standards, which I think was Deputy Dudley-Owen's point when she spoke, the agreed space standards were as a result of the jointly commissioned work between the Committees *for* Education, Sport & Culture and the Policy & Resources Committee, which resulted in Peter Marsh's report. That then triggered a process of dialogue, which led to the plans on which the Education, Sport & Culture Committee are proceeding. Understandably, I think she is challenging what further would be brought to that process by that additional Resolution. But I think the key point is enabling dialogue to take place with the profession because, as Deputy Trott said in his intervention, that is the fundamental point. That is the thing that has fundamentally changed since both January 2018 and, perhaps more recently, September 2019 and that is what the amendment is clearly seeking to acknowledge and address, albeit, as I said earlier, I do not think it fully addresses that issue.

There is much emotion in this, and my and Policy & Resources' fairly logical comments up to this point, in relation to, we have to have faith and trust in the process ... I am frequently criticised for adopting that sort of emotionless analysis of problems, not least by Deputy Trott, who has a different approach to these issues and a different political experience as well. Indeed, other Members of the Assembly equally say, 'You are too process-driven.' But I think we do need to have confidence and faith in the process. The Assembly did support the Committee *for* Health & Social Care's hospital modernisation and gave delegated authority with considerably less information than they have had in relation to the alternative model subsequently. There was no traffic impact assessment, as Deputy Meerveld referred to earlier on that project.

So I think I, in my dealing with this issue, and there is absolutely, I think as Deputy Ferbrache has said, no fence to sit on on this amendment, there is no hiding place. It is a finely balanced judgement. I have gone back to first principles. I have spent eight years as the political representative with responsibility, seeking to build confidence in our capital processes and to have confidence and trust in them and Deputy Soulsby, when she spoke, did an excellent analysis of the level of project assurance that we have. In fact, only last week a project came before Policy & Resources which was stopped in its tracks as a result of the project assurance review process. So I know that it does work. Now, that does put pressure on Policy & Resources in this case, which I do not particularly welcome. I do not know whether it will be this Policy & Resources Committee or the next one, but Policy & Resources does have the delegated authority, under the full business case.

Frankly, the politically most convenient solution for me and for the Policy & Resources Committee is for the Requête to succeed, because it avoids me or the Committee having to make a decision. But I have not ducked any politically difficult or uncomfortable decisions in the last eight years, and I do not intend to start doing so now. But if the amendment succeeds or the Requête fails, there is and there can be – going back to the fact that we had confidence and trust in the process – no assurance that the full business case will be approved by the Policy & Resources Committee. If the Policy & Resources Committee, either as currently constituted or in the future, is not happy, it has questions, it has challenges, it will, discharging that role objectively and with integrity, have to pass back to the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture or not use its delegated authority.

So the supporters of the two-school model cannot skip out of this Assembly today if that is the result, if the amendment succeeds but the Requête fails, because there is much work still to do and as I said before, the full business case is about the delivery of policy. It is not just about the buildings. I think the fact that will require engagement and support of the profession, and I think Deputy Langlois spoke to that as well, that is an essential part of this process and that is obviously what part of this amendment is seeking to acknowledge and deal with.

So my final analysis, really, I think, in support of what Deputies Langlois and Dorey have already said is we are into a process, it may be deeply uncomfortable, but we do have to have trust and confidence in it to deliver the right checks and balances on this and indeed any other project which comes before us. And on that basis, although I do not like either of the choices faced before me, I will be reluctantly supporting the amendment, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: Sir, I know others are holding back, but it is as good a time as any for me to rise, immediately after my President.

You cannot make an omelette without cracking a few eggs. That, I think, is a fact. But you can choose to use chicken eggs or duck eggs. You do not necessarily have to be specific on what egg you are using. The first thing I want to address, and I am mainly doing it because it is a rarity for Deputy Lowe and I to agree on something and agree on something absolutely – it does not happen very often. When it does happen, sir, it is worthy of mention, and we saw that with regard to her comments on Brexit.

I say to Deputy St Pier and Deputy Soulsby, this is not Guernsey's Brexit for two very important reasons. The first is there has been no referendum on this matter and, in fact, at the last election four years ago, no one – and I mean no one – talked about a two-school model. It could not be more distant from a Brexit-type comparison than anything I could think of. Of course it is not Guernsey's Brexit moment. But it has divided the community, of that there is little doubt.

This amendment here, in front of us, as others have said, effectively asks us to do a whole load of noting, save in two regards. 3(d), and I am going to read it out, says:

To direct the Committee to ensure that decisions about the operation of the school and its colleges shall follow an improved process of consultation with teachers and support staff and that such consultation shall proceed in a way which secures the maximum possible confidence of key stakeholders.

Well, the way to proceed in that way, to secure the maximum confidence of key stakeholders, is to do as they have asked and that is pause and review, because that is precisely what those stakeholders ... What this amendment really says is, 'We'll consult with you on one narrow issue, that is the fact that it will be two 11-18 schools, and we will keep consulting with you until you agree with us'.

