



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Tuesday, 3rd March 2020

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

Volume 9, No. 10

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

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

Law Officers

R. M. Titterington, Q.C. (H.M. Comptroller)

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

J. A. B. Gollop, C. N. K. Parkinson, L. C. Queripel,
M. K. Le Clerc, 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, A. C. Dudley-Owen, 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

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

Absent at the Evocation

Miss M. M. E. Pullum, Q.C. (H.M. Procureur); Deputies M. P. Leadbeater (*relevé à 14h 31*),
P. R. Le Pelley (*indisposé*) and C. P. Meerveld (*relevé à 10h 14*);
Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and A. Snowdon (*absent de l'île*)

Business transacted

Evocation	743
Billet d'État V	743
X. Requête – Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Debate continued.....	743
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 12.33 p.m. and resumed it sitting at 2.30 p.m.</i>	<i>778</i>
Requête – Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Debate concluded – Amended Propositions carried.....	778
Procedural – Adjournment of sitting until next day – Motion lost	820
XII. Policy & Resources Committee – Future States' Business approved	821
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.54 p.m.</i>	<i>822</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE DEPUTY BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

PRAYERS

The Greffier

EVOCATION

Billet d'État V

REQUÊTE

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

The Greffier: Article X, Requête – Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – continuing the debate on the amendments.

5 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, the first thing we will do is invite Deputy Inder to propose the motion under Article 7(1) of the Reform (Guernsey) Law 1948 to suspend Rule 24(2)(b) to enable Amendment 8 to be moved. Do you wish to speak to that motion at all, Deputy Inder?

10 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, I think you have given the explanation. I would just ask for that motion to be moved.

The Deputy Bailiff: And that is formally seconded by you, Deputy Brouard?

15 **Deputy Brouard:** Yes, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

The Deputy Bailiff: I am going to put the motion to suspend the Rules to you, Members of the States. Those in favour; those against.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: I think we might go to a recorded vote on that, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

20 **Deputy Lester Queripel:** Sir, while the votes are being counted, could I just ask for clarification, please, as to why we were not given the opportunity to speak on that motion? You did allow the Assembly to speak on the motion to suspend the Rules for the previous amendment, but we were not allowed to speak on the motion to debate, or not, on this occasion.

25 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Queripel, the first time that this motion in respect of another amendment was to be put it was the first amendment in this debate. If Deputy Inder did not want to speak to the motion and simply wanted it put, I was prepared to simply put it. The vote is close, which is why I am waiting for the official record, but that is the motion.

Not carried – Pour 18, Contre 16, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 5

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

30 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, the vote on the motion to suspend Rule 24(2)(b) of the Rules of Procedure, proposed by Deputy Inder and seconded by Deputy Brouard is 18 in favour, 16 against and 5 absences. Therefore, the motion is carried and amendment 8 can now be moved.

35 **Deputy Dorey:** Pont of order, sir.
Under Rule 4(3), it has got to give the financial implications of a Proposition. The Rule 4(3) information bears absolutely no resemblance to the financial implications of this amendment and therefore can be ruled out of order.

40 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Unless the Comptroller is going to advise me differently, this amendment has attached to it some information purporting to comply with Rule 4(3), so the amendment is not flawed as such, even if the information might not be correct.
Mr Comptroller, do you disagree?

45 **The Comptroller:** Sir, I am not going to disagree. I think as Members will be aware, Rule 4(3) requires that every Proposition laid before the States which has financial implications to the States should have appended to it, in a policy letter or requête, or otherwise, an estimate of the financial implications to the States of carrying the proposal into effect. So I think it is an estimate, but it depends, I suppose, on whether it deals with the right issue, (*Laughter*) to be candid about it.

50 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: The financial implication of carrying out a comprehensive review is not £129 million.

55 **A Member:** Yes, that's right!

Deputy Dorey: And also, even if it was related to the two-school model, the Propositions that were passed in September last year talked about £77.9 million for the two-school model. Does this bear any resemblance to the cost of the two-school model which it claims to be about? The whole point of that Rule is that States Members have good information in order to make decisions. This is not acceptable information.

60 **The Deputy Bailiff:** And that is, with the greatest of respect, Deputy Dorey, a point that you can make in debate, but it does not render the amendment unacceptable on the basis that the gatekeeper of all amendments is the Greffier and the Greffier has accepted it and given it a number – and I am not going to rule it out of order. A slim majority is enabling the Rules to be suspended to allow this amendment to be laid, and therefore I am going to invite Deputy Inder now to speak to this amendment.

[Amendment 8](#)

1. For Proposition 2, substitute the following:-

"2. To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to prepare a report on non-selective educational delivery, for the States before the end of March 2021, that must include a comprehensive comparison of the structure and implementation of:-

(a) the one school on two sites plan,

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

(c) three 11-16 school models, including a separate sixth form centre;

(d) two 11-16 school models and one 11-18 school; and

to revert to the States with a policy letter and suitable Propositions to implement what it believes to be the best model for secondary education in Guernsey."

70 **Deputy Inder:** Can I ask for the Greffier to read the Proposition out, please?

The Greffier read out the amendment

The Deputy Greffier: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Sir, thank you.

Over the past few days there have been some criticisms of the Requête and I think some of that is genuine given the timelines adopted, and also we have had a number of amendments that have sought to replace the whole of the amendment with specific models which are of a type that certain Deputies may or may not have wanted.

I have said through this debate I am beyond guessing what the likely models are going to be. I have got a feeling, for example, that a sixth form centre in one place feels like it is the right thing, the version of a sixth form centre that should appear, but Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Al Brouard put in a suggestion for three 11-18 schools, which would effectively ... not necessarily a split sixth-form, it would just be three 11-18 schools. That was defeated, but I suspect it was defeated because it was going to be substantive and would have been the only option on the table.

What this amendment has attempted to do – and thank you to Deputy Brouard for seconding it – is to give more reasonable timelines. In the first paragraph of Proposition 2 we said 'before the end of March 2021', so that adds an extra three or four months to the requérants' ideal of coming back before the end of 2020, and it is reasonable. We have got an awful lot of work to do now as

a body politic. We have got an election coming up, we will have a new Assembly, there will be elections in the way and we are probably then going to break for summer. I do not think it is reasonable to have asked a new committee to come back by the end of 2020, so there is an extension there to 2021.

So, what are the four options? Quite clearly, for the comparison there has to be the one school on two sites plan, and that was actually mentioned in the original Proposition 2; and the one school, three colleges model encompassing the three 11-18 colleges as per the Brouard and Le Tocq Requête.

There is the three 11-16, including a separate sixth form centre. When I say a separate sixth form centre, that does not necessarily ... and I hope Members will read into this that the separate sixth form centre is distinct from one 11-18. A separate sixth form centre could go anywhere; it could be separate as in on a different site. We already know that a separate sixth form centre is likely to be more expensive. We already know that. That has been well understood and it would have to be staffed differently, but it might be the case that when either the current Committee along with the next Committee speaks with the primary stakeholder, which is the teachers, it may be determined that that is the best model for Guernsey's education going forward. It might, so it does not seem unreasonable to keep that in the frame.

And finally, I know this is the red line for the current Committee and even if they speak to it now, I am fairly sure they will vote it out later on, but it is the two 11-16 model and the 11-18 school, which let's face it, we know what it looks like. It looks like St Sampson's, it looks like Beaucamps and it is probably the current grammar school site. So, let's not beat about the bush. We are not going to redesign that. That is basically the three schools as they effectively are.

But without wanting to speak to that and start drawing out the postcode lottery in all those things, I do not think it is unreasonable for this to be kept in the frame, because it might be the case that from what we have heard over the last few days about postcode lotteries under a more non-selective system, there might be a different outcome. It might be the case that we find – and I think it is the case, actually, that the high school students who go into the sixth form at the moment generally go in with an average of around a C+. Those who come through from the 11-16, from the grammar school, go in with, I believe, a B. That is not surprising because they are already selected, but I personally do not think the difference between the B and the C+ is so much that issues resolving around a sixth form centre on the grammar school are so great that we need to spend an awful lot of capital elsewhere.

That, again, is my personal opinion. It may prove, when this Committee or the previous Committee engages with the teachers ... And this is the problem – there are no two ways about it, the teachers need to be involved in this. I have gone, personally, beyond guessing what the likely model is. We have got to be practical as well. And we know what the likely models are going to be. We are not going to reinvent them. We have not got acres and acres, or – sorry, Deputy Paint – vergées and vergées of spare real estate to start building schools all around the Island. We can only deal with the current sites that we have got.

So, that is where we are at the moment. It is, I believe, a practical response to some of the gaps in Proposition 2 of the Requête and it recognises what the likely schools might be.

I fully accept that option (d) with the current ESC Committee is unacceptable, but I ask Members to at least discuss this fairly quickly and come to some form of decision before we move to general debate.

Thank you.

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

Deputy Brouard: Yes, sir, and may I reserve my right? Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Fallaize.

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

I have to say I think Deputy Inder, in his opening speech, gave a very balanced account of the amendment and what he is trying to do, even if the financial information in his amendment is obviously for completely the wrong amendment, (*Interjection and laughter*) which under normal circumstances would have been a minor problem, probably, but we essentially have gone into committee here and so the normal rules of a parliamentary debate probably do not work very well.

I think what Deputy Inder is trying to do, obviously, is provide the Requête with some kind of structure. One of the questions which the Committee has been asking the signatories for some time is to try to set out what, in their opinion, the models would be which would require analysis if the Requête was successful, and we never felt that we had a satisfactory answer to that question. I think Deputy Inder is probably reflecting on that, trying to contain the review or at least make it more prescriptive about which models would have to be considered.

I have to say that almost all of my Committee's objections to the Requête apply equally to this amendment. In terms of the costs of review, or the costs of stopping the agreed reforms now and going into the kind of review set out in this amendment, clearly the costs are going to be very similar, or the range of possible costs is going to be very similar to those in the Requête – which, to remind Members, have been estimated by officers to be anything between £2½ million and £11½ million. There is not going to be any substantial difference in those costs with this amendment.

I think that the length of the uncertainty that would be created by any review would be similar. I accept that if the Requête is approved unamended it might be that there are five or six models to review, and if the amendment is passed in place of the Requête it might be that there are four models to review. But in substantial terms it is not going to make a great deal of difference to how long the review takes and for how long the uncertainty has to go on with the transition model that is currently in place having been ripped up and with our Committee or another Committee not having any idea what sort of transition model to put in its place.

We continue to believe that all of the information is available now to allow the States to make a decision about what the future structure of secondary and further education should be and that the request for information is being used as a Trojan Horse when the real problem is either indecision or lack of conviction, but providing more information on these models, or more information on any models, is not going to help Members reach a decision, because it is not an information problem.

Also, this continues the problem of displacement activity, where in response to genuine concerns from the profession, which are primarily around space standards and the operation of the school and the colleges, the States are being asked to get into a doubtless lengthy review of models. That is not going to address the concerns around space and the operation of the colleges.

So, compared to the Requête, because of it perhaps reducing slightly the number of models which would need to be reviewed, on a scale of 1 to 100, where 1 is perfect and 100 is terrible, the Requête is 100 and this is probably about 99½. I do not know whether that means that the States should support it to replace the Propositions in the Requête, but the Committee is not going to.

Another consideration I think which needs to be borne in mind by Members is I do not think this amendment – though I accept it probably has this intention, which is a good intention but it do not think it quite achieves it – really protects the concept or the timeline of the Guernsey Institute. On the face of it, it might, because it does not require the review of any models which explicitly engage the Guernsey Institute, but the problem is that (c), three 11-16 school models, including a separate sixth form centre, is just wholly unworkable. That is the advice. That is not politicised advice; that has been the conclusion of, I think, three successive committees which have had very different political views in relation to education, and multiple officers who have advised committees. If you have 400, 450, 500 students, you just do not have enough students to operate a separate sixth form. You have to attach it either to a school or to further education. And

so I think (c), this model of three 11-16 schools including a separate sixth form centre, would inevitably have to become an analysis of whether that sixth form centre should be attached in some way to this to a school or in some way to further education, and because the latter option would still be open I do not think the Guernsey Institute in its present concept could be allowed to develop.

I will give way to Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Deputy Fallaize – through you, sir – do you understand that just because there is an extended date to March 2021, which I thought might help, it does not necessarily mean that, if he is right and the three 11-16 school model including a separate sixth form does not pass first blush, then it is never included? You do not have to spend millions of pounds disproving something which we may already know does not work. If the unions, or rather if the teachers are uncomfortable with it – if Deputy Fallaize is right, and I will assume that he is – if we know that a sixth form centre cannot function with only 400 students effectively somewhere else on the Island, wherever it might be, then that just falls away and that would significantly reduce the ... And I cannot believe we have got two figures between £2½ million and £11 million, but it does not necessarily mean that this would go forward to the final process because a new committee – surely he would agree – could knock it out of the ball park within the first conversation.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of order, Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Could you please clarify, sir – if this new Proposition 2 is substituted in the Requête, would it be possible in the final vote to vote on 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) and 2(d) separately?

The Deputy Bailiff: I am not persuaded that that is a valid point of order because I am not sure who has broken any rule, but if it will assist, if Members were to invite me – if this Proposition were to be substituted for the current Proposition 2 – to put to you 2(a) and then (b), (c) and (d) separately, I would potentially be minded to do so.

Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

No, I do not accept Deputy Inder's explanation, because the amendment says to direct the Committee to prepare a report for the States 'that must include a comprehensive comparison of the structure and implementation of ...' and then lists all the models, so it cannot possibly be dismissed early.

It is not a matter of what the Committee thinks; it is not a matter, quite frankly, of what the teachers think. And incidentally, I do not think that the teachers are the primary stakeholder, I think the children are the primary stakeholder, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) though the views of teachers are clearly not unimportant. But the issue is it is what the States think of the models, because the reason that we are in this position at the moment is not because the Committee has been unable to decide which is the best model; it is because the States are so divided on the issue.

But Deputy Inder is laying an amendment which requires the Committee to include a comprehensive report on all of these models, so I do not think that any of those models can be discarded early in the way that he suggests, and for that reason I think at least until there was some direction following the report that is being requested in this amendment, I do not think any work could continue on the development of the Guernsey Institute, and I think that is a significant problem.

I also think there is some ... not misunderstanding, but a lack of appreciation that actually this is not just four different models, because there is also the issue of how you configure the sites, and that may not be a different model but it certainly is a different option. So, for example, three 11-16 school models could include La Mare de Carteret or it could exclude La Mare de Carteret,

but that is two different options
245 (A Member: Yes.) within the same model. Well, Deputy Gollop says it is flexible. Really, it just adds to the number of models and options that end up needing to be reviewed. One school on two sites – there are different ways of configuring that model. There is a large number of staff at the grammar school and sixth form centre who were resolutely supportive of two 11-18 colleges right up until the moment when the States decided that the two sites should be Beaucamps and St
250 Sampson's.

I will give way to Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Sir, would Deputy Fallaize agree that if the number of options was reduced to 2(a) and 2(b), there would be no debate about whether construction would take place at La
255 Mare de Carteret; and, further, that there would be no reason why work on the Institute should not go ahead because it would be unaffected by either 2(a) or 2(b)?

Deputy Fallaize: Yes, of course that is true. If a majority of the States want to go into a process where there is an agreement that the future structure should be based on one school operating in
260 11-18 colleges, either on two sites or three sites, then that is a much narrower review, and if that is the position of a majority of the Assembly then it might be possible to get to that place reasonably swiftly. And if Members want to indicate to the Committee that that is where the majority is coalescing around, then I think the Committee would have to reflect on that and consider allowing the States to get itself into that position by resolution.

265 But these two models that are set out at (c) and (d) are wholly unacceptable, I think certainly to the Committee ... No, I am not going to give way, sir, because my Committee criticises me for giving way too much (A Member: Hear, hear.) (*Laughter*) and says that things get prolonged as a result, or maybe it is talking too much.

270 **A Member:** One of those!

Deputy Fallaize: But the problem with (c) ... Look, a separate sixth form is not workable, okay. Do not take my word for it; that is the consistent advice of officers over many years. It is the consistent advice of at least three successive Committees. There is no point assessing a model
275 with a separate sixth form centre.