That is exactly why we are in the problem we are in now, because there has been no denying the tenacity of the ESC Committee. And I have to say that their stubbornness and their resilience is, in most political environments, something to congratulate them on. But on this issue, I do not think any of us bargained on such overwhelming and significant lack of support, opposition from the very people we are asking to take this forward.

Now it gets even worse a little bit later, in 4(c), which is the only other aspect of this amendment that asks us to do anything and that is to direct ESC to come back with an opinion as to:

whether further building space should be added to the 11-18 colleges ...

As others have reminded us throughout this debate, they are already one-third larger than they would be in the UK. So how on earth one ever proves value for money if we suddenly say to buy a few votes, well, we will

spend another £10 million, £15 million, £20 million. Of course it is an absolute nonsense. ESC are well aware – because this is an area where they have done a very good job – of the fact that the schools are already larger than they should be. But that is all to do with something called the Guernsey factor. So I wholeheartedly reject both of those aspects.

Now, Deputy Roffey, who is one of the speakers in this Assembly who I hang on his every word because he is a very skilful orator and as I have said on a number of previous occasions, over the years, his and my views have aligned. But I think he would agree with me that I am one Member of this Assembly who needs no lessons in political courage. To my knowledge I remain the only Member of this Assembly who has been threatened with having their head cut off with a couple of rusty swords.

But I ploughed on, notwithstanding, and this Assembly did not spend taxpayers' money on funding the Landsbanki Depositors' Action Group, who on occasions were as vile in their behaviour as some of the behaviours that we have witnessed against Deputy Fallaize. And they did get most of their money back, as I said they would sir, but at no time did we put taxpayers' money at risk in an environment that was wholly unsupportive of that.

So I do not need an lectures on political courage, but what I will say is that sometimes it is more courageous to admit that, despite your very best efforts, you have failed to take with you the most important cohort in this whole picture. Because people have said the children must come first. Of course they must. But if you have a completely disillusioned, dissatisfied and strike-threatening group, and of course I refer to the teachers when I use that language, you are hardly going to get the best possible environment for the teaching community to teach and therefore for children to thrive. So it really is that critical.

Now, others have again talked about what do you get if you vote for this amendment. Well, if you vote for this amendment you are voting for two 11-18 schools, albeit delayed. They will be delayed because the Policy & Resources Committee, this Policy & Resources Committee, will bring the business case back to this Assembly. It will not deal with this matter under its own delegated authority.

Now, if ESC had accepted the Policy & Resources amendment, and this States had said, 'We do not want you to come back with the business case' then I for one would not have insisted that we did. (*Laughter*) You laugh. I am telling you, that is what I would have done. Of course you have no way of knowing otherwise, so you are just going to have to take my word for it.

I give way to Deputy Dorey.

3900 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you for giving way.

Can you just clarify: are you speaking on behalf of P&R? I thought it was normally the President that speaks on behalf of P&R, not the Vice-President.

3905 **Deputy Trott:** I am not sure that question should be dignified with an answer. The President of P&R has made it quite clear, Deputy Dorey, there is no P&R opinion on this amendment. Why is that? Because we are divided. But I have said publicly before and I will say it again, it would be an act of insanity for the Policy & Resources Committee not to bring this matter back to the Assembly, so, of course, it will do precisely that.

3910 So if you vote for this amendment, you are voting for two 11-18 schools, albeit delayed, with a couple of comments that are made, which of course could already be dealt with within the amendment by dealing with matters in the completely opposite way.

3915 However, as others have said – I think it may have been Deputy Ferbrache – if you vote for the Requête you are not necessarily voting against two 11-18 schools, because when that comparison comes back, you will have an opportunity in the most objective of environments to make that decision.

3920 Deputy Hunter Adam, when he was in this Assembly, an eminent doctor, he once said, 'If you were in a situation in an operating theatre and you were under instruction to amputate somebody's leg and, as a surgeon, you were halfway through amputating the right leg, when the nurse in the operating theatre said to you, "I beg your pardon, Mr Adam, but you are amputating the wrong leg." He said, "Am I?"'

A Member: He was a gynaecologist! *(Laughter)*

3925 **Deputy Trott:** He was. I felt it was improper to substitute ovaries for legs. So halfway through and the nurse says, 'I am terribly sorry, sir, but I think this is the wrong leg.' 'I want another opinion.' So the nurse goes out of the operating theatre and the rest of the surgical ward come running in and say, 'The attending nurse is correct. It is the wrong leg.' 'Ah, well can you go and get all the nurses from the hospital to come?' 'Nine out of 10, sir, are pretty certain that it's the wrong leg.' 'Get me matron.' So matron arrives and matron says, 'Ah, it may be the wrong leg, sir, but that's not my job. My job isn't to tell you it's the wrong ... my job is to make sure that absolutely everybody loses one leg.'

Deputy Gollop: It is a nonsense.

3935 **Deputy Trott:** It is a nonsense, Deputy Gollop, you are absolutely right. It is a total nonsense. The import of those comments will not be lost on most but probably the most relevant aspect of this is we have a situation where the profession is telling us we are going about this operation in the wrong way.