I also think there is a majority in the States for 11-18 colleges, if we tested it now I am sure it would be a majority. Also, (d), this absolutely absurd option of two 11-16 schools and one 11-18 school, I mean Deputy Inder is right, and I thank him for saying what he said in his opening speech, because the separate sixth form centre is not a red line for the Committee – other than
280 the advice is that it is not workable – it is not a red line in terms of principle. But I personally do not think, and I do not think any other Member of the Committee could even be involved in reviewing two 11-16 schools and one 11-18 school, because there is no way that anything that we came back with, or were involved in coming back with, would be seen as dispassionate because it is just a wholly egregious model. You will end up with an imbalance in the allocation of resources
285 between the schools, the choice and the opportunity available to students at one school will be greater than at other schools. You also will end up with ... Clearly if those people who are concerned – not the profession so much but the public – about the current reforms, essentially it is around school size, in my view, I do not think that it is overwhelmingly about anything else. That is why the Deputy Parkinson suggestion of two or three would be a response to that element of a
290 concern. Well, actually, under this two 11-16 and one 11-18 model there is going to be a school of 1,200 or 1,300 students at Les Varendes almost inevitably, so that just does not overcome that problem.

And finally, sir, I think Deputy Inder does not quite capture the problem which we, and many others, see with two 11-16 schools and one 11-18 school, the problem is not the sixth form;
295 Deputy Inder described the issue of children entering from the high schools to the sixth form and

their experience compared to those who go into the sixth form from the Grammar School, the problem is in the 11-16 phase. Obviously we know that a single sixth form attached to a school can work; it is working now, but the problem is at the 11-16 phase. And the experience of 11-16-year-olds in an 11-18 school would be materially different than the experience of 11-16-year-olds in an 11-16 school. So (c) and (d) certainly (A Member: No, no.) I do not think should go anywhere if the States is coalescing around (a) and (b).

Actually, I do not think that this amendment is the best way to do it because I think there are all sorts of structural problems with the way this amendment is set out. I think it could be done in a clearer form which would give clearer directions and clearer resolutions. But if Members want to indicate that that is the position that they are coalescing around, it may be possible to do it in a way which limits any delay and limits any disruption in terms of the transition model. If Members want to indicate that to the Committee then the Committee will consider it further, but please vote against this amendment.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy McSwiggan.

Deputy McSwiggan: Sir, this is probably not the wisest thing to confess to as a Member of the Committee for Health and Social Care, but I have always assumed that the biggest threat to our Bailiwick sovereignty would come from some form of health-related crisis. We know what those crises look like in other places; they are a toxic mixing pot of all manner of things going wrong, resulting in some form of tragic loss of life that in the immediate aftermath looks inexcusable. We would only need one or two of those things to happen – and it is there but for the grace of God – for our bigger neighbour across the water to say, ‘Is this tiny little island really fit to provide modern health services to its people anymore?’ That is what I have always feared would be the biggest threat to our sovereignty and to our independence. Last night, as I was walking home from the conclusion of our debate, I started to think well, no, maybe it is education.

You have heard me in the last few days of the debate saying I am fairly agnostic about the model of secondary education that we adopt, but that I am absolutely convinced that we must adopt one and must adopt it with the minimum of delay.

I was walking out of the debate trying to wear my agnostic hat, trying to say, well, look the States does these big disruptive things all the time and everything is all right in the end, and if it is not alright it is not the end. *(Laughter)* But the thing that I cannot get past, if we do not walk out of here with some kind of certainty, is the effect that this is going to have on recruitment. We put a lot of trust, and rightly so, in the teachers to provide our children with their education on a day-to-day basis. We trust that they will hang in there and do the best for the children who are in their care. But I think we heard enough in debate yesterday, and I think if we play it out honestly in our own heads, we must know that it is getting harder and harder to recruit teachers to a system which is in constant flux, about which the Government cannot make and stick to any decision. That has been the case for a period of time now; it has clearly got worse since the Requête has been in play. It will get much worse if we walk out of here without a clear resolution.

And without in any way suspending my trust or belief in teachers – those teachers have to be there for me to trust them, and my real fear is that this debate is going to leave us without that safety net of even having the right people in place to continue on a day-to-day basis the education that our children deserve, that is a real fear.

Sir, I did have the particular privilege of going to school in a bubble, in that I went to one of the private colleges, and so my education was at arm’s length from the decisions that this Government makes. And, perhaps it was because I was cosseted in that way that maybe I overestimate the importance of cossetting our children. But I do honestly think that it is vital that their education is kept at arm’s length from the damage that our debates can do. And I think we are failing at that and failing quite spectacularly.

I cannot wait for the arrival of devolved school governance because I think that will be a key factor in it, but I do not think that is the whole of the solution. I think this Government's courage and ability to hold steadfast to a set of decisions and see them through, regardless of how far any
350 of the schools are from us, so long as we still have any element of influence over them it is going to be absolutely critical. I am losing a lot of faith in that, to the extent that I am almost running a thought experiment of well, what does happen if we walk out of here without any decision and we are left with a recruitment crisis in our secondary education system? What are we going to do about that? Are we going to become a government that is not capable of delivering an
355 educational system? Are we going to find ourselves privatising all our schools? And I know that feels like a long way down the road ... I can see Deputy Ferbrache pulling a face, and I am not trying to insinuate that that is anyone's end goal, except perhaps for Deputy Trott, but I think that we need to play this out in the short and long term and see what might happen.

One of the only reasons why I am playing with that thought experiment is because then I ask
360 myself what would the secondary schools look like if they were privatised? And the reality is that they would look a lot like one of the options that we have on the table, they would look like two colleges or they would look like three colleges that are 11-18 schools, because those kind of institutions are capable of being fairly self-contained and fairly self-sustaining; they have the economies of scale and the breadth of curriculum that lets themselves continue as schools. That
365 ability to be self-contained and self-sustaining is one of those other buffers around students more than just the devolved governance. It is one of those other things that keeps them a little bit at arm's length because ... I am going to forget my A-level science now, but the more unstable a system is the more likely it is to fall apart at any point in time, and so the more stability we can build into it – and we can build a lot of stability into decent sized 11-18 schools – the less risk we
370 have going around this whole circuit again in the near future.

So stability has been my big thing throughout this debate. I have to explain why I did not support the motion to debate this amendment and why I now will not vote for this amendment, having said to Deputy Inder yesterday, yes, I think it is a great deal better than the Requête. Deputy Inder has a little bit of a problem (*Interjections and laughter*) because when he invited me
375 to join his SAC Committee he said, 'You have to trust in me, I have got a good side'. I do not know if it was quite those words, but that was basically the argument was – and his problem is that now I know that he has got one and this is a demonstration of it. This is trying to make something better out of the Requête than what we have on the table at the moment, and I give it full credit for that. It is the Requête as it could have been and as we could have had a sensible debate about
380 it.

But what it is not, sir, is good enough to give my baby away for. I use the expression 'my baby' because particularly every time one of the requérants – and it happened a couple of times in this week's debate – referred to, 'We do not need to worry because the States has done this before, it has made decisions and then had to remake them in the light of more evidence. I mean think
385 about the waste debate!' I have been put in mind of the story we know of as Solomon's baby, and the awful decision that two women who both claimed to be the mother of the child had to make, about who it would be allowed to live with, and when faced with the choice of, 'Cut that baby in half and you can have half each,' the mother said no, you take it.

I feel, sir, that I have done that twice already in the course of this debate. I did it once in
390 stepping in to support Deputy de Lisle's amendment and I did it again in voting for Deputy Le Tocq's amendment, because my baby, sir, is ensuring that there is stability for the children who are in the education system today and who are going to be in it in future. Actually, a step away from that is ensuring that we, as a government, are able to continue providing that education system to future generations of children. I do not imagine that we are going to end up with a
395 privatised education system. But I think there is a high risk we will end up with a severely discredited one for a couple of generations at least.

Sir, whatever the 18 Members who voted against yesterday's amendment were defending, whatever it is, it is precious enough to them to have wrestled that baby away from me. So those

are the stakes. And that is the bed this States has chosen to lie in. This amendment would make that bed more comfortable but not for my baby, my symbolic baby and the literal baby of many others here. It would only make it more comfortable for those who have said, 'Okay, we will step up to lead if the Requête succeeds.' Or take another analogy to Deputy Inder is offering a life raft to those who are soon going to be stepping up to deliver the undeliverable. It is a life raft but it does not repair the fundamental damage which in my eyes the Requête has already done.

But, sir, those are the waters that the requérants have chosen to swim in, and they have assured us that the tides are not going to drag our islands, our schools and our children down, so I say alright, sir, let them swim.

The Deputy Bailiff: Before I call anyone else, Deputy Meerveld, you have been sitting patiently for some time, is it your wish to be relevé?

Deputy Meerveld: Yes, sir, thank you very much.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Stephens.

Deputy Stephens: Thank you, sir.

I want to return to the subject of the children who are impacted by this current state of indecision in the Assembly.

And so picking up on some of the things that Deputy Fallaize and Deputy McSwiggan have said, I want to progress those thoughts a little further. Now, comparison between amendment 8 and the Requête demonstrates that, as predicted, timelines for the period of uncertainty caused because the States wish to revisit a decision on a preferred model are extending and now to 2021. Deputy Inder thinks that this date is more reasonable, well I do not and I have questions which have not yet been satisfactorily answered so far in the whole of this long debate, and I am thinking that maybe Deputy Inder or Deputy Brouard might wish to assist me now.

So returning to the transition arrangements: if amendment 8 is successful there will be an impact on transition models, and the advice I have is this; if amendment 8 is successful there will be no immediate impact on current Year 6 children in transfer to secondary education, in September 2021, the current Year 5s will be transferred in a double intake for both Beaucamps and the St Sampson sites and the students will be accommodated via a combination of improved management of school buildings, reworking of timetables and temporary classrooms. There will need to be a complete reworking of the transition arrangements for the current Year 4s and there is likely to be disruption to feeder school arrangements and sibling groups.

Added to this is the issue at the other end of school life, of the sixth form arrangement, which will be uncertain. Now, my colleagues on Policy & Resources have seen this impact arrangement, which is scenario two, and describes a three-to-five-year delay which will equal up to £11 million in additional costs.

So what mitigations in a period of extended delay would Deputy Inder and Brouard like to see? How will the concerns of parents of children with special educational needs and disabilities be satisfied if there is no movement in provision for them in this period of delay? How will the concerns of parents who want equity in the provision of options at GCSC across the schools be satisfied, if there is no change during this period of delay? And what should be done to improve La Mare de Carteret secondary school estate in this delay period?

Yesterday I received an email instructing me not to be bullied by members of Education, Sport & Culture. Now, that is a very interesting idea because I do not think I am a natural victim. But anyway, anyone who knows the seating plan of the Chamber might consider that that was a possibility. I have Deputy Fallaize to my immediate left, I have Deputy Graham to my immediate right, I have Deputy Dorey immediately in front of me. (*Interjection*) Should I wish to escape through the door in the centre of the Chamber, I have no doubt Deputy Tooley could probably intercept me; should I try to go to the rear exit then I am absolutely sure Deputy Roffey could be

there before me, but in reality in no sense am I being boxed in by ES&C. I am boxed in by the previous votes that I have given quite freely in this Assembly. And we are all boxed in by the majority votes that we have contributed to.

455 Now, just as I cannot step back and away from my seat in the Chamber because behind me is a granite exterior wall, I cannot step away from the previous votes I have made without absolute assurances on the management of any period of delay.

Those Members with ballot box anxiety maybe should think about the distress of the families of children in Years 3, 4, 5 and 6 when they realise that their certainty has gone, and the promises made by this Assembly have been broken.

460 I anticipate there will be a wall of protest every bit as solid as this granite wall behind me when those families realise that they do not have a plan for the transfer of their children from primary to secondary school. They do not have any immediate prospect of improved standards for their secondary school children or more option at GCSE, and children with special educational needs and disability will have nothing immediately new on offer, as the stretched budgets will remain as stretched as they are now.

465 So returning to my questions to the proposer and seconder of this amendment: if I can be reassured that mitigations can be devised to manage the interim period of delay and immediately after that then please can they describe them, not just for me, they need to do that for the families and children who have expectations that might not now be met in anything like the timeframes that they have been led to expect.

470 Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

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

I want to address this important subject of delay because clearly we do not want to leave the Island's children and their families in a state of uncertainty for any longer than absolutely necessary.

480 Now, as Members will have gathered from my interventions in earlier speeches, I will be strongly in favour of restricting the discussion to options 2(a) and 2(b), and I am against options 2(c) and 2(d), for all the reasons set out by Deputy Fallaize.

485 If the discussion is restricted to 2(a) and 2(b) education get to bank two important things: one is non-selective education and the other is education in 11-18 schools, and those then become certainties. Moreover, as I suggested in one of my interventions, work on the Guernsey Institute can proceed because it is unaffected whichever option is chosen for the secondary level, so quite a lot of the uncertainty goes away. And when you come to consider what work could be involved in doing a comparison between 2(a) and 2(b), 2(a) is fully worked up, there is no further work necessary, Education already know everything they need to know about option 2(a). It is option 2(b) which has never been explored and certainly would involve an amount of work, but because a solution within option 2(b) would fit the existing estate, indeed the amendment is quite prescriptive about the estate to be used, I think the total amount of renovation and reconstruction work that would be required to deliver option 2(b) would be significantly less than is required under option 2(a). That is not to say it is not a significant task to reorganise on that basis, because as I said in my speech last week, I think it has implications for the curriculum that is taught in the three schools if it is three sites, and also therefore for the process of transition from primary to secondary school, which I think has to cease to be a postcode issue.

495 Now, that is not a small task. It would be quite a difficult exercise to work through that to discover whether it is practical. But I still think that that work could be done in a matter of a few months. If the Education Committee believe strongly that that is not the case no doubt they will tell us.

500 But my view is that if we restrict this to option 2(a) or 2(b) the comparison that the amendment requires could be done, that whole exercise could be completed probably in three months. I do

not believe the cost would be anything like £11 million. It is essentially about reorganising the structure of education, not the physical infrastructure. There would obviously have to be some adaptation of the physical infrastructure, but nothing like on the same scale as is implicit in option 2(a).

Deputy Fallaize said that he found the wording of this amendment unsatisfactory, and I have been trying to hint to any Members of Education that will listen to me that I think they should bring their own amendment if the wording is not appropriate but if they agree with the objective, then come up with better wording and I would certainly be very supportive of that.

So I think this is a way forward, it is a compromise, of course. I know that the Members of the Education Committee are passionate about the two-school model. They genuinely believe that schools of 1,300 pupils will deliver better academic results than schools of 800 or 900. I totally respect that, but I really urge them to compromise because there is a grave danger, if they do not compromise on this they will lose some of the core values that they stand for. Clearly the other options, 2(c) and 2(d) will come back on the table and like them, I do not believe either of those options are worthy of consideration. And worse, if the uncertainty continues long past the general election, the whole issue of selection may come back on the table.

So please, Education, think again. Be prepared to flex on the numbers, it is only the difference between two and three schools, the fundamental principles are largely intact and please come up with an amendment of your own to deliver this outcome that can be effectively put in place, I think, in a matter of a few months, and then the States will be able to make an informed decision between the two options.

And I do trust the Education Committee – passionate as I know they are about the two-school model – to give us an honest appraisal of whether three 11-18 colleges can work.

Thank you, sir.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Graham.

Deputy Graham: Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

Whilst it is still fresh in my mind, and in response to Deputy Parkinson, I do assure Members of the States that actually it is not so much passion that I think drives the current Committee, although there is that behind it; it is really the sort of cool, calculated and objective analysis of what is the best way ahead. And once you latch onto that I suppose you do need an enthusiasm akin to passion to drive it through, particularly in the face of considerable opposition.

But it is not all about passion and that does not stand in the way really of any decision I think the Committee might make about a possible additional amendment, if we ever get round to having the time to discuss that.

There was a moment during debate yesterday which passed by almost unnoticed, and in fact I think it was almost missed as a slightly petulant exchange between two Deputies, but I think it was very significant because it was when Deputy Trott was making his speech and he said quite clearly there is no question now that P&R will take its delegated authority to consider the Committee's business case. It was a very clear statement, it will be returned to the Assembly for debate. Now, that inescapably means there is going to be a delay anyway, and it would be helpful if a Member of P&R, during the debate on this amendment, could make it clear whether Deputy Trott was speaking on behalf of P&R. Deputy Dorey asked Deputy Trott whether he was and I think Deputy Trott took the question in the wrong spirit, really, because I think it was a question designed to elicit whether this was actually the agreed policy or intention of P&R rather than of one or two Members of it. So I think whether or not P&R are going to do that rather changes the whole landscape for whether we are debating the Requête or amendments to the Requête and so on, so I think that is pretty fundamental. If that was in fact the intention of P&R we are talking about delay to the current transition programme.

555 Now, if that is so, for me the next two questions are how best to reduce the delay and how to
make best use of the delay. This is I think where the amendment before us now falls short because
it actually does not reduce by any substantial amount the length of the delay that the unamended
Requête would bring, in my view. I do not think it is best use of any delay to spend time and
money looking at options that most rational people would say are not worth looking at, and have
560 previously been looked at and rejected.

In that regard, we are talking first of all about 2(c), I do not think I need to repeat the
objections to that, and I cannot think of any circumstance in which the future of our secondary
and post-16 education will involve a separate, discreet, self-sustaining sixth form centre, I just do
not see it happening. It is not impossible, but I would not want personally to be a Member of a
565 Committee that spent time looking at it yet again.

And then we have 2(d), I wish there was a shorthand for this thing. We know what it is: it is the
thing that pretends it is not a cow, it is a horse with a co-located hump, but we know Now, not
only is that distinctly against all of the principles that I think most people have signed up to in
terms of equity of access to an educational experience, which I think it is, but crucially it does
570 open up, for entirely new reasons, the whole business of selection.

I argued for retention of selection nearly four years ago. Since then I have become a very
staunch convert to the merits of comprehensive education, if it is delivered in the right model, and
I have no doubt about that. I think there are still successful selective systems out there doing very
well, but I have seen some of the outstanding English comprehensive schools and they not only
575 hold a candle to, certainly what we have got here, but in many cases are right up there with the
world leaders. I am now wedded to that.

I have to say, even though I am wedded to it, 2(d) does open the prospect for me of changing
my mind because it would effectively mean a comprehensive grammar school, the access to which
would be by post code. I think that would be the most egregious outcome of them all. And rather
580 than have that, if that institution were there at the Les Varendes, with an 11-16 comprehensive
school in St Sampson's, an 11-16 comprehensive school at Les Beaucamps and at Les Varendes
was a pretend 11-16, but we all know it is an 11-18, I would say rather than have that and feed it
by postcode one ought to revert to feeding it by selection, by academic ability. Now, as long as
that remains an option I do not think, for example – and I am anticipating Deputy de Sausmarez's
585 amendment – I do not even know that I can guarantee her my support purely on that basis, for
ruling out the return of selection.

So I think both 2(c) and 2(d) are just unacceptable for me and I, frankly, could not really be a
member of the team that was seriously looking to spend money and time looking at them.

Deputy Stephens talked about the difficulties of recruitment of teachers. On a personal level, I
590 have got a personal contact with a National Teaching School in the United Kingdom that does
some terrific work, and I have to tell Members of the States ... one has to be very careful about
how to put this, the Guernsey traditional and current educational system at secondary level is not
held in high esteem elsewhere, and we need to accept that, and we are seeing that in the
difficulties of recruiting good teachers to teach in it. The enemy of recruitment is not only delay
595 but it is also the quality of the teaching environment that we have here.

I will give way.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir, to Deputy Graham for giving way.

I wonder if Deputy Graham might elaborate and provide more information about that
600 assertion regarding the education system in Guernsey. What evidence is that assertion based on?
Because that is extremely worrying to hear that.

Thank you.

Deputy Graham: Well, I have been Vice-President of the Committee for Education, Sport &
605 Culture for the last two years. I have not exactly been burying my head in the sand in that time. I
have consulted pretty wildly (*Interjection and laughter*) widely – perhaps even wildly! (*Laughter*) I

am not going to quote all my sources from the top of my head to Deputy Dudley-Owen, but I would not be making a statement like that in the Assembly if I was not very confident that it had quite a strong element of reality to it. If the Assembly wishes not to accept that statement then they are free to do so.

All I would say is we are experiencing severe difficulties in recruiting any teacher; let alone the very best teachers into some of our 11-16 schools. That is not their fault, it is not the fault of existing teachers there and it is certainly not the fault of the school leaders that we happen to have at the moment.

Last week in a debate I did mention that it would be a sad – and this again is from my contacts with the National Teaching Schools – I said that we would be in an adverse position if a whole tranche of gifted teachers in the United Kingdom, on whom our recruitment very much depends, were to look to this Island and say if I want to teach 11-18 the only schools I can do it in are the private colleges. When I said that I noted that Deputy Green looked at me slightly quizzically, I was not sure whether he was not agreeing with me or he was surprised to hear me saying that. And the problem certainly with 2(c) is very much along those lines, and 2(d) is only a partial solution to that.

But it is not, Members of the States, just a question of recruiting the best teachers, in my view. We keep saying the students are right at the top of the list of priorities, we need to watch the student numbers. Now, very interestingly, and some will say, 'Oh, it was coincidence', as the States' subsidy to the private colleges begins to diminish, it may have been a coincidence, but I do not think it was. Two years ago when it became clear to parents that the States were preparing to offer a fairly equivalent alternative to private secondary education in the form of two 11-18 schools, against Elizabeth College 11-18 and Ladies' College 11-18. It is interesting that at that point in time the recruitment level from all of our pupils, the percentage of those into the private colleges began to drop off. Now, it has been pretty consistently at 30% and even above in living memory. Suddenly when the States' first made a decision two years ago to go for two 11-18 schools, and with all the rationale that we were advancing behind it, the buyout rates of the colleges dropped from just over 30% to just over 27%, and they have maintained that for this year. The forecast for this September is that the buyout rate will be just over 27%.

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction, sir.

Deputy Graham: I will give way.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: I think the information the Deputy is providing may be misleading.

What you need to look at is the buyout rate after deducting the number of students who would have gone there under a grant. So has the buyout rate dropped or actually gone up? Because, of course, the 27%, they are all paying cash to buy out of the system, whereas the 30% represented a significant chunk of students were being paid for by the States. So, in fact, you could have had an increase in the number of parents paying from their own pocket to buy students out of the system at a 27% buyout rate, as opposed to the 30% with a significant number subsidised.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Graham to continue.

Deputy Graham: Well the buyout rate, of course, is a sort of shorthand for the phenomenon which reflects how many States pupils actually go into the private sector.

But interestingly, I need to pause and think here, but I believe the current Year 7s in the private colleges are there as part ... or are they the first non-selective cohort, they are already the non-

selective cohort. Well, all I would say is that whereas in the past 30% plus have been going to the private colleges now we seem to be almost in a pattern were it just over 27%. And, of course, this is reflected in the signs we have seen outside the two biggest colleges advertising that places are still there. That is probably why those colleges –

I will give way to my President.

Deputy Fallaize: I am grateful to Deputy Graham.

Is the more relevant point not that all of the planning that had been done by the previous Committee, and initially by the present Committee, had assumed that all of the special place holders would be replaced by fee payers, and indeed the college funding model that was put before the States by the previous Committee made that assumption, but that that has proved not to be the case, which is why the total percentage of students going into the colleges has fallen. And it is that which provides the indication that the haemorrhaging of confidence in the state sector as a result of the removal of selection has not happened as many of us predicted it would not happen.

Deputy Graham: Members of the States, you have just had a demonstration of why Deputy Fallaize is President of the Committee and I am only Vice-President – absolutely, yes.

But the point I was going to make is that if anybody is going to benefit from the confusion and uncertainty that has been generated, and certainly it would be exacerbated by further delay and unnecessary delay, it is the colleges. Now, I am sure they would be too well-mannered and polite really to make a sort of public show of their gleeful smiles. But it may be that Deputy Trott cannot keep the Cheshire cat grin off his face because I suspect he is probably pleased about anything that might aid recruitment to the private colleges – he is indicating he would like me to give way.

Deputy Trott: I have the opportunity to speak later but I am grateful nonetheless to Deputy Graham for giving way.

I certainly am not going to stand up here and talk about the private colleges in the knowledge that we all understand what a marvellous job they do, not only in educating nearly one third of our children but also, of course, in helping to reduce the cost of public finances in the Island.

What I will say is this; that the Committee has repeatedly told us that moving to 11-18 schools will significantly help recruitment. Yet we are in an environment where the overwhelming majority of those that are currently within that school are opposed, it would appear, to what we are moving to. So the issues are, I admit, possibly about recruitment, although that is a different argument to the one we have had heard earlier, but clearly there is a very clear and present danger around retention and retention is an important part of the equation.

So I am afraid I do refute the arguments made by ... well, not by Deputy Yerby who was being very balanced, as she often tries to be, but in terms of the Vice President of P&R ... Oh, I beg your pardon, Deputy McSwiggan, my sincere apologies, I still call my wife by her maiden name on occasions, and we have been married nearly 10 years, so I am sorry about that.

But the point is that we were very heavily sold as an Assembly that 11-18 was going to materially assist retention and recruitment. On retention the argument is clearly lost, on recruitment it appears far from a solid argument.

Deputy Graham: I do not accept that the argument on retention is lost because retention rates have not changed ever since it was announced that we were going to go to 11-18. What has changed is that certainly the uncertainty generated since last autumn, and now in recent weeks at its feverish height has certainly not helped.

I am going to park that one just for a while, and conclude by saying I think probably the most significant speech so far has been that of Deputy Parkinson, he is giving ... well, it is not even a hint, is it? It is an invitation. I cannot speak on behalf of the Committee, because we have not had time to discuss this, but certainly really the message from Deputy Parkinson, and I think around

the Assembly there were a number of sympathetic nods to indicate perhaps what the way forward might have to be.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brehaut.

Deputy Brehaut: Thank you, sir.

Can I speak to that sympathetic nod; I do not think King Solomon ever had to adjudicate over the ownership of a small appliance ... bear with me, but I am reminded of a 1970's quiz show, I am on Education's team and I want the caravan of one school over two sites, that is what I want, I am worried that I am going to end up with the toaster of a Requête, and I want to avoid that.

I think there may be an opportunity now to merge within the Assembly and to consolidate some support around that, so that Education walk away with something at the risk of losing ... Do you accept something you really do not ideally want or do you hold out for the things you really want and do not get it? That really does concern me, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir.

I think Deputy Brehaut summed it up pretty well there. I think that we have got a situation now where Education are either playing chicken or brinkmanship to ensure that they get their model through.

Deputy Parkinson is absolutely right; one of the ideas of the amendment that was put in place and having the four options was that we hoped that the Deputy Bailiff would be minded to allow votes on the individual propositions to narrow down the focus. And I think that, to some extent, brings me in line with Deputy Stephens with regard to the timetable to look at the various options. Although there is a timetable put in to the amendment of March 2021 that is the backstop, if Education wish to come in earlier than we are very supportive of that.

I think I also feel a little bit bullied as well that we have to accept the model that is on the table that Education are driving through of one school, two sites, because students already now know which schools they are going to go to. Of course, if that model changed and it became three schools the transition elements would have to change as well. But the teachers are obviously just as cognisant of that as we are and as parents are.

I think finding something that the Island can coalesce around is a better prize than doing some short-term fix just because we have got it written down on paper. I would rather go for something, perhaps a little bit longer, perhaps a little bit more painful, but if it gets us to a better place for the long-term education of our children and better overall results and a better fix for the Island, that is a prize worth fighting for. But, of course, it is going to be a compromise.

I would just first of all just thank the States for allowing the amendment to be put into play. I appreciate again it is that thing if we can kill it straight off by not even having it debated I would appreciate the thoughts of Deputy Dorey. It is a little bit like trying to kill some sort of vampire: I think that the States put a bit of a stake through its heart yesterday when we narrowly defeated the amendment from Education to replace all the propositions of the Requête. Now we have to go around and sprinkle the body with holy water and then on top of that put a ring of garlic around it because it will still keep coming back. And my fear is that if we walk away from this States with the one school, two sites still intact it will be a dead school walking because it will then come back again and again and again.

Also you then have the problem that if P&R are minded to bring the business case back to the States, you will have the business case back in the States but without anything to compare it with. So you will be starting again from a blank sheet of paper when the business case comes back to the States you will be faced with a *fait accompli*, either you approve it, in which case the one school, two sites continues or we stay as we are with the four schools chugging along.

So the nemesis, I think, of the one school, two site, model and its closest rival is the three site option, and I think from the point of view of the Education Committee they do not want to have that stand-off between the two of them because I think they know which side will win.

765 And, of course, we do have, to be fair, some very able politicians on Education and they will use every available method to ensure that preferred model succeeds, and quite rightly so. We are in politics here, that is why we signed up that is why we stood for election.

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction, sir.

770

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, Deputy Brouard really ought to refer to it as the States' agreed model. The Committee is under a direction from the States (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) to introduce two 11-18 colleges. If the Committee just threw up its arms and said, 'No, actually we don't fancy doing that anymore', we would be in breach of the direction that the States have provided to the Committee.

775

And I have also just got up to say that if the States is coalescing around a narrower review restricted to 11-18 colleges then if Members advise the Committee we are prepared to reflect on that. So I do think sir, what Deputy Brouard has just said is very incorrect.

780

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Brouard to continue.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you.

785

If Education are minded to narrow down the review I think that would be very helpful and if they can indicate that during this debate I would be happy to do so, I think that would be a very positive move forward because I do not think we can continue with the single proposition of one school on two sites.

I also want to apologise to the requérants that they have done what they should do and there are is me and Deputy Inder marching on top of their parade with amending their Proposition 2. My apologies for that, I just think our offering to them, and I hope they take it in the spirit in which it was given, just gives that clarity of what Proposition 2 looks like. I was struggling a little bit of how far they would go.

790

Also for me, and I think it picks up what Deputy Parkinson said and what the Deputy Le Tocq said the other day, is that at the moment the Requête would not allow a visitation or a looking at the one school, three sites 11-18 because it has not been debated before and therefore it could not be reviewed. So this makes sure that the La Tocq, Brouard amendment from yesterday can still be looked at if the Requête succeeds.

795

As I said earlier, the Committee, and rightly so, will continue to push for their one school, two sites model until something else is put in their way. And I think the best option for us as the States is to offer a comparison. Whether that is going to be the four items in in the Brouard Requête amendment or whether it is going to be narrowed down, I think my preference would be for it to be narrowed down and a sooner review.

800

Thank you, sir. That is all I have to say at this time.

805

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

Deputy Gollop: Thank you, sir.

I think we have had heard some interesting speeches this morning from Deputy Graham, Deputy McSwiggan and so on.

810

This amendment I think is a life raft, I always want to jump onto a lifeboat and cling to the wreckage rather than drown completely. I think some of us longer-term States' Members here are aware of the importance of survival and working within the system.

I think we heard a lot of interesting insights yesterday and this morning, Deputy Graham reminded us of one of them: The revelation that maybe Policy & Resources by a majority will choose – I mean, we know they have all got different views from what we have heard in votes – to have a business case debated in the Chamber. Now, will we get through to that point? I will give way to Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I am grateful for Deputy Gollop giving way because I think it is appropriate to intervene at this stage to explain the position of Policy & Resources.

Doubly Trott, when he was speaking yesterday, was clearly giving his personal opinion but a personal political assessment of where he thinks Policy & Resources, either in its current form or as constituted after the election, is likely to get to with the full business case. That decision has not yet been made by Policy & Resources, simply because we have not yet been asked to make that decision. The full business case has not been presented to us so we have not made any objective or impartial assessment of whether we can or cannot use our delegated authority. Deputy Trott was offering his view.

I have said on a number of occasions in this Assembly, and publicly in the last few weeks, that the full business case is more than just the case around the building, it is around the delivery of the policy and that does require the Education Committee to demonstrate that it can discharge the policy and inevitably the concerns which have been expressed by teachers will need to be covered off in that business case. Deputy Trott has plenty of experience; he was offering his opinion on where that decision may go. But I can be quite clear that the Policy & Resources Committee has not had a discussion, it has not reached a conclusion on that but I think the environment is clear, and that is why we have been sat here for however many days it is now.

Deputy Gollop: I thank Deputy St Pier for that, I think, very useful intervention.

But it raises the point that I cannot and nor should I guess as to which way the majority of Policy & Resources would go on that, should a request be made. And, of course, Deputy St Pier rightly points out in this instance, because I never particularly like the term ‘business case’, it embraces a much wider range of questions such as policy implementation maybe, the delivery of the overall strategy and its acceptance by key stakeholders.

But more than that, he has raised the obvious point that I was just about to make before, he explained in greater depth that it is amazing and discouraging in a way, but we have only got about eight or nine weeks of this Assembly left, meeting as we do in this present form, probably. And there will not be time for Policy & Resources, I strongly suspect, to receive this business case and consider it on its merits with all the depth and complexity that would require and bring it back. So Deputy St Pier hinted it might be the next Policy & Resources Committee.