3940 I want the *Hansard* record to state, as it will now, that I have supported two 11-18 schools twice before. I will be supporting the Requête unamended on this occasion for one fundamental reason. Not because 2,500 of our citizens have been marching or because we have had a petition signed by people from all over the world, it would seem. But because, in my view, only an idiot would continue with this policy in the knowledge that the overwhelming majority of the people that we are going to entrust to make this work, tell you, 'Do not do it. Pause and review.' And that is the basis for my support of the Requête.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

3950 I rise in support of the comments of my good friend Deputy Trott just now. Deputy Fallaize said earlier on that the terms of the Requête will not satisfy the concerns of the profession. But the profession are asking us to support the Requête, just as Deputy Trott pointed just now. Deputy Fallaize also said that they were looking to set up processes to work with the teachers over their concerns, confident that most can be addressed. Confident that most can be addressed
3955 is not certain that all can be addressed. Deputy Roffey also pointed out that some of the concerns the professionals have the Committee will not be able to meet and will just say no.

Deputy Brouard's prediction that the current reforms are on their knees, I cannot remember the words he used, but they probably will not make it past September/October if they got through today. I do not think you have to be Nostradamus to predict that and I think he is bang
3960 on.

I think we either pause and review now or stop and reboot later on this year when maybe works have started, contracts have been signed but concerns have not been allayed and this subject is again brought back to this Assembly. So I think voting out this amendment and voting through the Requête is not delaying. It is going to actually increase progress on this, because we
3965 will get here at one point – we will get here at one point – whether if this Requête is successful or it is unsuccessful, sometime later on in the year this will be back in this Assembly.

So please, sir, I urge everybody to reject the amendment and support the Requête unamended. Thank you.

3970 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

I just wanted to address the comment that came from Deputy Trott. He said we already know that the schools are one third larger than their UK counterparts, they are already too large. One of
3975 the key concerns has been that the space within the schools will not be enough. So if you were to be honest with the stakeholders, that no matter what model you choose those are the space standards that P&R have agreed to, and that in any model those are the space standards, then I would take seriously his point regarding speaking to stakeholders.

But we are not being honest with the real concerns coming from teachers. We are not
3980 addressing their concerns. That is unfortunately the conclusion I came to after spending three weeks looking at absolutely every single option, listening to every concern that came through from the teachers, speaking to all of the union representatives, looking at every single option. If we are being honest, we need to be completely honest.

Yes, we have not taken the teachers with us and I am incredibly cross. I am cross that we are
3985 being put in this position. I am cross at the requérants, I am cross at ESC, I am cross at P&R. Because there is nothing; no winners from this. If we are to move beyond this, it is not about throwing mud at everybody and saying, 'I have the moral high ground and you do not. I am the voice of the people and you are not.' It is not possible to have a win out of this and it should not be about winning. The only people that will lose are the students. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

3990 It is undeniable that there is passion amongst the teaching profession. But we, as politicians, have a duty to be honest with them about the political process and honest with them about the process that creates the space in the schools. So no matter what model we have, the space standards that are causing a problem right now will be the problem after. Going ahead and saying there are unicorn options out there is just simply not good enough. We need to have a real,
3995 honest conversation with the teachers.

Now, had this Requête not been brought forward, that was exactly what I was getting to, is to have that stakeholder engagement and explain to the teachers all of the information that I have discovered and go through those options with them, so that they can understand where the issues lie.

4000 I give way to Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel. I thank Deputy Hansmann Rouxel for giving way.

4005 I just want to make it clear, on the issue of space standards, and I do think it is a very big issue because it is the one section here where I really do not think, if ESC have any intention of trying to do that, while well intended, I do not think they will get anywhere. Because I was at two meetings with union representatives when ESC were present and I made it absolutely clear that there was no more money available for making more space available in the schools. I personally, sir, cannot see that P&R would be willing to go in that. Not this P&R or a P&R in the future. But further than
4010 that, I think if it came back to this Assembly or any other Assembly, they would refuse that as well.

So I think the advice is it is very cold comfort to expect a change in that sort of environment, as far as space standards are concerned and certainly the unions have been aware of that.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: I take Deputy Le Tocq's point and that is what has come out from
4015 conversations with them. But my point is that if the requérants were honest with the public and the teachers, they would be identifying that. And I found it very disingenuous from Deputy Trott saying that there is no more space.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Point of correction, please, sir.
4020

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: The requérants are not being dishonest.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: I said disingenuous.
4025

Deputy Dudley-Owen: We are not disingenuous. That is the same. I refute that absolutely.

Deputy Trott: On a further point of correction, sir.
4030

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: It is not Deputy Trott, or for that matter the Policy & Resources Committee, that are advising this Assembly that the space standards are very materially larger than they would be
4035 in the UK. It is ESC's independent consultants that have done precisely that.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel to continue.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you sir.
4040

If I gave the impression that I was saying it was just P&R, it is the independent consultant, but we do need to be honest about the outcome of any models.

I give way to Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you sir.
4045

Sorry, I think I have got a bit lost here. Are we talking about inside space or are we talking about the outside space?

Thank you.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: It is all the space standards. (*Interjection*) Yes. There are issues
4050 coming, concerns from teachers came about the internal space within the schools, that there were not enough classrooms. But, as Deputy Trott has outlined, that is agreed by an independent specialist – the Peter Marsh report. So those space standards will remain, no matter what model we choose.

4055 If we got to the point, the Nirvana that some teachers – only some, not all – are looking for, is that the Sixth Form Centre becomes a large 11-18 campus, perhaps there does not need, under the space standards, to be that much re-jigging of the 11-16 side of the school. Because, actually, the space standards say that we are able to fit this many students into that school and those are the space standards. So, if there is concern now, we need to be honest about what those concerns are that are present now, with the implementation of this model, and be honest that those
4060 concerns will happen no matter which model we choose. I fear we have lost that level of communication with the teachers, partly because the situation has broken down.

I just want to say that I also, like Deputy St Pier – and I believe Deputy Merrett as well also said – I do not like this amendment, but having spent three weeks going through things, trying to find an amendment, I cannot see a way of building a way over what is a lot of crossed wires, when
4065 it comes to what is the real root of the problem.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: No one else is standing, so that closes debate on this amendment, subject to me turning to the proposer in due course, to reply to it. I am saying that just so nobody is
4070 going to leap to their feet, once we do what I am just about to suggest we do.

A couple of Members have mentioned that they think it would be helpful for Members to see amendment 8, which has been emailed, but if people are not keeping up with their emails, before taking a vote on this. I have checked with Deputy Fallaize and he is content for me to direct that that be circulated now, so that you have it in front of you. You will not need very much time to
4075 read it. But once that is circulated quickly, I will then call on Deputy Fallaize to reply to debate on amendment 5.

Now, Members of the States, as you will realise, it is unlikely that the motion and the amendment attached thereto, numbered 8, will need to be put if amendment 5 is successful. It becomes a little bit meaningless. So this is more to inform the choice between the original
4080 Propositions, which might then be subject to a series of amendments, including this one, or the Propositions in amendment 5.

Deputy Fallaize will now reply to the debate, please.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you sir.

4085 I am amused, sometimes, by this Assembly, because what became a theme in this debate was that this amendment is somehow a sort of conspiracy, that its real intention is to defeat the Requête. Well, yes, I think that is pretty obvious because it starts by saying, 'To delete the Propositions and substitute therefor ...' So yes, the intention of this amendment is to defeat the Requête because my Committee believes the Requête is all of the things that I said when I opened
4090 debate on this amendment.

The debate on this amendment did not touch much, if at all really, upon educational outcomes. I think we have been debating it for six and a half hours, or whatever it has been, and there has been a lot of talk about stakeholders. There has been some talk about traffic. There has been talk about other infrastructure issues. There has been talk about the Election. But there has
4095 not been any talk, or very little, about educational outcomes. I do think that that is what the focus of this debate needs to be about.

I will respond to a few of the questions and points that were made in debate. Deputy Merrett, quite understandably, I think, said that she required reassurances about what happens or what changes if 4(c) and 3(d) are approved and she probably was referring more to 4(c), because the
4100 space Proposition is clearer. So in relation to the issue of engagement, stakeholders and operational implementation of these changes, I think there are three things that will change. The first thing, and the reason for trying to capture it in a States' Resolution, is that it sends a message, as well as trying to capture where we are. Of course it is true to say that it is asking to put into a States' Resolution something the Committee could do anyway. But I do think it at least places on
4105 the record, in the place where Government makes its decisions, and therefore it is valuable for

that reason. But more importantly, I think there is the prospect, very soon, of us – when I say us, I am talking about the Committee and its officers – being able to do less internal talking within the States and more constructive engagement with stakeholders.

4110 A criticism I have and I, like Deputy St Pier, will be asking the States to continue to allow the process of business cases and planning application, *etc.* to continue, but there is a real challenge in that this is a major transformation programme. At the last moment in the normal course of events when it is meant to come before the States, there is still a great deal of work that needs to be done before the Policy & Resources Committee releases funds. That requires putting together a great deal of additional information, a lot of pages in business cases. It is very onerous. It
4115 inevitably detracts from the time available to engage with external stakeholders, unless you are a very large organisation, or you throw very large sums of money at it and you can do both of those things together. But that is not the position the States are in.

Under the old way of approving capital projects, after the decision had been made by the States in September, that would have been it, as far as the authorisation for the funds are
4120 concerned. That would have been it. Yet there would still have been a period of several months between the States approving the programme and the capital investment and the construction starting. In that period of time, there would have been much more space to engage with stakeholders. I think this is a challenge, which corporately the States needs to deal with. Because it is not productive – it might cause a bit of short-term amusement, but it is not productive – to
4125 have a situation where a Committee gets the endorsement of the States twice for a major strategic policy and then the internal processes, which the Committee has to apply itself to, are making a significant contribution that the policy runs into. That is just not a productive position to be in.

If Government makes a decision that it wants to move in a particular direction, in terms of
4130 strategic policy, the whole of the Government – and I do not mean the Members of the States because the Members of the States are acting here as a parliamentary Assembly and not all of the Members agreed with the strategic direction, but – the organs of Government, the States' Committees and the bureaucratic machine need to get behind that strategic policy and deliver it.