That means that we have the ordeal of the election and Deputy Stephens, I think, made a great point this morning that we should not assume that just because people are wearing a green ribbon that they will have an electoral advantage. It could be completely the opposite because of the disruption and the sense of things not going anywhere. But it will be a change and it is inevitably a delay; that is the first point.

We also heard Deputy Trott say, perhaps as an individual, but a very experienced individual in political building and political finance, that he was unlikely – and I think Deputy Le Tocq echoed this – to request in any hurry spatial increases, bearing in mind the process and the consultancy work that has occurred.

So that very key point which Education made very clear yesterday, and is part of the Requête’s thinking as well, to be fair, that space is an issue that the stakeholders, especially the teachers, and to a degree perhaps people interested in good planning and special needs have made, might not easily be accommodated without a change of thinking of P&R and some policy work in this Chamber. That is another reason for pause and review, pause and reflect.

Now, this amendment, I know it might have taken a month to prepare, but it does give us the structure to move forward, and I know Deputy Parkinson would like to amend the amendment or vote on the propositions should it become included differently.

You may recall on Friday I did something I do not usually do, but people probably do not listen too much anyway: I spoke against one of the amendments and voted in favour of it. *(Laughter)* Now, did I make a mistake? Did I betray the requérants yesterday or is it par for the course? Or was I getting confused at the end of the day? No. I heard some of the speeches that were made by Deputy Hansmann Rouxel and Deputy McSwiggan and thought that, bearing in mind I am not die-in-the-ditch two-school, or three-school, or whatever model, and I do not particularly want nothing to happen or a complete breakdown. I do not necessarily share the opinion we have heard from Education, Sport & Culture Members, very eloquently, and indeed from a letter we had from an educationalist that a sixth-form college is a non-starter in Guernsey because sixth-form colleges in the private sector that are small can work. *(Interjection)* In London, I mentioned two, for example, I mentioned Ashbourne College in Kensington and one in Westminster, and so on. But I accept that a municipal sixth-form college is not an obvious winner for Guernsey, and I accept that reopening the debate about the Guernsey Institute is not ideal. Some of us may have reservations about that but it was perhaps the Achilles' heel of the former Education, Sport & Culture package.

Deputy McSwiggan said we give so much away and there is a point when you feel that you cannot give any more compromising. Well, I thought the same thoughts last night, but perhaps on a slightly different basis. When you think about where we have come, and where I have come to a degree as a Member, we had a situation we inherited after 15 years of not delivering the Torode amendment in full, not rebuilding the Mare de Carteret school and finding it economically from a building point of view not particularly viable, and it went through one ordeal after another. We got to the point, back in the day, of supporting by a majority – I was a dissenter – the four-school model of the then Sillars committee which got amended to look at pre-schools. Then we came back and we had a selection debate, and then after a while and a fake sort of vote-of-no-confidence debate, Education, Sport & Culture, the then Committee, came back with a model that was rejected and a new model adopted.

Think of the position, Members who wanted to keep selection and the scholarships accepted that and this Requête is not about restoring selection. Members also, as you can see from the Requête, from the spokespeople for the Requête, do not want to see the Guernsey Institute debate reopened, or some kind of tertiary college created. We have moved away from that, we have moved away from a sixth-form college, and I think most of us, who would be a little bit reluctant if there was a bus in this direction, have moved away from rebuilding the Mare de Carteret school, despite the promises we made, because of the potential cost and environmental difficulty and dislocation of doing that.

So we really come down to supporting continuing to look at, with a degree of reluctance, the one school on two sites plan, which I personally would accept has its advantages in terms of curriculum delivery but other disadvantages. We have also come down to (b) a one-school, three-college model encompassing three 11-18 colleges, which will be federated as one school, which are based at the modern site, the two rebuilt sites at Les Varendes which dates from the 1980s; and also (c) is still included here, but is perhaps one we could move on; and (d) two 11-16 school models and one 11-18 school.

We know that model is completely unacceptable to many Members of the Chamber, including all of Education, Sport & Culture and Deputy Parkinson, and we have heard the arguments about a postcode lottery. I happen to believe, sadly, that there is an element in the two school model as well that exaggerates itself if you have two 11-16 schools and one arguably unequal 11-18 school. I personally think we could live with difference and inequality but that is not the view of other Members.

We had an interesting letter from somebody who has a leadership role in education who definitely, like Deputy Roffey, Deputy Graham and Deputy Fallaize rejected the sixth-form

standalone college model but would in the interests of community cohesion, and focusing more on learning outcomes based upon strengthening delivery in the classroom and resources and curriculum. He suggested that he could live, perhaps reluctantly, with one 11-18 school and two 11-16 schools on the basis that there was a federation, and a 16-18 that embraced the young people from all three schools. But I admit that that is not ideal.

I think we should give the Inder amendment a chance because in the real world we had other revelations yesterday as well. There was a point made by Deputy Fallaize that some teachers were very supportive of the two-school model but were a bit reluctant to speak out; and I thought, who was pressurising them not to speak out? That was one issue.

Another issue came up this morning about the private schools, the independent schools, which are still part of our States system in some respects, one or two have States Members on their boards, they still have scholars passing through and they still receive States finance, but when you look at them they defy the logic of the educationalists in the UK. I will give two examples – I do not know enough about Ladies' College, even though I was a little child there, but of course they have had a significant amount of rebuilding.

But Blanchelande College is mixed ability, semi-religious, it is small, it had a sixth form in the past, it wants to have a sixth form in the future, but it has very commendable GCSE results despite its suboptimal size. And I will mention Elizabeth College. Elizabeth College has made two amazing decisions in the last year for good or for bad, hopefully for good. The first is the decision by the board, on which Deputy Trott is a very passionate and diligent member, to go co-educational after four and a half or five centuries of being more or less a single sex school, despite its name Elizabeth College. The second change they have made, which is more relevant to this debate, is that they have acquired, and they got planning permission, a large formerly finance sector building adjacent to the Regency Complex, and yet they have put out a message that they do not intend to increase their size any time soon.

Deputy Merrett: I thank Deputy Gollop for giving way.

Is there not a third one though, sir, the fact that Elizabeth College are openly lobbying and gathering money and funds to give scholarships and bursaries on a means-tested basis? I would say that is actually a third point in Deputy Gollop's – which, to date, in his speech he has not actually mentioned yet.

Deputy Gollop: I thank Deputy Merrett because I had a dialogue with somebody at Elizabeth College a few months ago on that point and they indicated, it was more than a year ago actually, but they needed quite a substantial treasure chest to achieve that objective, I am sure they are making progress towards it. But I do not see necessarily it goes against educational models in Guernsey if some pupils from especially disadvantaged backgrounds had the opportunity to be more socially mobile.

But let me move on from that, because the point I was getting to was not related to that, it was about the expansion of the campus. As we heard yesterday, rightly so, that some of the older schools in Guernsey had very restricted territories. Deputy Le Clerc, or somebody, mentioned the old Girls' Grammar School. I happened to live in the Girls' Grammar School, and I know I had my problems, but they are not educational, but I am just making that point.

But my argument offers a slight critique of Deputy Trott and maybe other Members of the States in that as I think Elizabeth College are probably doing the right thing in expanding to a new, larger technological site adjacent to the old building but, according to press reports, retaining the same number of pupils, which is I think 500 or so in the 11-16 part. That indicates that a good school sometimes sees the need to expand their space to improve the quality of learning outcomes, the curriculum, the activities, even if the pupil numbers remain the same. So I think there is a need to consider space, separately.

But Deputy McSwiggan was right too. She had, I hope, an outstanding education at Ladies' College, but she said she was in Portakabins for much of that time, so we should not get carried

away with the sites. Somebody said earlier, Deputy Fallaize I think, that there are too many models in the Inder amendment and he then drew out the, not anomaly, but the nice point that if you
970 look at 2(c) of the Deputy Inder, Deputy Brouard amendment you see three 11-16 school models, including a separate sixth form centre. Now that could read La Mare de Carteret or some other site comes back into the equation.

But that is the whole point of this, we are not just focused on the model, we are focused on sites as well, holistically, to ensure that the sites meet planning criteria and meet environmental
975 standards. So I approve of the flexibility of this amendment and I hope it goes through because I think is nearer the spirit of the Requête and it retains the best parts of the Requête in that it still allows a temporary pause rather than a delay. But it enables the States and the community when we have the inevitability now of knowing, given the open planning meeting and the Policy & Resources viewpoint that Deputy St Pier has not been considered yet on how they will proceed
980 with the business plan.

We are going to have a kind of delay, so why not integrate the sensible models, because we all know really there are only four models out there – and some of us would argue passionately against some of them. But it is (a), (b), (c) and (d), they are all on this model, and we probably can vote for them separately if they become substantial propositions – they could use a Rule so that
985 they will be able to do that. So it makes every sense to get on with this debate and put this amendment into the record and support it now.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

First of all I have to say I take slight exception to Deputy Brouard saying that ESC were trying to *push* through their model of two 11-16 schools. It had been pushed through and passed by the States before, to my own surprise, I allowed myself to be persuaded to actually join the Committee of ESC. So it is not the model of the Education, Sport & Culture Committee, it is the
995 model of this Assembly, and we are quite rightly trying to enact the will of this Assembly.

That said, sir, over the last – is it a week now that we have been at this? Yes, we started last Wednesday and it is Tuesday, okay it has not all been Education, but most of it is. At times I have really lost the will to govern. Even as a passionate supporter of our consensus non-executive system, I have thought to myself, are we proving that it cannot work?

In my long time in politics, nearly 40 years now in and out, there have been a few other occasions when I have thought that and then actually out of the ether things sometimes congeal or sometimes come forward, and actually a way forward emerges that most people can actually sign up to. The question is: is this amendment from Deputy Inder the catalyst for that?

I do not think it gets there, unfortunately, and I have two reasons for saying that: the first is in the word 'comprehensive' that is still there in the preamble of Proposition 2; because Deputy
1005 Stephens is quite right, if this is about delay, if this is about cost, if this is about uncertainty – it is about the impact on children in the system of lengthy delay.

Comprehensive, I do not know what it is meant to mean but I know that when we came forward in September with, as Deputy Ferbrache quite rightly side, an enormous amount of information on the two-school model, we know that some supporters of the Requête – not only the signatories but others – have said that was 'light on information'. So if their definition of comprehensive is that and beyond, then however much we limit the number of models we have to look at, we are talking about putting the whole programme back for years; and the damage of sticking that ratchet into the machine and bringing it to a grinding halt will be very considerable
1010 indeed.

If it had said something like, I do not know, you could say, 'Must include an educational and financial comparison of the structure and implementation of ...', I think that is something that would speed up. It would still bring delay, but it would speed up the delay quite considerably, because we would not be driven by the thought that actually ... I do not have Deputy Graham's

1020 knowledge of exactly how many pages that policy letter was and exactly how many pages the programme business case was, but it would actually send a signal that what this States was looking for was actually a normal report, a normal policy letter, that says, 'This model has this educational advantages and disadvantages; and financial advantages and disadvantages; and we are comparing it with this model which is a bit cheaper but worse educationally,' or whatever.

1025 To be honest, the last thing I want is any delay – I have got a grandson in Year 7 and the last thing I want is any delay. But if the only way we can go forward with some sort of semi-unity in this Assembly is a delay that can be limited to one year, and reworking of the transition model, I will hugely regret that. I think we will be letting down a lot of people, but I think at least that salvages something from this shipwreck rather than actually us walking away with all the pieces on the ground and saying, 'Where do we go from here?' So that 'comprehensive' word I think ideally I would like to see removed.

1030 But also it is these models that we are being asked to look at. Deputy Inder is not in the Chamber but earlier on in an intervention in Deputy Fallaize's speech he said, 'Well, if none of them are going to make the mustard we are not going to go along with them; don't actually spend all your time and money working into detail.' Well, okay, let's do that now, because we can see they do not make the mustard, they really do not.

1035 I think we need to explore exactly what option (d) would actually mean. It is not just about a postcode lottery, and it is not just that 11-18s are better in some ways than 11-16s, and therefore why should people in some feeder schools get it? The 11-18 schools get more money. Now, you can say they no longer do that but everywhere in the UK and elsewhere they do, through a formula; because to deliver A-levels you need a certain amount of teachers, a certain amount of resources, class sizes are smaller there, and it is well-established that it is not just the 16-18 part of the school that benefits from that extra money, there is a trickle down to the rest of the school which gives them a financial advantage over 11-16 schools. It is a formula used everywhere.

1040 Teachers in Guernsey at the 11-16 schools have been complaining for years that they are disadvantaged compared to the 11-18 model, in the one 11-18 school we had, because the funding for the A-levels benefits the rest of the school as well. But it is not just that, you want a broad range of A-levels so you have got the teachers there to deliver those A-levels, and that means at that school you will have a broad range of GCSE options because the specialist teachers are there and they teach across all sections.

1045 Now, you can say, 'Okay, well, those are off in the 11-16 schools when they come in at A-level, they will have all of these choices' – but it will not be open to them! If they have not been able to do it at GCSE they are not so brilliant that they can suddenly bypass and say, 'Oh, I have not studied Spanish up to now but I will start it at 16 and do A-level'. It just does not work that way.

1050 I give way to Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

That is not always right. I know there are children that do certain GCSEs and not all of them have to do the same A-levels as the GCSEs they have taken. They can decide to do different ones.

1060 **Deputy Roffey:** It is extremely hard to start doing a subject that you have not been offered at GCSE, starting a A-level course when you have not got the foundation. It is really, really difficult indeed. It really is unrealistic.

Then we go up to 2(c).

1065 We know – don't we? – all of us know in our heart of hearts that not just financially but educationally and in every other way, successive Education Committees, in whatever name, back from the Education Council in the days of Martin Ozanne – sorry, I can call him Martin Ozanne now, but I do believe he was Deputy Ozanne then – through to today, have looked at whether or not a sixth-form standalone college will work and everyone has concluded it does not.

1070 Now, Deputy Gollop says there are some in London. Yes, there were a number in England and they do one of two things: either they are specialists and they deal with a small range of subjects –

and of course it will work on that basis – but then that is because there are other specialist ones dealing with other subjects. Yes, in London you can do that but in Guernsey how many sixth-form colleges would we want in order to cover the range of subjects? Or they rely on part-time teachers, and actually some of them work quite successfully on part-time teachers. But imagine trying to recruit to Guernsey on the basis of part-time contracts. It would be absolutely nonsensical.

So we have here four options that we are being asked to go and study comprehensively, in depth, it would take a long time and cost a lot of money when most of us, I believe – I know some believe in these options – but most of us in this Assembly know that two of them are complete non-starters. That is not good government.

Now, let's come to (b), the three 11-18 schools. This amendment in that respect has the advantage over the Le Tocq amendment that it is not asking us to decide on the floor of the Assembly just to go for it, but to compare it with the approved model. That is something that – whether I stay on ESC or not is really not important, but I have to say I could not credibly be charged with looking at option (c) and (d) because everybody knows that I am just missing them out. It is a bit like a member of the Planning Authority saying, 'No, no way, I am totally that sort of thing. This is awful, I don't like glass buildings, but okay, give me a glass building to look at and I will consider whether to pass it'.

I do not like glass building either, by the way, but that has got nothing to do with this debate.

Sir, I could not credibly – and I do not think most of my colleagues could credibly look at (c) and (d) because you know what we are going to come back with. You know we are going to come back and say, 'Absolutely no way, José'.

I could do an open-minded comparison between two 11-18 colleges and three 11-18 colleges. Now, I know in my mind that three would be more expensive to operate; I know that the A-level offer would be difficult to be as broad and would need quite a lot of collaboration with teachers moving around between them. The core subjects could be done in all of them, like they are in the private colleges, but with the specialist subjects it would be hard to maintain the same range.

I know that 11-16 would be more constrained for educational options because we are talking in the long-term that the projection for the numbers of children in Guernsey is going down. It is not, as Deputy Tooley hinted some days ago during this debate, because of the population is going down, it is because of the changing demographics. For the same population there are going to be fewer children and more oldies.

This Assembly goes against the trend. We are not a representative Assembly. There are quite a lot of fertile people in this Assembly but out there Guernsey's fertility rate is really low! Therefore the projections are for fewer children; and the projection for secondary school pupils in the state sector, and that is having to make an estimate on how many just choose to go to the private colleges, is in the medium term that it is going to go down to about 2,300.

So, three schools will be under 800 in size. Can that work? Of course it can work; of course it could work. Of course there are successful – let's say 800 to be fair, because it is close to that. There are schools that work like that, and they are very successful elsewhere, but it is definitely suboptimal educationally, and it is definitely suboptimal financially. I am amazed about how – as was said the other day – how finances suddenly go out the window when people get a bee in their bonnet over something, when people like me get lectured about stop being tax-and-spend. You may be on Education or you may be on Health, but you have still got to actually find your efficiency savings. But suddenly when you try and do that, you find actually you say 'This is a more efficient way of doing it'. So suddenly all of that becomes utterly irrelevant. And then we will be castigated when the cost of education goes up, won't we?

But, philosophically, I have no problem with the idea of three 11-18 schools. I do not think they are the optimum financially and I do not think they are optimum educationally, but I do accept, logical or not, there seems to be a desire in Guernsey not to have the medium-sized school – among some people, I am not sure it is a majority but there is a strong feeling amongst some that they want smaller schools rather than medium-sized schools.

I do not think that is logical. I do not understand what is wrong with medium-sized schools. I think they provide better outcomes but I am basically saying I would prefer to carry on with what we are doing. I would prefer to have no delay. I would prefer to deliver what I regard as the optimum system. But if the States will not back us in that, if they are determined not to stick by their own resolutions of the past, as Deputy Stephens has said, then for goodness' sake do it in a way that minimises the choices and minimises the delays.

This amendment moves towards that but it falls well short of it. The States could pass it and then vote against (c) and (d) – I still do not like the word 'comprehensive' in there because I think we will be up for all sorts of delay when we work through all the detail that is expected. So I think if that is Deputy Parkinson wants to go, then he ought to laid his own amendment actually saying: 'Reduce it to these two options' – and do it in a way that we can minimise the delay to one year. You cannot go less than one year, basically, because a building project needs to start in September.

It the tenders are being delivered today, you might just about get a huge amount of work and expense with them, on the basis of two decisions from this Assembly. So it is not speculative, it is not, 'Oh, I wonder if that's what the States want'. You just about *might* be able to get tenderers, subject to inflation, to be able to hold their estimates for a year. If you are talking about going into a two or three-year delay, which is really what the Requête or this amendment in its present form does, then I think all bets are off. We would have to compensate those people, probably, in all equity for what they have done, because losing a bid commercially is one thing but losing a bid when the States are just absolutely cannot stick to their previous decision and change their mind is quite another.

So, sir, I really do not know what to do. I really think that the best option is to do what we have decided twice to do. But if this Assembly cannot live for that and if they are looking for something to emerge out of this amazing consensus system we have, then I believe it should be just those two options and we should minimise delay and make sure it is no more than a year. But, be warned, that will not mean the teaching profession are suddenly happy, particularly those that teach A-level at the Varendes site where we might see that a three-school model, 11-18, is worse than a two-school model, because they have an *esprit de corps*, and they are together as one sixth form because it has grown up that way, and change is change, and splitting it in three ways is more change than splitting it in two ways. That does not mean it cannot work, but they will not like it.

So there is no easy answer here but this amendment, I think I have to vote against. I hope that something reflecting it emerges, something that will give more limited choices and that will cut out the non-starters so we are not wasting work on things we know do not work. Something that minimises the delay and if that happens I might have to vote for it. It will be holding my nose and doing it because I know that the best thing for the Island is to press on with what we have already decided. But sometimes there needs to be a healing, sometimes there needs to be a coming together and sometimes for a consensus to work you have to actually bury your first choice and go for your second choice.

So I look forward to seeing what emerges.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

I want to speak in favour of the three-school model. The three 11-16 secondary schools with a separate sixth form centre. Sir, the very model that I put forward at the beginning of this debate and I have to say that of course that received the same level of support that 2(b) did, that is 2(c), and also it received greater support than 2(d). So 2(c), the three-school model, the three 11-16 secondary schools with a separate sixth form centre is very much one that needs to be on the table and compared with others.

1175 I must say right at the beginning that that model 3(c) is a workable model. In fact the practicality of it and the viability of it of the three 11-16 schools and a separate sixth form centre has been proven by the Department. The Education Committee spent almost two years actually working on the numbers and working with that particular option as a result of looking at six and coming down to that particular one.

1180 So this selection and looking at options has already taken place within the Education Department, and this particular one is one of those that was looked at and has received – I am not giving way – a considerable amount of time and effort by the staff in the Education Department, this term.

1185 So the value of that particular model, the three-school model, is that secondary education does not resolve around the sixth form, and that is the weakness with some of these other models. The three-school model resolves around 11-16 secondary education. It resolves around secondary education, not post-secondary education, but secondary education and also provides for post-16 education after that, which is quite different actually from the other models. What you have in fact is the three secondary schools, 11-16, and all the youngsters at 16 make their decisions as to where they are going from that point – are they going out to work, are they going to follow A-levels and the IB system, or are they going into technical education and following the courses that are provided through the Guernsey Institute? So they make that choice at that point.

1195 The difference between the comprehensive system that was formulated in the 1950's and 1960's in London, in England, had everything under one roof essentially for the students as they progressed through the school system. Here, we are already isolating out the Guernsey Institute, in other words for the vocational, for the technical professional education. So it makes sense then to isolate out also the sixth form centre. The sixth form centre is viable with teachers that can be based solely there within the sixth form centre, and drawing from the secondary schools some teachers to teach within the sixth form centre also, should they wish to have that opportunity.

1200 So my point is very sincerely to let secondary education resolve around secondary education, not Sixth Form work, but resolve around secondary. I know we have tagged on the post-secondary education to this but the fact is we are really dealing with secondary education and I think that is where we should concentrate, and that is where the three-school model is extremely valuable and provides a total comprehensive, inclusive system for our youngsters.

1205 So, in summary, I think all the models – I would not in any way take away from any of the other models that are here and written down – (a), (b), (c), (d). All the models need to be compared and looked at critically; and of course for two of the models, for (a) and (c), we have a lot more information already on file, the Department has all that information, and so a lot of the work has already been done. For two of the others this work has yet to be done. That can be done fairly quickly in order to provide some sort of comprehensive look at each of these in order to come back to the States with preferred options, or a preferred option, for further debate.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

1215

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

I have to admit I really do feel like I am in Groundhog Day. I know people have to use repetitions on speeches within a speech, and we have certainly almost heard identical speeches over the last couple of days and quite frankly it is getting embarrassing.

1220 I am going to speak to this amendment. Now, I am a bit confused because if Deputy Inder or Deputy Brouard had felt strongly about investigating two other models, I do not understand why they did not bring this amendment two years ago and why it has only been submitted now. Because that could have saved our community millions of pounds and also working down a route of education that I thought this Assembly had already determined.

1225 So the questions I have for the promoter and the seconder, or even for the requérants, or even for the ESC, because I do not even know who to direct my questions to although I do obviously

know, sir, that the proposer and the seconder should be trying to answer my questions because it is, after all, their amendment. But the date on this Proposition 2 is March 2021. Has the existing Department of Education, Sport and Culture agreed that deadline? Is that an achievable deadline?

1230 I do not know. If they do not believe it is, do the requérants think it is, because the requérants have a different timeline that they wanted in the Requête.

I mean, Deputy Parkinson said it would only take three months, but then this is a year. I really am a bit confused about where are we are plucking these timelines from and if anybody is actually saying they can achieve them. So if the EFC say, for example, sir, we cannot achieve March 2021,

1235 but the requérants say, 'We do, and we will go into the Committee and we will get this in for March 2021'. I do not know. I am a bit confused by these timelines.

The Deputies did say when they opened, that it is a more reasonable timeline, but I would challenge that as: it is more reasonable to whom?

Is it more reasonable to the Committee? If so I assume it is reasonable to the Committee to do this timeline. Or is it more reasonable to the requérants, because they believe their timeline on their Requête is not reasonable? Is the more reasonable to our community? Or actually, sir, as I said yesterday, is it more reasonable to our children and young people?

1240

More reasonable to whom? I do not think it is more reasonable to our children or our young people. I have not yet heard from. ... Oh, sorry, I give way to Deputy Fallaize.

1245 **Deputy Fallaize:** I thank Deputy Merrett.

There has been no discussion with the Committee from the proposer or seconder of the amendment in relation to the timeline. I think that we are now in a situation, and I said earlier that it felt as if we were essentially now acting in Committee. I think we are in a situation where

1250 without some reflection it is just not possible to give an informed view on whether any timeline, frankly plucked out of thin air, is deliverable. I would suggest that any direction that is going to be provided, be provided on the basis of something happening as soon as possible rather than to any particular timeline which would not be an informed timeline.

I mean, this Committee or any other Committee is going to have no interest in dragging this

1255 out. So I do not think the State needs to put in place a timeline to make sure it happens as quickly as possible. But I cannot give the States any assurance that this timeline is deliverable or not deliverable, because it needs some kind of reflection.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, Deputy Fallaize, that is as much as I suspected and of course it

1260 disappoints me.

So first of all, because obviously how we can return something to this Assembly is of paramount importance to our children in Year 7, Year 6 and Year 5. Then the comprehensive comparison which Deputy Roffey picked up on, because I am not sure and I hope that Deputy Inder responds to this debate: is it the expectation to have a full business case and the traffic

1265 impact assessment back to this Assembly? Or if he could define what he means by a 'comprehensive comparison', that would be really helpful. Because 2(b) the 11-18, three-college model, I am led to believe, but I am happy to be corrected – because I have not been a Vice-President in Education, Sport and Culture this term – Deputy Dudley-Owen has, and Deputy Meerveld has, and Deputy Graham has, but I have not. So I do not know if that model has been

1270 worked up at all yet. And if you consider it has taken 18 months to come back with the two-school model, *per se*, the 11-18, then is it ... ?

I do not know what work has been done to date, so if Deputy Inder could help me out with that, because I know he was also a Member of Education, Sport and Culture for a period of time. So what really concerns me, really concerns me, which I find, quite honestly, it is Groundhog Day –

1275 is that we are still discussing models of education. We cannot appear to decide as an Assembly. We have already said no to two of these models by a majority, but now we are back deliberating the same thing. I cannot remember if it was Thursday or Friday, to be frank, sir, I cannot even remember that. And we are back here again.

1280 I really want to get to the position where we are debating, or deciding, educational outcomes equity of provision within a model.

I really thought we had already determined the future of our secondary education. I am trying to be brief, sir, I really am, but if we are trying to talk to this amendment then I need to know where the States come from and I need to know what the proposer and seconder mean about 'comprehensive comparison'. And I do need assurances as well, sir, because you said you 'may be minded'... I am trying to listen to the debates, sir, but I think those were your words, because I think it will be important to Members to know if we can, in fact, vote separately on 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c) and 2(d), if this amendment does pass.

Thank you, sir.

1290 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, before I call the next speaker, let me just clarify what I indicated earlier. I will put amendment 8 to you for a vote as it stands which will be the wholesale substitution of Proposition 2.

If it carries and it remains Proposition 2 by the end of general debate, and there is a wish that there is an opportunity to vote separately on (b), (c) and (d) because (a) has to be the comparator, come what may, then I will take separate votes on (b), (c) and (d). The reason being that this could have been crafted in such a way that there is to be a comparison and then you decide what to include in the comparison.

Deputy Dudley-Owen.

1300 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Sir, may I ask that Deputy Inder gives the States an idea of his original intention of whether the amendment was meant to be taken and voted upon in this way?

1305 **The Deputy Bailiff:** No, I do not think that is necessary at the moment because it was put by another Member, Deputy Parkinson, whether it would be possible to have separate votes, and I have indicated that if there is a wish for those to be put separately then I would put them separately.

At the moment, although the debate has strayed in to the substance of each of the options (b), (c) and (d) that might be comparators, can I remind Members that it is a straightforward choice between whether or not you are going to have a vote on the direction in the line of the original Proposition or whether you are going to have a vote for a more targeted comparison rather than an open-ended one. That should not involve you descending into the detail about the rights and wrongs of it, particularly in light of the indication I have given as to how the vote might be taken if amendment 8 were to carry and not be further amended before you get to a final vote.

So with that I will now call Deputy Lester Queripel.

1315

Deputy Lester Queripel: Sir, thank you.

When he spoke, Deputy Brouard apologised to the requérants for laying this amendment. As far as I am concerned, sir, there was no need whatsoever for him to apologise, because even though I am a signatory on the Requête I am absolutely delighted to see this composite amendment in front of us. I am so delighted that I am wearing my smiley-face tie once more. The last time I actually wore this tie was speaking in support of the Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Brouard amendment which was laid last week and I wholeheartedly supported them in their quest to move from a one-school, two-college model to a one-school, three 11-18 year-old college model.

1325 That amendment lost, as we know, but there is hope on the horizon in the form of this amendment in front of us.

Unlike Deputy Roffey, sir, who is unfortunately not in the Chamber at the moment, I wholeheartedly support the comprehensive report being laid in front of the next States.

1330 Sir, as a signatory on the Requête I feel the need to explain to my colleagues why I support this amendment. I will start by saying that I am a great believer in holding up one's hands in

admission, when I feel something I have championed needs to be amended, streamlined and improved then I see no problem and I have had no concern about doing that.

Now, as this debate on the Requête has evolved, I have come to realise the Propositions in the Requête do need to be streamlined and improved, hence my supporting this amendment. Why
1335 am I supporting it instead of sticking religiously to the Proposition in the Requête? Well, the answer to that question, sir, is as the debate has progressed and evolved I have come to realise I am not satisfied with Proposition 2 in the Requête. I am not satisfied with it because it does not cover the things I think need to be covered regarding future secondary education here in the Island, which is why I supported the Deputy Le Tocq and Deputy Brouard amendment, which is
1340 why I support this amendment, and which is why I shall be supporting some of the other amendments that have yet to be laid.

And now, sir, to home in on the words from a verse of a song that was a massive worldwide hit for George Benson in the 1970's, I truly believe, as I am sure all of my colleagues in the Assembly also believe, children are our future and we need to give them the best start in life that we
1345 possibly can. George Benson said exactly that in his song, because he said: 'I believe the children are our future, teach them well and let them lead the way. Show them all the beauty there is inside and give them a sense of pride'; and the only way that any child can attain a sense of pride, in my view, is if they feel they are valued and supported. I do not think that children will feel valued and supported in a one-school, two-college model, due to issues of the isolation concerns
1350 I expressed in previous speeches. I do not think there will be the opportunity to access the sort of one-to-ones that took place when I was at school. I do not think teachers will have that time.

Now, surely, sir, when we talk about educational outcomes we are not just talking about teaching our children from textbooks. We are also talking about giving them confidence and making them feel valued at the same time. That is crucial and that is why I am convinced that
1355 large schools will afford the opportunity for the sort of one-to-ones that I sincerely believe children need.

But putting my views to one side, sir, surely even the most avid supporter of the one-school, two-college model can see the merit and the value in supporting this amendment which puts so much into the mix, and will result in the next Assembly being presented with the sort of evidence-based report that this Assembly should have been provided with, and yet has never been
1360 provided with, to enable us to say that we were fully informed. How many times do we hear it said during debates that we need to be fully informed to enable us to reach a decision?

And, sir, as we would have expected, because he is fighting his corner to the best of his ability and I commend him for the way in which he is doing it, Deputy Fallaize has done his best to
1365 encourage us to vote against this amendment and keep supporters of the one-school, two-college model on his side.

But in my view, sir, as I said in a previous speech I do not see anything *wrong* with colleagues changing their minds. If they have consistently voted in favour of the one-school, two-college model and are now of the view that they would much prefer an evidence-based composite report be laid in front of the next States, then there is no shame in changing one's mind. In fact surely
1370 that would be an extremely statesman and stateswoman-like approach to adopt. Because the report that will result from this work if this amendment succeeds would contain information and evidence that has not yet been provided to the States and it would be all in one policy letter. The reality being that the States will then be finally, fully informed as many of us in the States often
1375 say.

In closing, sir, I ask for recorded vote, please, when we go to the vote. Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Okay. Deputy Dorey.

1380 **Deputy Dorey:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Bailiff.

I would like to try and shine a bit of light on to this debate. This is all about comparisons and what do you want in terms of a comparison? If you look at the letter that was sent by Deputy

Fallaize to Deputy St Pier about Rule 4(3) information, at the back there is Appendix 5 and there is a comparison in it between two 11-18, three 11-16 and separate Sixth Form, and three 11-8; and there is – how many pages? Side by side, four-and-a-half pages.

So if you want a comparison between them, there is a comparison there for you, and you can make a decision today – there is information. But the key word here is *comprehensive* comparison.