In any other jurisdiction, if this policy fell apart, it would not just be a matter of the Committee
4135 or the person in my position saying, 'Oh, well, sorry. We will go through another committee', the government would fall and Deputy St Pier would be just as much on the line for it as I would be. Now, because we do not have that sort of system of Government, it is very difficult for a Committee to create the pressure for the whole Government machine to get behind a strategic policy. But it is a very major problem and the Committee *for* Health & Social Care is likely to come
4140 up against the same problem in relation to hospital modernisation and other Committees are in relation to their major transformation programmes.

But we are now getting to the end of the business case process. So in response to Deputy Merrett when she says, 'What will change?', one thing that will change is some of the resource which has been used to talk internally will be able to engage more constructively with
4145 stakeholders. Also, there has been an increase in the programme team which we employ, because while you are in the phase of planning, the programme team is smaller and as you get closer to this point of delivery, you can enlarge the team. That has all been set out in the Programme Business Case and approved by the States. But until you have those additional resources, you cannot engage with your external stakeholders as successfully as you would wish.

4150 So I do not think this is a problem specific to the Committee; I do not think it is a problem specific to this transformation programme. It is a corporate problem. But if this amendment is approved and the strategic policy direction can continue on track, then I am confident, for the reasons that I have just set out, that there will be the resources available to do the things with stakeholders which should have been done previously.

4155 Deputy de Lisle said that he wants to have more focus on students who are pursuing vocational and technical studies. I respect his view. But if he rejects this amendment and backs the Requête, he is backing it on the basis of it stopping the development around the Guernsey

Institute. Deputy Inder says it is not true, but it is true, because Deputy Inder does not know if he is going to get his amendment through the States and because the terms of the Requête are quite clear that previously considered models need to be re-examined and some of those include models which are not consistent with the concept and the timeline of the Guernsey Institute. So I do not think Deputy de Lisle is doing anything to focus on students who are pursuing vocational and technical studies by doing that to the Guernsey Institute.

Deputy Inder said, if there is any addition of space, the capital costs will go up. Of course that is true. Then he said that is not what was sold to the States originally. Now, sir, I have to pick up on this, because when the States agreed to the strategic direction that there should be two 11-18 colleges, the estimated capital costs that the States were advised of by the previous Education Committee, were in the region of £100 million. They were the costs that the States were advised and the actual costs, in the budget that has been authorised by the States, are in the low £60 millions. So there would have to be the addition of an awful lot of space, the size of the extensions would nearly have to double, if there is going to be any increase in capital costs, beyond what the States believed when they voted for the policy two years ago.

I agreed with the analysis of Deputy Soulsby. I think she was setting out a process whereby a model is agreed, plans are then developed to implement it, it inevitably hits opposition and so you stop. Actually, the Requête does not propose any recipe for getting off that cycle and if you continue to do that, you will never get anywhere. You can develop an endless number of models. The only models or model that is going to encounter almost no resistance at the point of implementation is the model of no change, because it is change which creates the uncertainty and creates the resistance. Now, the consequences of no change, a few years down the line, might encounter a great deal of opposition. But at the moment of implementation, no change is likely to encounter the least resistance.

Deputy Laurie Queripel chose to present this in terms of revolution or evolution. I think the word is ambition. The question is: how ambitious are we? If we are not ambitious we can probably avoid resistance, because we can have no change, or something very close to no change. If we are ambitious for our education system, ambitious for what our students can achieve, ambitious for what our schools can provide, we have to have a reasonable degree of change and that will inevitably encounter uncertainty and resistance.

Deputy Soulsby was saying: stick to the strategic policy agreed, but then shift the focus to implementation and plans. That essentially is what this amendment is all about. It is saying there is no solution here to be found in revisiting an endless number of models, but there are solutions to be found in sticking to the strategic policy and then shifting the focus to how that model can most successfully be implemented.

Deputy Lowe said that the Proposition in relation to space would require the States to vote on it blind. I do not think that is true at all, because the Proposition on space merely directs the Committee to report to the States with any recommendations on whether there should be additional space and at that point the States would then make a considered decision off the back of a policy letter. So unless from now on, every time there is a proposal for a Committee to bring a report to the States, that is going to be dismissed as requiring the States to vote blind, I do not think that that argument holds.

So the Proposition in relation to space is quite clear. If the States approve the amendment and then turn it into States' Resolutions, the Committee will have to report to the States, after engagement with stakeholders, setting out its considered view on whether there is a case for adding additional space. I strongly suspect that what would happen is the Committee would report back and say, actually, the independent analysis shows there does not need to be any space, but these are the concerns that have been set out by the profession and if the States want to add space, this is where it is best to add it and these are the costs. And the States then would have to reach a conclusion.

Deputy Laurie Queripel said there is going to be an election and, in any event, that might mean there is a change of course. In other words, whatever the States votes for today, the policy

4210 might not hold beyond the election. Of course that is true, but you could say that in the run-up to every election about every policy. I do not think you can just throw up the white flag six months before an election or 12 months before an election, or however long it is, and say, actually it is not really worth us making any contentious or difficult decisions now, because they might be changed by the next Government.