Now, this document also explains what education, based on the professional information given to this Committee by professional officers, what a comprehensive comparison is, and I will read it out: 'In order to carry out a comprehensive comparison of previously presented models alongside any new options it will be necessary, once a shortlist has been arrived at, to carry out more detailed analysis and evaluation of the shortlisted options. It will be necessary for the shortlisted models to be evaluated alongside (1) the *status quo*; (2) the one-school in two 11-18 colleges model; and for the purposes of this impact assessment it has been assumed that that three further models will be shortlisted for inclusion in that more detailed analysis'.

And it goes on to say: 'As a minimum, the more detailed analysis should include: agreeing a common set of consistent assumptions across all options including curriculum, student population projections and space standards; deriving space requirements for each option; carrying out a site selection exercise; estimated costs of a new-build, repurposing based on space and site selected; undertaking high-level traffic impact assessments; assessing capital costs; developing a transition model; developing an implementation plan and resource plan; developing a staff structure; developing a revenue model; undertaking a benefits evaluation; carrying out a risk assessment; assessing the impact on the overall Transforming Education Programme including the impact on the plans and costs of primary education, digital roadmap, further higher education and co-location of health and other services'.

That is what a comprehensive comparison is. It is clearly defined in that.

Now, in the very short time that we have had available officers have tried to carry out an analysis of what Rule 4(3) is and I made my opening point of order and I must come back to it. And, sir, you said I could refer to it in debate. I really do think that this has reached a new low in terms of Rule 4(3) because if a Member can just chuck in any number, and the numbers in there make no resemblance to doing a comprehensive review, what is the point of Rule 4(3)? We are going to be making – I am not giving away – important financial decisions which will cost the taxpayer significant sums of money. We have been told only just recently about how much extra money is needed, with no decent financial information. I think that is an appalling situation to be in. But that is where we are.

Sir, I will just read from what the staff reckon. They do not think it is possible to do that comprehensive comparison, as I outlined, in 12 months – it is more likely to be a 24-month delay, and that will cost £2.5 million to £3 million additional costs. And that would be if, at the end of that – (*Interjection*)

These are professionals who have looked at it.

Deputy Inder: Yes, yes, professional teachers.

Deputy Dorey: No, no, professional people involved in this project.

And that is if we adopt the one-school, two-site model. If we develop any other model it will cost between £8.8 million and £10.4 million – hence the £11 million that was in the original document.

Now, Deputy Parkinson has specifically talked about limiting it to just the current two 11-18, and three 11-18, and so I asked a specific question on what would be the impact if we did this more restricted comparison – and, yes, that could be done within a year. That would cause a one year delay. That is the estimate and these are done very roughly in short time, and it would cost another £1.3 million. But then the estimate is, if you then decided after that year that you wanted to develop a new model and not the two 11-18 sites with one school, and you went for the three

11-18 it would cost another £3.5 million to £4.5 million and a further 18 months, as was in this document of the Requête impact assessment.

So there would be £1.3 million to do the comparison and then a further £3.5 million to £4.5 million and a further 18 months as per the Requête impact assessment to develop a new model. We are talking about significant sums of money, so please do not underestimate. And when the public complain about the taxes they have to pay, I think Members will have to stand up if they vote for this amendment today.

But the key thing to me is the point that Deputy Fallaize made yesterday about when we first met with the unions after their survey, the word was space, space, space. People have said they want to get the teachers, or we should get the teachers to agree – or words to that effect. But you are not going to do that unless you build schools which are considerably bigger than what is being proposed, because that was the key point they kept saying to us. Deputy Fallaize described it very clearly. So there is going to be additional cost in terms of that extra space.

I would also like to remind Members that the points that were made when we looked at the previous amendment, which looked at the three 11-18 ... The sixth form would be about 140-150 pupils. Elizabeth College and Ladies' College have approximately 200 pupils across their two sixth forms, so you are going to have far more restricted choices of subjects than we have now, or you are going to have a lot more cost, or you are going to have pupils moving between all the schools.

Deputy Lester Queripel, who is not in the Assembly now, talked about one-to-one conversations. One of the key things in our proposal is his vertical tutor group, which will have 14 to 15 pupils in, which will go from Year 13 to Year 7 and give opportunities every day for pupils to have that contact, and by keeping this in these very small groups which, as Deputy Fallaize explained, with the enrichment we have got additional teachers, is what we are trying to deliver. So you will lose that contact of pupils being at their school from Year 7 to Year 13 because they are going to disperse according to what subjects they want to do.

Sir, I am not going to repeat the arguments about the amendment (c) and (d), as I think Deputy Merrett talked about Groundhog Day in terms of the comments that Deputy de Lisle made. We have been through all these points before, but the one point that he did make yesterday, which I am re-emphasising is that when we did ask for a side-by-side review which was looking at four different options before the September 2019 debate, specifically it was explained that if you have a smaller school you have fewer curriculum choices – and that is not just at A-level but at GCSE – and these schools will be, by 2050, based on the predictions, under 800 pupils. They will be smaller than we had our Grammar School at, which went up to just short of 1,100.

I would remind Members of the comments made in the very good speech by Deputy Stephens about the impact on children. I do not think anybody agrees that a four-school, non-selective system is the ideal system to be in – in fact, it has been rejected repeatedly – but that is what we are putting our children in and we are extending the time, which is not the ideal system. If we go for Deputy Parkinson's idea we will spend a considerable amount of money and we have a one-year delay initially to do the evaluation, another 18 months' delay and another £4.5 million or so spent on that new model. We will have a school that has higher running costs. If Members want to vote to do that analysis, do that. I will not be one of them. I think it is a very expensive option and Members are going to have to explain to the public why they want to spend so much of their money when they have twice voted for two 11-18 colleges with one school, which is the best system when you do any analysis.

I urge Members, while they are sitting, if they have got a chance ... because the comparison that was done which I mentioned at the very beginning, which was in the letter of comment from P&R – it is on the website. Look at those side-by-side analyses and see – and do you really want to go for another model? I do not think it is in the best interests of our children, it is not in the best interest of our finances, so I cannot possibly vote for it.

I urge Members, please vote against this amendment. Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: I will call Deputy Dudley-Owen next, as the lead requérant.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

1490 I will come to make some comments on the amendment, but this debate again has gone around the houses today and I think it is important to put some points of comment on record.

1495 There has been much made in Deputy Stephens' speech today about parents being fearful of the uncertainty and that they do not know where their children are going to go, but I would like to balance that with parents who are terrified, some of them, about the prospect of their children going into settings with an increased amount of children – really very concerned. We have had emails about this. We have had protests about this. We have had, especially, educational needs specialists talking about this. There needs to be some balance in this debate. It is not one sided. We have had very few parents, in the context of this debate, coming forward and saying, 'Please continue, we are really confident with this system and we are looking forward to it.' There have been some, absolutely, but very few compared to the number that have said, 'Please, stop and consider – this is not a model we have confidence in, the teachers agree with us and we do not want it for our Island.'

1500 There is talk about the delay in transition, and any issues around this can be dealt with practically. We must not scare people into thinking ... Listeners could be forgiven for thinking that after a successful – which I hope it is – result on the Requête, the schools will suddenly disappear, there will be no teachers; it could almost be that we have no schools at the moment, we have no teachers and that we have a whole cohort of children who are in the state school sector sitting at home waiting for the doors to open in these imaginary schools. They are there today. They exist. High-quality teaching is being delivered today with teachers who are professional and have a high duty of care, and please let us not mislead the public that anything otherwise is the truth.

1510 We have heard talk about recruitment problems – and retention problems, Deputy Trott brought up. This is something that was brought up by one of the Members of Education, Sport and Culture yesterday as well. Without proof of the effect of our debate being the sole cause of that recruitment issue, I am afraid that we cannot continue with putting that comment out there, because again it is incorrect. I understand from the teacher surveys that actually there is a high degree of dissatisfaction. If teachers themselves have no confidence in the model in which they are going to be expected to teach, then surely that in and of itself would cause issues and cause a teacher from the UK coming to think twice about whether they themselves want to do that. They would be looking at what their peers are saying, and if their peers are saying this model is not going to be fit for purpose then they would also be questioning whether they want to teach in that system. So, I would refute the suggestion that it is solely down to this Requête and that actually the Education Committee need to be looking at their own model (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) as a reason for teachers not wanting to come and teach in Guernsey at this time. And clearly that will feed into retention. I would like to see some facts and figures in the recent past about how many teachers we might be losing because we know that there is a high degree of dissatisfaction: 1525 90% of our teachers have said they are dissatisfied with the model – whether it be implementation or whether it be space, they are dissatisfied.

1530 One more thing on that issue: Deputy Roffey today, again, despite me trying to clarify yesterday, said about the pages and pages of information that we were presented with in the States debate in September. Again I say it is not about the number of pages. There are pages and pages of information on lots of things. It is about the quality and the relevance of that information. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I did not really want to go into this granular detail, but I will very quickly step into it.

1535 We can look at things like the critical success factors on the programme business case on the 11-18 schools. We know, or we should do, that critical success factors need to be defined and measurable. How can we define an education which meets the needs of every student in a high-quality learning environment? A high-quality learning environment is different to everybody, so it is not definable, and therefore, if it is not definable, you cannot measure it. A successful and

productive workforce – again, success and productivity mean different things. It goes on and on, actually. There are plenty of examples that I can pick out, but I will not because we are pressed for time and I do not want to rip into this – I really do not, but the point is it is not about the number of pages produced and the amount of information; it was the relevance of that information.

Going on to the amendment, I know that Deputy Inder and Deputy Brouard have laid this with the best of intent but it appears to me that throughout this debate this morning certain Members will take this amendment, if it is successful, and they will pick it like a chicken bone, and that is not the intent of the Requête. The Requête was to provide for an objective analysis, a shortlist of appraisals provided by the economic case that we actually have in our process chest back at Frossard House. That was the original intention of the Requête. I think that Deputy Inder and Deputy Brouard were trying to limit the scope of that so that it was definable and measurable, which was very helpful, but my fear is that it will be picked apart like a chicken bone and it will absolutely bear no resemblance to what those who laid that motion intended. Therefore, unless I hear anything different, that that will not be the intent and that we can take that Proposition 2 in its entirety, then I will not be voting for this amendment because I think that it will absolutely risk losing any objective review that the requérants are seeking.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: Thank you, sir.

Firstly, apologies if I sound like I am slurring my words. I have not resorted to the drink yet. (Laughter) I have actually had my dentist appointment earlier this morning and so half my mouth is numb.

I mentioned that. I could not actually remember what day it was I mentioned it. I had to ask Deputy Le Clerc. It is Tuesday today. Anyway, we are where we are and we are actually in the position where we are basically in the same place we were back on Thursday, I think, with an inadequate Requête. I am sorry, but whatever Deputy Dudley-Owen says about the purity of the Requête and what the intentions of the requérants were, this is politics. This is about trying to find a way through and getting what is right and having a decision that we all know will provide us with a way forward. That has always been my concern with the Requête. It is really a sledgehammer to crack a nut and it gives us, as I have said before – and Deputy Dudley-Owen might not like it – but it will give us years of uncertainty, which is not good for children, teachers or parents. That is the biggest concern for me, absolutely, and that is one thing that has guided me in how I voted for various Propositions. It does look like we stand with no end in sight at the moment and I think we have to find a way through.

I did vote for the P&R amendment, as I saw it was a way through. Yes, it had points in it which I was not happy about but Deputy St Pier yesterday, when commenting against the ESC amendment really made it clearer there than he did actually at the summing up of his own amendment, and actually through hindsight you see it was a better idea compared with where we are. But that failed. (Interjection by Deputy Trott) Yes, thank you, Deputy Trott.

I have issues on the Proposal on one and two 11-16 schools, but I did think it took us forward. I have no ideological viewpoint on any new model. I think it is fantastic that people ... like Deputy de Lisle, who absolutely believes in his three schools in his sixth form centre. Fantastic! God, that would make my life so much easier. But no, I am trying to find, on the evidence, what I think would be the best thing to do.

I did vote against Deputy Le Tocq's amendment as it only gave us that one option and at the time I did say that if it had said provide us with a two 11-18 school versus a three 11-18 school I think I would have supported that. In fact, I am pretty sure I would have supported it because I can see absolutely how it makes a proper comparison and deals with the issues that a lot of people have been raising, certainly through our inbox about the size of schools and the problems around accessing just two schools. It deals with all that without having to worry about where we

1590 put a sixth form centre and whether it should be a sixth form centre, or whether it should be attached to a school or whether it should be a school and whether that sixth form would be big enough or it will not be, or we have two sixth form centres. Anyway, it meant we did not have to worry about that which is why I liked it and I liked the fact it would have been opportune. But I could not, because it just provided that one option.

1595 Now, I voted for the ESC amendment as I wanted more certainty, as I have said before, it is just that for me it has been about more certainty, and I do want resolution although it has been mentioned today there is going to be a delay anyway so that leads us to this amendment – an imperfect, again, but I think I think every single amendment we have had has had its imperfections.

1600 I think, actually; if we had that more time and I think it was wrong that we brought this debate forward now. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think we have seen that, we have seen how more could have been done. We could have been able to have a citizens' assembly in between times to really get the public involved and got an idea. We could have had something where we had a better idea about where people *really* were before we came into this debate, other than just a group of people who are directly involved in this debate right at this moment in time.

1605 So I think that was a mistake. But we are where we are, as they say. So it is an imperfect amendment, for that reason if nothing else.

But in the absence of any other amendment, which should be a possible way through this jungle that has been this debate, I am very tempted to support it. It has a clear advantage on the Requête to me as it limits the option to review and enables a comparison with the one-school, two-sites model, and that is what I like. But, like Deputy Parkinson, I think it would be better if it were just a comparison between the one-school, two sites 11-18 schools, and three 11-18 schools, but it is better than nothing and does enable us to find a way forward.

1610 So I am happy to support this amendment at this stage, but I will not be able to support © or (d) when we get to that vote, if we ever do because it just provides models that I could not support. I welcome the input of Deputy Dorey in terms of the time and cost that he mentioned and just having those two options would clearly be – it sounds like cheaper and faster than going through every single option within this amendment. So I think really that would allow us to have what could say is a bit of a pit-stop to refresh on our journey, then the Requête which to me is more like a long diversion and we will probably start off in the same place as we are now.

1620 So I think, for me, I would much rather support this amendment and then decide to vote for just the comparison between two schools and three schools than leaving things as they are. So I will be supporting this amendment.

1625 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Smithies.

Deputy Smithies: Thank you very much, sir.

Listening to the speeches and the way they are going backwards and forwards I am a little reminded of that old chestnut about President Kennedy who said he wanted a one-armed economist because his adviser kept saying 'On the other hand, Mr President'. (*Laughter*)

1630 I am fairly neutral about this amendment. I am not quite as ecstatic perhaps as Deputy Lester Queripel, I have not gone out and bought myself a smiley tie, but it does offer much of that which I am seeking. But I am not drawn to the proposed report delivery date – 12 months hence may be realistic but it is not challenging.

1635 Without straying into the detail I think with this amendment reduced to 2(a) and 2(b) then an earlier report date is achievable, a report with costs.

Turning briefly to recruitment and retention, and here I do apologise for not seeking to ask Deputy Graham to give way when he was speaking, but I was going through some of my notes based on my attendance at the Baubigny Schools' Committee over several years, and whilst I am not inviting Deputy Graham to request me to give away I could be amenable should he wish to exercise that option. (*Laughter*) Reasons for difficulties in recruiting teaching staff are more than

just about uncertainty in the education system, although that may be a factor and a most unwelcome factor. However, we would be deceiving ourselves if we do not acknowledge the effects of short term contracts, delays in confirming appointments, cost of housing, cost of living and also we should address shortcomings in encouraging and training local teachers and trainee teachers.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, sir.

This amendment is all well and good but we are already hearing this morning that we are designing yet again the education system on the floor of this Assembly, which is exactly the reason why the original Requête was put forward as well, following the need to have a pause and go and have another look which was set out in number 2 of the Requête.

Sir, we have got now a new number 2 before us which is more prescriptive. So also we are hearing we should only be looking at (a) and (b) and we should not be looking at (c) and (d). Well, honestly, I just despair really because that is not what we should be doing. We should either do it properly or just turn this into a complete farce, which it is becoming, in my opinion.

We have heard we should be listening to the public and we should be listening to the teachers and those that are in the education system. And yet we are not prepared to do that because we are still wanting to pick what we want to pick on the floor of the Assembly rather than, actually the first part of the amendment of the Requête is key for me because unless the first part of the Requête is supported you can forget about this amendment and what is going on.