4215 I will give way to Deputy Queripel.

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

I know he is not accusing me of anything, but I think he has misrepresented, to some extent, what I said, and so has Deputy Dorey earlier.

4220 I am not saying that business cannot continue until the end of a political term and before an election. In the last term, quite close to the end of that term, we took the vote on selection, didn't we? Moving away from selection and towards ... I voted for that. I am not scared to make a tough decision or be involved in tough decisions. But this to me is an exceptional issue. I am not saying all Government business should stop before an election, but this is clearly an exceptional issue and that has been backed up by the response of the community and of course the professionals.

Deputy Fallaize: Okay, but I think one problem then, in the context of this particular issue, is that given the time that it takes to analyse different models and to develop them, and to get from the stage of the States saying, 'Yes this is what we want to do in principle', and then developing all the detailed plans to get to the stage we are at now, could very easily take the next States close to the next election. So if this issue is unique and the States are caught up in this position where they cannot implement substantial change in this area close to an election, or within whatever it is, six months or nine months from an election, I think that could be a problem for successive States.

4230 Deputy Gollop said there is no reason why the Committee cannot go out to the public, go out to teachers, on a list of models and then come back to the States in October. I do think that is a wholly unrealistic timeline, given the Election, but it misses the point. You could have discussions with every person in Guernsey about the model. That is not going to address the issue, because the issue is, the issues arise when you come to the moment of implementation. If anything, if the Requête proposed deferral of elements of the strategic plan, to allow for further dialogue around implementation, then it might be possible to say, well okay, the Requête is trying to respond to the concerns that have been raised. But actually, having an endless review of models is not going to do anything to respond to the concerns which have been raised.

4235 I submit to Deputy Trott's point, sir, when he says it is clear that the unions have asked for pause, I think it is because they think that is the only way that the implementation concerns they have can be addressed. Now, that has subsequently become an attempt to re-debate or re-examine models of education, but that is not the crux of the issue and I will come back to that in a moment.

4240 I do agree with Deputy Graham. I think this argument about governance and process is a nonsense, quite honestly. I think it has been hit upon by some of the signatories to the Requête, with respect to them, because they have been very vulnerable to this charge, 'We know what you do not want, but we do not know what you want, because you just want to have another round of review of models.' They hit upon this idea of saying the process has all been wrong, the governance has all been wrong, there have not been enough models studied, there has not been enough comparative analyses, the full business case was not put before the States. None of this makes any sense.

4255 If that was the problem, they would now be arguing vehemently against the Guernsey Institute. Because actually, compared to the Lisia School proposals, the 11-18 proposals, which have had hundreds of pages of analysis of different models, thousands of pages and material put before this States by this Committee as well as by previous Committees, actually, the States are allowing the Guernsey Institute to proceed on that, literally, and I think only six Members of the States voted against it when it was voted on in September. States' Members know almost no detail

whatsoever about the Guernsey Institute, but they have been happy to allow it to happen. So much so that when I say I think this Requête engages the Guernsey Institute, the signatories to the Requête are very quick to say, 'Oh no it does not. We do not have any problem with the Guernsey Institute; let it happen.' Fair enough. But it cannot then be a problem of governance and process, because there has been far more information about the 11-18 element than about the Guernsey Institute.

I am not going to give way to Deputy Meerveld, and I assure him it is not because it is Deputy Meerveld. It is just that the hour is late, and I think the States would be grateful if I finished sooner rather than later. But Deputy Trott is free to go if he wants. (*Laughter*) In fact, if he has to be anywhere at a certain time, if he could let me know I will carry on until ...

Deputy Dudley-Owen says there is no reason why the work required by the Requête could not be done swiftly. Well, of course there is. She says there is lots of analysis done already. But this is not a technical problem, this is not a problem of a lack of information, this is political problem. That is why it is going to take ages to do the work. Because if all the information existed now then it would be possible for all the States to say, 'We do not want that model, we want this model instead. Go away and implement it.' This is not a technical problem, it is a political problem. It is really a problem of the States objectively deciding what should be the strategic direction in education and then having the courage to see it through. That is not a technical problem, it is not a dearth of information, it is an absence of political courage.

The NASUWT, I am afraid, any Member of the States who is disposed towards 11-18 schools, if the test is going to be you have to have the support of the NASUWT, just give up now, because the NASUWT has consistently supported 11-16 arrangements in a three-school configuration. I do not think that every strategic education policy of the States should have to be given assent by the unions. But if that is the position – and that appears to be the position being presented by the signatories and indeed by Deputy Trott – then you are seriously narrowing your options and I do not think that is a wise thing to do, in any event.

So the position of the Committee on spaces, based on the advice of the independent reviewer, who incidentally is not my Committee's independent reviewer – it is an independent reviewer commissioned jointly by my Committee and the Policy & Resources Committee – based on his advice, we are clear that the current space standards in these reforms are adequate. But clearly there is a lot of concern among teachers that they may not be adequate. Now, that probably arises because they are less generous than the space standards in some of our current schools. Not all of them, certainly, but some of them, and because our current schools, or three of the four of them, are operating significantly under capacity. So there is bound to be a sense of space and because of those concerns, we think it is reasonable to work with the professionals to understand exactly where they feel there is less space than there should be and to return to the States with our considered view of whether additional space should be added. I do not think that is an unreasonable position.