Deputy Dorey was really helpful with what he pointed out here. The first part of the Amendment actually says to *stop* what is actually going on at the moment and pause. Listening to Deputy Fallaize's speech just before, no, that is not going to happen because they are still going to carry on with the transitional period and not going to stop that transformation.

So as I say unless we actually support number 1 of the Requête and then follow through with the amendment of number 2, which *must* include consultation with the teachers and indeed the public and the parents, otherwise we are yet again ignoring that factor, designing on the floor of the Assembly, going off and looking at whether it is (a), (b), (c), (d) or whatever they want to look at – and it should be all of them if they are going to do the job properly. There is little point in supporting this amendment because we are not going to be following through the wishes of what we have been asked to do.

We hear again this morning and outside the Chamber and indeed in here about the impact on the children. Of course there is impact on the children. But equally the teaching profession are the ones that are asking us to pause. They put the children first. That is their job to put the children first and their education. They would not be asking us to pause if they thought it would damage. The only people who are damaging the children's education is someone not really listening to the teachers who are asking for it to be done properly in the first place. And I think that is rather unfortunate.

Teachers have results that they want to prove that they have done really well in their class with their exams. They will not have forgotten about that when they are asking for a pause, because they are fully aware that they can still teach these children while things are going on.

Deputy Dorey, who I just referred to just now, referred to Deputy Fallaize's letter that he sent out – although I did call it a book to Deputy Fallaize because there was an awful lot of detail in there, and I thank him for that, because it was quite helpful. So a lot of that information is already there.

So what have we got here? Unless the number 1 of the Requête is actually supported to pause, if that is rejected, Education would just carry on with the one-school, two-site and look over their shoulder at ... 'Well we will look at (a) and (b) and we are not going to bother with (c) and (d) because actually that goes further and we don't want to be doing that. We have got the details anyway. We are not going to change our mind ...'

Because rightly so they have sold this with absolute conviction and they have not altered at all and nobody can take that away from them. And I think credit to them, they feel really strongly about it, that that is right. But that does not mean to say that the rest of us have to agree with that. But equally we have got the information before us, so why are we sending them away to actually be doing something that they have already looked at, if they are not going to support number 1 of the Requête? That is key and I want assurances from the Members of Education that they will support number 1 of the Requête. Unless they support number 1 of the Requête there will not be any need, I think, for the rest of the Requête to go through because they still feel very passionately and want to go through with the one-school, two sites.

So we have been now just about three hours going round in circles and I am not sure we are any further ahead, and I just think this has become an absolute farce and an embarrassment that we are not getting anywhere with all these amendments that are going forward. I ask Members to, please, if they are going to support this Requête they must support Proposition 1 of the Requête as well, and we move on.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

I just wanted to pick up mainly on a few points in Deputy Dudley-Owen's speech. I should probably start with a declaration of interest in that I have children who will be very directly affected by this Requête and particularly, and more specifically I have a child in Year 6 which is right in the middle of the impacted zone of those Years 7, 6 and 5. Although I think Deputy Stephens was quite right this morning when she described the impact as extending at least until Year 3, I cannot see how that is avoidable unless the current model is reaffirmed at any point after a review.

So I have been very quiet during this debate really because I have not really trusted that I have been able to stand up and speak without getting overly emotional because it is a very emotional subject. I know Deputy Laurie Queripel, in a slightly different context, used the word 'academic', yesterday; well this is very far from academic for me, it is very much about real world impacts. And although my child is one of about 1,500 children in those Years 7, 6 and 5, it does extend beyond that.

The impacts are very real and Deputy Dudley-Owen said there has been much talk about parents being fearful of the uncertainty and then she wanted to balance that with concerns from parents who are terrified of children going into larger settings. I certainly do not dispute that there are some parents who are not happy with the proposals but I have to say for the last two or three weeks I have been finding emails on this Requête and actually there have been more emails that I have received certainly in support of Education's plans, and the vast majority – well, not the vast majority, and I am just speaking from my own inbox – there has been a higher percentage of parents within the group that are supportive of Education's plans, because you never can tell unless they declare it explicitly, than there appear to be those that support the Requête. So I would challenge Deputy Dudley-Owen's assertion that the concerns of parents worried about children going into a larger setting – and let's not forget that does not mean larger classes of course – are greater than the concerns of parents who are concerned with the impact of delay.

There are a lot of people, particularly for families with children in Year 7, who have already made decisions about schooling that were based on the promises effectively that we made as an Assembly. We stated – it was not just a direction of travel – we made commitments to those students about what that education would look like. I do not think we can belittle the significance of changing that now after those decisions have been made. I think it is a very fundamental thing.

Obviously people will have all kinds of factors to take into consideration, but I would like to speak for parents, particularly parents of those particular cohorts, that actually that is a very significant factor in the real world.

1745 Deputy Dudley-Owen also said that there was no conclusive proof that the Requête is a reason for any recruitment problems. I would agree that there is no definitive proof; I would accept that. But I think it is also factually correct to state that there has been a correlation between the recruitment problems that are being experienced at moment and this period of uncertainty that has been created since talk of the Requête. So I think those two things can be distinguished and I
 1750 would agree with her. I do not think anyone is necessarily claiming causality, but I think it remains the case that our system is currently experiencing recruitment issues and those issues do seem to correlate with this period of renewed uncertainty. Retention of course is a slightly different issue, and we have heard from Deputy Fallaize and others that the retention rates remain similar to what they have been in previous years.

1755 I feel about this amendment very similarly to other people who have spoken. I too would have to draw the line at options (c) and (d). I do not see that there can be anything usefully gained from spending time and money and prolonging delay and uncertainty for models that probably a majority of the Assembly believe are inherently either unworkable or unfair. So I too would have to draw the line at that.

1760 Is it an improvement on the original Requête? I think it probably is because it actually provides a little bit of clarity, but I do agree with the concerns over the wording about what 'comprehensive comparison' means; and I do think it is important we have heard a range of different views actually on what kind of detail. The requérants on the one hand have accused the Committee of not being detailed enough in their current proposals, and so I think we really do
 1765 need to have articulated quite explicitly for us what comprehensive comparison actually means on the ground, because that will very much dictate the degree of delay and the timelines that we are looking at, as well obviously as the number of models that are being compared.

I would say, also, just because I am a little bit pedantic – which those who work for me already know! I do have a couple of queries about the specific wording which is in (c) it does say 'three
 1770 11-16 school models' and I just wondered whether Deputies Inder and Brouard proposed, and whether it is their intention, that more than one model is put forward for that. And I think there is one in (d) as well. Yes, and there is also the same on (d) there is 'two 11-16 school models'. And again I would like some clarity on that, thank you.

1775 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, we will now adjourn until 2.30 p.m.

*The Assembly adjourned at 12.33 p.m.
 and resumed it sitting at 2.30 p.m.*

**Requête –
 Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education –
 Debate concluded –
 Amended Propositions carried**

The Greffier: Requête – Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education – Continuation of debate on amendment 8.

1780 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, a motion under Rule 26(1).

1785 **The Deputy Bailiff:** All right. Before we get to a motion under Rule 26(1) that has been potentially proposed by Deputy St Pier – Deputy Leadbeater, welcome, is it your wish to be relevéd?

Deputy Leadbeater: Please, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you very much.

1790 Will those Members who wish to speak on amendment number 8 who have not yet spoken please stand in their places. So Deputy St Pier, is it still you wish to – ?

Deputy St Pier: No, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: I will call Deputy Hansmann Rouxel then.

1795

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Thank you, sir.

I just wanted to expand on what Deputy Lowe mentioned before that this is a farce, and actually I think laying this amendment has exposed the farce of the Requête. Firstly in the timelines, this is a far more realistic look at the timeline. It may not be entirely possible but it is still far more realistic.

1800

The Requête was attractive to those who had genuine concerns because it promised something that was not possible. Now in deciding to evaluate this amendment against the Requête and as other have said it does move us forward but does it solve the problem that we were trying to fix? That is the question that we as parliamentarians, as policy makers, need to start to think about. What is the problem we are trying to solve?

1805

Now, a lot of speeches have mentioned what the people, what the unions have said, and what lack of information there might have been in order to make an informed decision. But ultimately how we respond to concerns as a parliament, as a government, is how effective we are in our decision making and I do not think that there is a way of resolving this in this way that actually resolves the problem we are trying to fix.

1810

Initially we were trying to fix the problem of how to reorganise secondary and post-16 education in a non-selective atmosphere after the decision to end selection. The whole estate, the whole system is an ecosystem; because we are on Island, that ecosystem includes the grant-aided colleges, and it includes the special schools. It is a whole entire ecosystem and we have looked at this the wrong way round.

1815

In responding to criticisms laid by Deputy Dudley-Owen regarding the concerns that parents and teachers have, particularly around special educational needs education, that their concerns regarding large schools is a reason to vote for the pause and review, what has been apparent is that we have forgotten right from the beginning of this process in the kernels of somebody's mind when they thought up the Your Schools, Your Choice consultation was at that point there needed to be meaningful engagement and actually looking at the whole ecosystem and not just parts of the ecosystem of our education system.

1820

When the policy letter came out in March 2016 there was a lack of understanding of what an all-ability system would actually involve if you did include everybody in the ecosystem a truly inclusive way forward. Again in July 2017 when the previous consultation on the three school model came out there was concern raised again that again the special schools and special educational needs had not really been looked at and involved.

1825

And again, when the alternative model was agreed in January 2018 there was real concern and many meetings and more concern and those who have written to us regarding that concern say yes we support pause and review because we want to know that the reviews of SEND education can inform the decision going forward. That is not the case with this Requête and it is not the case with this amendment.

1830

There is a review on special education and disability education needs at the moment that is looking at how we do things across the whole system and how well that is working and where it is not working and what we can do to improve that and how it can fit into the whole system.

1835

There are some things that the two school model does start to resolve and a lot of that is about resources. We are operating a system of best endeavours, best wishes. Where teachers are

providing the best that they can across a whole system and no part of that system works efficiently and works effectively in the resources that we can afford. So part of the reason why I initially voted for the two school model was to see if as promised we would be able to pull those resources effectively and efficiently in two schools and whether it was possible to deliver quality inclusive education in those two schools.

That is from my speech in 2018 which I wrote after the debate. Those things are not demonstrated in the two school model. I know that because I have spoken at length and spoken to the senior leaders who are in charge of putting in the systems that can support an inclusive community environment. It is not about how big the school is it is about how much that school is resourced, and that is something that is completely missed.

Looking back at the three school model, pupil to teacher ratios were 15:1; in the two school model the pupil to teacher ratio of 12:1. What does that do on a daily basis, what does that allow a head teacher to do with those resources? Are they able to give individual one to one support to those who need it? Yes. Can you do that in a 15:1 system? Potentially but you are starting to create more problems than you are asking to fix.

What the amendment is asking is to go back and consider these. I have shown in my analysis that none of the options that we are looking at would pass the first viability test. The first viability test is an economic one. The second viability test would be what are the structural faults in this model and can those structural faults be mitigated.

Now in the model where we have one school attached to a sixth form centre and the other two not attached to a sixth form centre, that model, the structural inequalities – you can start to mitigate those structural inequalities. Like the fact that in the 11-18 school you would get a 12:1 pupil to teacher ratio which was in the original policy letter as option two, we know that we have already worked that out and actually the way to look at the system just from a purely financial point of view is well, if you do not need more teachers in an 11-16 school because you do not have A-levels then it does not make financial sense to put the pupil to teacher ratios, but if you are trying to make sure that those at the 11-16 school are not getting more advantage then they would add in the pupil to teacher ratio of 12:1 in the 11-16 schools.

That is how I know that financially it is going to be more expensive, so we are already going through all these mitigations every single one. All of those mitigations there is no way we are coming out of this with the two school model being less attractive financially and less attractive with the resource that you can actually turn back into educational outcomes.

In terms of the Requête, the Proposition that it seeks to replace, there has been a lot of talk about well, what the teachers want and what the unions said in their letter. Actually what the union's letter did say was that we do not really like any of the amendments and we do not really like the Requête. So I have very severe doubts whether they would like this amendment any more than any of the other amendments because actually in that letter, if I can just find it, is a little part of it that actually says 'If I was to write an amendment it would look like this...'

It does not look anything like the – I cannot find it now – but it asks for an options review and the terms of that options review has in it the issues about implementation issues of implementation that the teachers have raised.

Deputy Inder: Sorry, just a point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Deputy Hansmann Rouxel said, if I understood correctly, that the letter from the unions, I assume she is referring to the one of 25th February ... I think she basically said it did not say it did not want the pause and review, but again that is not correct.

A way forward. What is the way forward? It is incontrovertible that our members want a genuine pause and review which involves consideration of a range of possible options and not just the heavily prescribed option put forward by P&R ...

So that I am afraid is misleading. The letter of 25th February from the unions said they wanted a pause and review.

1890 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Ha! (*Laughter*) Apologies; trying to work to work paperlessly has been my downfall. I bow to my colleague's paperfall – as is demonstrated by my lack of ability to find this electronically on my two screens in front of me.

So the letter reads:

Had we been drafting an amendment to the requête we would have included the following elements ...

1895 So that was what I was referring to. The reference in the letter is 'had we', and there would be a direction for ESC not to enter into any obligations and for the options appraisal to be focused on the issues of implementation that have been raised by the unions.

Now, partially what ESC's amendment the other day did was try to look at the issues concerning implementation. None of these reviews are going to actually get to the nub of the issues concerning implementation because we will only know those issues in the models when
1900 they are developed to a point where you are starting to implement them.

But if we look back at what the issues are with the elements of implementation, they revolve around space, and this is what I was trying to say yesterday, revolving around space. If the space issues are an issue in this model they will be an issue in other models. We know that other models are not going to be nearly as revenue cost effective, to the point where we are actually able to
1905 take some of those revenue savings and put them back into educational outcomes and improve the pupil to teacher ratio. A million pounds a year extra revenue going to 20 extra teachers I think is not to be sniffed at.

The other major issue with implementation – and it has come out from letters and correspondence and speaking to teachers of the sixth form – is the integration of the sixth form as
1910 part of the school. They were prepared to accept the splitting of the sixth form but not the integration of the sixth form into the whole school, and it is the whole school approach where you start to have those vertical tutor groups where you have those sixth form pupils on site that it adds something to the whole school. That is part of the issues that have been raised about implementation.

1915 So as attractive as the three 11-18 schools is for those who support it and see it in this amendment as a good option that implementation issue will still be an issue with the teachers and the unions. The implementation of two 11-16's and one 11-18 will also have structural failures and will fail with the teachers. As for the three 11-16's and a separate sixth form, that is not possible. It is not possible. Unfortunately as much Deputy de Lisle would like that option to be possible it is
1920 not. That was originally looked at by the Committee, the 2012-2016 Committee, they looked at it in depth before the sent out the consultation and as a result of it coming up again in the consultation they looked at it again and they decided it just was not viable. The benefits that Deputy de Lisle had spoken about in his speech, and I know he feels very passionately about it, are laudable but if it is not possible to do then why include it in an options appraisal in the first
1925 place. We would just be wasting money.

So the amendment is better than the Requête because it is more realistic but there is still no point.

1930 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I now turn to the proposer of amendment number 8, Deputy Inder, to reply to the debate.

Deputy Inder: I beg your pardon, I thought we were in a pause there.

You will be glad to know I am not going to go through everyone's responses. I think we practically know where everyone is now. But there are a couple of things I do need to touch on.

1935 Deputy Fallaize and I think Deputy Hansmann Rouxel in the last speech believe that the issues these are primarily around space standards. They are clearly not. They really are not.

Through you, sir, Deputy Fallaize yesterday brought a letter – he must have found one of a few letters supporting the two school model and it was obviously from one of the ... I believe it was one of the teaching professionals. They made reference to what they thought they knew about delivering educational outcomes for the special educational needs sector. Quite clearly that teacher had not read the letter from Le Murier. I will read ... You will be glad again, if anyone is listening, I am glad finally we have got again mention of Le Murier, because after three or four days it has not really been discussed at all. But what they said is – and I am not going through the percentages; you will just have to take them as read.

Current proposals regarding how the new model will affect these routines ...

and this is of the children –

Students with anxiety, ASD and hypersensitivity disorders require quiet, low stimulation environments – can this be guaranteed when the numbers of students in each group at Victor Hugo College are greater?