In terms of operational issues, the position is this is a very major programme of change and it was always inevitable that it was going to run up against periods of uncertainty, anxiety and resistance. When governments undertake major change, they very often encounter big resistance and, very often, the people they encounter the resistance from most are the people in the system, already operating in the system. That is not unusual.

I think, at the first sign of that, this Government is threatening, potentially on the verge, of running away from it and saying we cannot face that kind of resistance. Well, if that is the case, the big challenges, which to some extent this States has put off, which may have to be dealt with by the next States, around long-term care, the fiscal challenges – what is the fiscal gap, of £16 million a year or ...? These are big challenges, which probably will dwarf the challenges that we are facing now in Education. If we are heading into an era, or we are in an era, where Government cannot drive through any strategic policy in the face of the resistance of stakeholders, then I think this is an issue of how governable the Island is.

Now, I do not disagree with Deputy Trott that the fundamental issue is the need to address teachers' concerns. His analysis, I think, in that respect, is spot on. I think that the States always knew there would be a sector of public resistance. If you have a survey and 62% of the respondents say, 'We would like to keep selection', and you decide that you are going to remove selection, it is not surprising that you are going to get a degree of public resistance when you come to implement the policy.

But I think clearly what has changed the nature of the debate are the concerns raised by teachers. But this is where I think Deputy Trott and I disagree and where I suspect the States is split almost down the middle. It is: how do we respond to that? Either we say, we stick to the strategic direction because twice, on considering all of the evidence objectively, we have decided that that is the best model for the future of secondary and further education and we deal with the concerns around implementation and the operation of the two 11-18 colleges, including during the transition period, which takes us through to 2022-23. Or we say the best way of dealing with the teachers' concerns is that we stop the strategic direction and we go into an indefinite period of reviews of other models of education previously rejected. I think, and my Committee thinks, that latter option is just not going to get us anywhere in terms of dealing with the core of teachers' concerns.

I also think, having praised Deputy Trott's analysis, he is being illogical in one respect. To say that we must respond to teachers' representations and then to say that we must not, in any circumstances, provide more space, is just ... I do not understand how Deputy Trott can ride both of those arguments. Because space is the main issue. In October, when the teachers' unions were first raising their concerns with us, they were saying to us, 'We want to work with you. We will go to the Policy & Resources Committee and we will force them to give you more space'. That was the original position. Not, 'We do not want this model.' It was: 'We want more space'.

We were saying, corporately, there is not any more space. We have got to stick to the space standards because they have been independently assessed. We are not going to detach ourselves from the position of the Policy & Resources Committee and our Committee, and the States have authorised the budget ceiling in any event. But their concerns were around space standards. So I think this is the point Deputy Hansmann Rouxel is making. We have got to level with teachers. It is no good saying to teachers, 'We are responding to your concerns by having an indefinite review of other models of education', knowing full well that their concerns are around the implementation of the future model and the space standards, if we know that when those concerns arise a year or two or three years down the line, we are going to say, 'Oh no no, the space standards were never negotiable. But I think that is the position that Deputy Trott is setting up.

I also think it was slightly unfortunate ... I was pulled up the other day, sir, for referring to Deputy Trott as daft. I think Deputy Trott referred to the people who will support this amendment as idiots. I think that was slightly unfortunate. **(Severall Members: Hear, hear.)**

Okay, I will give way to Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: What I thought I said, sir, was that I considered half the Assembly would be idiotic to support the amendment. What I am prepared to say is that I do not think half of the Assembly are idiots.

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, but I think everybody could see through that! *(Laughter and interjection)* Nothing, probably.

Now, we have been told, though, that the opposition from the profession is overwhelming. I think it has been convenient for that to become opposition to the model, when I think it is concerns in relation to the implementation. But I want to refer to an email, which all Members had from a secondary school teacher, and I will not reveal the person's name, but we all had this email some weeks ago in relation to this issue. It said:

The requête due to be discussed this Wednesday has further served to highlight that as a profession staff have differing and often contradictory ideas about what the best model of secondary education will look like. Undoubtedly, there are different priorities underpinning some of the suggestions from various institutions and it is important that we do not let our own priorities cloud our judgement of what is best educationally. The implementation of change is challenging and no doubt many stakeholders will feel anxious about what this will mean for them. However, as difficult as change might be, we need to look not at which model provides least change, but at which will provide the best opportunities for our Island's children.

The States has voted twice to remove selection. The model which best provides this, is the 2 x 11-18 model. Not only does this provide the numbers to offer broad curriculum choice, but it also places high aspirations of all at the forefront of secondary education. I explained how students had said they would feel more comfortable continuing their education if the sixth form was attached to their school. Should we advantage a third of children by providing this, without considering the disadvantage this leaves for the other two thirds?

Financially, many of the other proposals do not make sense. Quite simply, they will be far more costly to implement long term. Furthermore, many of the benefits of economies of scale would be lost, leaving less money to invest in much needed specialist support, for example, for students with educational needs. Many of the concerns raised by staff are, in my mind, logistical. For example, while the central corridor at St Sampson's is not ideal design-wise, there are clear plans to alleviate some of the pressure by building adjoining corridors, which provide alternative routes around the school. Our canteens may not sit an entire school, but split lunchtimes aptly accommodate this.

One argument for retaining selection is that the removal of selection would increase the divide between those who can afford a private education and those who cannot. In many ways, I feel that this model takes many of the wonderful things that a private education affords young people: encouragement to mix with students of all ages; a focus on developing both in the classroom and outside, with an array of enrichment opportunities; and unwavering high standards. A number of those reading this will have chosen private education for these reasons. Can we meet the challenge of providing this for all children?

With this in mind, I urge Deputies to stand by the decisions they have made already, to trust their reasons for supporting the model are still the most important priorities for our Island's young people, to be realistic about what we can afford as an Island and to allow a five-year strategic plan to be fully implemented, before claiming that not everything is in place.

4365 Sir, I do think that message, which is not shared only by that teacher alone, has not always
been allowed – and I use that word advisedly – to be heard by Deputies in the run-up to this
debate. So these strategic reforms, which this Requête is trying to stop, are, and I say what I said
this morning, I still believe a majority of the Members of the States believe that if we are going to
have a non-selective system, that this model of two 11-18 colleges is the optimum way of running
it. It is the model best placed to deliver the highest possible standards of education and equality
4370 of opportunity to students and high quality facilities for all students, and making the best use of
the funds the States are prepared to invest in education.

We can continue with that strategic plan and we can deal with the concerns there are around
the implementation of that model, beginning with immediate effect and during the transition
model; the transition plan. Or we can stop all of that, with absolutely no idea what to do instead,
4375 which is what is set out in the Requête.

Despite five years' worth of analysis, three Committees looking at all the models, eight States'
debates and thousands of pages of information, we will be saying: stop these reforms that we are
embarked upon, which we know, because we have voted for them twice already, can deliver
significant benefit; stop them and go into another indefinite period of review of other models,
4380 when we know full well, or the majority of us do, that the substantial issues are not around the
model, but around the implementation of the model.

So the Requête offers absolutely nothing than an abyss, which is what Deputy McSwiggan
referred to it as the other day. This amendment allows the States to stick to the strategic policy
and provide a reasonable way forward to give us the best chance of dealing with the concerns,
4385 which are genuine and do exist around implementation and I encourage Members to support the
amendment.

Thank you, sir.

4390 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, we come to the vote on amendment 5, proposed
by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Graham. There has already been a request for a recorded
vote, some time shortly after 11 o'clock this morning. (*Laughter*)

Deputy Greffier, we will have a recorded vote please.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 18, Contre 18, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

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

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting on amendment 5, proposed by Deputy Fallaize, seconded by Deputy Graham was: there voted Pour, 18; Contre 18; with three absences. Because there is an equality of votes, I therefore declare the amendment lost.

Procedural

The Deputy Bailiff: Now, Members of the States, I think, unless anyone is desperate to stay here, with Deputy Roffey's proposed lock-in, it is time now to say that tomorrow morning, we will start with amendment 8, on the basis that it is seeking to substitute Proposition 2. We will then, if Deputy McSwiggan and Deputy Merrett wanted to, move to amendment 2, to add to that or not as the case might be.

But when we get to amendments 3 and 4, assuming that is where we end up, because they are simply to insert new Propositions, can I encourage you overnight to reflect on the fact that just letting them through on the nod, and then deciding whether you want to vote for or against them after general debate might actually be a simpler solution than having a substantive debate on each rather than taking them, effectively, in general debate.

So as I indicated earlier, in the light of the decision that you took, I will now adjourn until 9.30 a.m. tomorrow.

Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Sir, could you just clarify for Members, in order to prepare for tomorrow, when this issue is complete, do you intend to debate any other issues, or would it all be put back to the March Assembly?

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, much depends on timing. There is the Scrutiny Management Committee's Tribunal of Inquiry additional policy letter that was included, and I understand, not seeking to take his arguments away from him, that there might be a suggestion that that be more time-critical than the two requêtes – not my words but somebody else's. Therefore if one got to a stage tomorrow that the only business left was the two other requêtes, for argument's sake, then

4420 it may well be that the States would be minded simply to deal with the Schedule for future States' business and defer those two items into the next Meeting.

4425 If, during the course of tomorrow, progress is not being made well, then it is possible that I will once again test Members' desires to come back for another consecutive day on Wednesday. I am going to encourage you not to rely upon that because there has to come a point where enough is enough for a single Meeting and therefore there will be some flexibility but clearly it is desirable now to get to a final vote on whatever the Propositions will be by the end of this debate and, ideally, by the end of tomorrow, and then see where we are to. I hope that helps.

But we will now adjourn until 9.30 tomorrow morning.

The Assembly adjourned at 6.58 p.m.