What we are hearing is that this is all about space. I do not actually think it is. I think it is more about crowds. It is about large cohorts, or rather large groups of children in two what appears to be very large crowds and no amount of statistics telling me that a 1,400 one in Norfolk and a 1,300 one here and a 1,200 one is going to change that fact. There is something very wrong with a two school model that does not like crowds. Now how that ends up dispersing, that can only be with a third school. That would be the one thing that sorts out the majority of the space problems, dials down the reaction from teachers. But to suggest that it is just ...

I have heard that we have got to deal with the unions. For the life of me, I cannot believe I am standing here like a sort of modern day Neil Scargill, listening to Deputy Margaret Roffey in the corner acting like a modern day Margaret Thatcher – a sort of hammer of the unions – *(Interjection and laughter)* I have said to you all before I am beyond guessing my way through it and I will eventually refer to the models that are here. If someone tells me that three 11-18s work I will shut up and go away – seriously. Well, not literally, but I will shut up and go away.

Deputy Yerby said that there are fears about the recruitment –

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy McSwiggan.

Deputy Inder: I have done it again – Deputy McSwiggan. I apologise through you, sir, to Deputy McSwiggan. Fears about the recruitment of teachers. Now, this seems to be new information. Only recently we were told that the turnover of teachers is not particularly different to how it has been over the last couple of years. But apparently ... and I think there is an element of project fear. It is a fact that in political debates what is good is always proposed as brilliant and what is bad is always a heck of a lot worse.

But I must remind Members that for the two school model itself, if it goes through and the Requête along with this amendment is lost, it is not the recruitment of the teachers that may or may not be a fact but they are talking about industrial action.

The last time they spoke about industrial action was the previous head of Beaucamps School, we were four hours away from a portion of the Beaucamps School walking out. Deputy Fallaize can shake his head but the previous Beaucamps head nearly had her school walking out. We were four hours away from a walk out and that I am afraid is a fact.

There has been something going on and to be honest with you I never found out what the problem was there because we were kept way out of it. But again only two years later our teaching profession is talking about industrial action. I personally do not understand the union rules enough to know what that industrial action can be matched against – it might be withdrawing labour, it might be ... I do not know, working to rule. But significantly our teaching profession is absolutely upset about this process, It is not just about –

Deputy Fallaize: Point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

1985

Deputy Fallaize: I think Deputy Inder needs to be very careful with the language that he is using and if he is not going to be careful he at least needs to be accurate.

1990 What actually was said by a national representative of the NASUWT, which is one of the unions active in schools, was that they kept all options on the table and that he would not rule out industrial action.

That being said ... which *was* said; there is no point in trying to avoid that. That was said by one national representative of one of the teaching unions. For Deputy Inder to translate that, when we get into the States, as teachers – as if he is talking about the whole profession – are considering industrial action, I think is misleading.

1995 So let's at least try to be proportionate even if we cannot be fully accurate.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Inder to continue.

2000 **Deputy Inder:** Well okay, again, sir, to be perfectly frank with you, we are dancing on a pinhead. (*Interjections*) There is only twice I have heard of industrial action: we were on the verge of it with the previous head of the Beaucamps School, we were four hours away from ... Deputy Fallaize can shake his head all he wants, but that is a fact. Deputy Fallaize, if he would like to get up and challenge me that we were four hours away from ... a first time in this Island's history we were going to have industrial action by teachers and close Les Beaucamps School – he can get up and challenge me if he would like to. Clearly he cannot, so there we go.

2005

So two years later we are in the realms of being told that members will be balloted on a number of options which would probably include some kind of industrial action. Play with the sentence as much as you want, that is where we are right now. It is not just about the recruitment of teachers going forward, the problem we have is with the transformation, and the management over the last two years of this transformation, that has got us to this point. It is no one else's fault at all. It is not the requérants', it is not my amendment, it is absolutely at the door of the current ESC – no one else's at all.

2010

Moving on, Deputy Stephens asked me to answer the transition issues. Through you, sir, Deputy Stephens, that is not my job. Bear with me, this amendment uses the words from the main body of the Requête and all this is, is a mild amendment talking about the number of schools. If there are transition issues it is up to the lead requérants to discuss those. It is not for me. I am only amending, along with Deputy Brouard is only amending, a small portion of that.

2015

Deputies Charles Parkinson, Brouard and I think Deputy Soulsby to a degree, made a plea for compromise to ESC. I suspect that is not going to happen. I genuinely think they should find compromise. Was it Mr Woodrow who said the voice of the people should ring in the ears of the leaders? Without a shadow of a doubt the voice of the people and the profession should be ringing in the ears of the leaders of this project – absolutely they should be – and for some reason it is the hear nothing, see nothing, say nothing, smell nothing; I cannot remember what the fourth monkey did.

2020

Deputy Graham thinks that keeping 11-18 open might leave the door open to selection. Okay, that is his view. I also knew I think when I shared this with Deputy Graham and I think he said in the opening speech that the red line would be the fourth model I accept that that is his view.

2025

Deputy Gollop called the amendment a life lost but anyway – I am not going to go through absolutely everything.

2030

Deputy Merrett said she was confused a couple of times and she could not understand why the amendment was not laid two years ago. Well, Deputy Merrett, we were not here two years ago, we were not talking about a reaction from the public, a reaction from the students and a threat of industrial action and the withholding of labour. That is the absolute reason we were not here.

2035 As someone who lost the previous model and I think to a degree there were elements of it that were not very good the reason to answer her question it is not very clever to come back and say well you could have done this two years ago. I told Deputy Fallaize and I have said it again in the States is that I will never personally agree with 11-18 college but I will never brief against him but I will never vote for it, and I kept that, I was true to my words.

2040 It is not me that wrote the letter from the unions; it is not me that wrote the letter from Le Murier, St Sampson's, Les Beaucamps and La Mare de Carteret; it is not me that started People Power of Guernsey; it is not me that led 2,500 people through the streets of this Island. The problem has been the Education Committee, no-one else's. They have brought this on this Island, no-one else has done it. It is their failure of leadership; it is their failure to deliver the transformation that was promised in this Assembly two years ago. That is the answer to Deputy Merrett's question.

2045 Finally, I am just going to talk to Deputy Dorey and again another member of ESC who seems to be dancing on a pinhead. He is so concerned about Rule 4(3). Now I will remind Deputy Dorey that only two years ago he presented it was part of through you, that presented a letter on the inert waste strategy, now that was £30 million it transpired that that was written on the back of a fag packet, basically that Committee of which he was a member of told us via email through Deputy Brehaut that effectively they did the maths and they took the last job multiplied it by the RPI by 15% and added 40%. Seven months later it became £42 million. We now have a policy letter in place where it is now £45 million and I am fairly sure when Deputy Ferbrache behind me will have the unfortunate position of having to present it, he will be telling the States he is not even sure it is £45 million. So from now I will take no lessons at all from Deputy Mark Dorey on something that we put together to try and save his project, his project in two minutes when he had two years to get –

2060 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

2065 **Deputy Hansmann Rouxel:** Deputy Inder is making this very personal to Education, Sport & Culture. As a States' decision, as a consensus Government, sir, we all take responsibility for the decisions made by this Assembly. Deputy is straying into the territory of now making personal attacks on one of the Members.

2070 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Inder, I think it is fair that you can speak to the debate and the amendment that you are proposing without necessarily – I am adopting your wording – 'dialling things up' to the extent that you seem to be at the moment.

Deputy Inder: Sir, I accept that but I am a bit of a scrapper so there you go, sir. But I am not withdrawing any of it because those are absolutely facts.

2075 So anyway, let's get to the actual amendment itself. The idea of this amendment is effectively as we said –

Deputy Merrett: Point of correction please, sir.

2080 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Deputy Inder said it was Deputy Mark Dorey's project. It clearly is not Deputy Mark Dorey's project. It is clearly a policy of the position of the States of Deliberation.

2085 **The Deputy Bailiff:** It is a fair point in the sense there is more than one person involved, Deputy Inder. But you are dealing with, as I understood it, the criticisms that were levelled at this

amendment by reference to the information provided pursuant to Rule 4(3), and that was something that was raised by Deputy Dorey in the debate.

2090 But once again, if we can see the positives as to why people should support this amendment, Deputy Inder, that might focus people's minds.

Deputy Inder: Sir, I was getting –

2095 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Another point of correction has been called, Deputy Inder. Deputy Dorey.

Deputy Dorey: Sir, this is not a comparable situation –

Deputy Inder: No, it is worse.

2100 **Deputy Dorey:** That policy letter was put forward with the best knowledge at the time given by officers. This Rule 4(3) is not put together with the best knowledge at that time, at the time presented by the officers. It has no resemblance to the amount of money involved, therefore it cannot be a comparable situation.

2105 **Deputy Inder:** Sir, I am –

The Deputy Bailiff: Just a minute, Deputy Inder.

2110 That is not really a point of correction as such, in that Deputy Inder is giving his view and he is entitled to give his view, so he has not done something that is inaccurate or misleading as such and therefore it should not have been a point of correction.

Can we move away from this issue and get back to –

Deputy Inder: I am moving away from this issue –

2115 **The Deputy Bailiff:** – the debate on the amendment.

Deputy Inder: I was going to move on to waste strategy and new jetties, but I will leave it there.

2120 So where we are at the moment is asking this Assembly to adopt this Proposition to replace Proposition 2.

There is not much more to say on the matter. I think Deputy Laurie Queripel said a couple of days ago the reality is we all know where we are I am not going to try and convince anyone, people have all got their positions and we will vote the way we will vote, sir, and I will be asking ask for – and I think it has previously been asked for – a recorded vote.

2125 Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Yes, there has been a request for a recorded vote already. This is amendment number 8, Members of the States, which is proposed by Deputy Inder, seconded by Deputy Brouard, the effect of which if carried would be to substitute Proposition 2 as set out.

2130 Recorded vote, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried: – Pour 14, Contre 22, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Brouard
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint
Deputy Le Tocq

CONTRE

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Langlois
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Dorey

NE VOTE PAS

None

ABSENT

Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Le Pelley

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States the voting on amendment number 8 proposed by Deputy Inder seconded by Deputy Brouard was that there were 14 Members who voted *Pour*, 22 who voted *Contre*, three absences and therefore the amendment is lost.

Deputy McSwiggan, it is now time for amendment number 2 if you wish to lay it.

2135

Deputy McSwiggan: I think it would be wiser not to. It is in everyone's interest we finish today. *(Interjection)*

The Deputy Bailiff: Thank you very much. We will pass over amendment number 2. Amendment number 3, Deputy de Sausmarez, is it your wish to lay that?

2140

Deputy de Sausmarez: Not amendment number 3, sir, but I think amendment number 4.

The Deputy Bailiff: So that is not being laid. So it is amendment number 4. Do you wish that to be read at all or can you speak to it?

2145

[Amendment 4](#)

To insert after Proposition 2 the following:

"3. To agree that any comparison or consideration of educational models must exclude models that involve selection by academic ability or aptitude."

Deputy de Sausmarez: I will just speak to it, sir, in the interest of getting on, if that is okay. We certainly do not need any long debate on this I am sure with the vast majority of people that we need to reach a resolution on this.

This amendment is very simple it is just to agree that any comparison or consideration of educational models must exclude models that include selection by academic ability or aptitude.

2150

It is as the Deputy Bailiff advised yesterday simply to insert a Proposition and so it could if the Assembly decides go through effectively on the nod and then we vote on the substantive Propositions which would be the more efficient way of doing it. However, I think this does run the risk of getting a little bit lost in general debate and so I would perhaps ask it might be a useful

2155 indication, if anyone plans to vote against this if it is a substantive Proposition, to make that intention clear as part of this debate and limit it to that.

Thank you.

2160 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Merrett, do you formally second the amendment. 4?

Deputy Merrett: I do, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Does anyone wish to debate this amendment?

Deputy Ferbrache.

2165

Deputy Ferbrache: No, sir, just to say can we have a recorded vote, because I will vote against it.

A Member: Hear, hear.

2170

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Paint.

Deputy Paint: Well, I did want to add some comments on it but I think we will go on ...

2175

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, I doubt there is anything – I will turn to Deputy Dudley-Owen first just to make sure that she does not wish to exercise her entitlement to speak.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: No, just to say that this is a gratefully short debate.

Thank you very much.

2180

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez, is there any need to reply?

Deputy de Sausmarez: No, sir.

2185

The Deputy Bailiff: Well then, I will put amendment number 4 to you, Members of the States. This is proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez seconded by the Deputy Merrett, the effect of which will be to insert a Proposition 2(a). Those in favour – *(Interjection)* Oh, a recorded vote, I do apologise. Can we have a recorded vote then, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

2190

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Members of the States, I am satisfied that that amendment was carried, therefore we go into general debate on the three Propositions as they now are: 1, 2 and 2(a).

It is apparent that no-one wishes to speak in general debate.

Deputy Ferbrache: I do, sir.

2195

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

2200

Deputy Ferbrache: I was just hoping somebody else might have spoken first. I am going to be a lot briefer than I was because, as Deputy Laurie Queripel said so wisely, no minds have been changed at all during the days and days that we have debated this. But there are some factors that have to be said because they are true.

It is true, and it is not a criticism of the teachers; and it is not a criticism of the students; it is not a criticism of anybody, that our exam results are moderate. It is true that they should be a lot

2205 better for our socio-economic group. It is true that the Education Committee have spent pursuant
to two States' Resolutions many hours, weeks and much blood sweat and tears with committed,
unbiased, experienced educationalists and professionals in bringing to the States these proposals.
It is offensive I think to say they have been done as it has been said several times on the back of a
fag packet. It would have to have been the biggest fag packet in life that I have ever seen. Indeed
2210 Deputy Meerveld almost destroyed his own argument because he showed a traffic assessment
report, I did not count the pages but it looked many, and that was just one of the proposed
school sites – I am not giving way.

Deputy Meerveld: Point of correction, sir.

2215 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Well, I will give way on that.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Meerveld.

2220 **Deputy Meerveld:** The back of the envelope accusation was about the first proposal from two
years ago to bring forward the plan for Education and it was based on the fact of how little work
was done then. The traffic impact study was published on 3rd December 2019 some two years
after that initial decision to adopt the two-school model was made.
Thank you, sir.

2225 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Well, sir, of course I always accept your explanation in relation to points of
correction, but I move on.

2230 In connection with this the point is that a great deal of work has been done. Now, I was not the
only one Deputy St Pier, for example, and Deputy Dudley-Owen and others attended on a
Saturday afternoon and there were others. I can only speak for myself but the hour and a half or
two hours, or whatever we spent there was extremely valuable. I did not get the impression ... I
asked questions, and I said 'If I ask a question I expect it to be answered'; the questions I asked
were fully answered without any caveats, without any qualifications. So I am satisfied that the
2235 Education Department have done their absolute best.

But as is evident in relation ... and I commend Deputy de Sausmarez for bringing it, because I
think perhaps one of the purposes – it is not for me to read her mind – was to sneak out or nose
out those of us that might still have selectionism as a consideration. I am sorry I do, and I am sorry
that it is not to be debated this time and it clearly would not be appropriate to be debated this
2240 time because the States has had two long debates on it in 2016.

Anyway, we move on in relation to where we are. Now we have got to compromise. The word
'compromise' has been used a lot, but if you – and, sir, through you, I am referring to my
colleagues in the States – if you believe that a system is the best, you should not compromise.
What I hoped for when the States ... and I voted first time for the two school model as everybody
2245 has taken great pleasure in reminding me and I have no problem with agreeing with that but I did
do that. I did not vote for it second time round because I realised that I could not be the person
that put the nail in the body of selection for the last time so I could not do that.

But I was hoping that we could come up with something for our 63,000, for our children and
grandchildren and the kids going forward, with something that had a wow factor. I did not know
2250 what it was; I just hoped we would come up with something with a wow factor. None of the
proposals that I have seen even get the letter 'w' out, let alone 'wow'. I can see at the moment
that we are heading for perhaps better mediocrity but still mediocrity. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Deputy Dudley-Owen was right when she said part of the problem was ... She I think took
issue – and I accept there is a difference of opinion – with the statement about the exam results
2255 being moderate. She said we have got probably one of the highest records, we have got the

highest records of full employment in the world and that is exactly true because we have really got full employment, and it means people are not as ambitious as they were. You do not have to get as good qualifications in Guernsey to get a good job in Guernsey as you would if you lived in Sunderland or Swindon. That is the truth of it, you do not have to be competitive.

2260 Our young people are able, they are wonderful, they are very good etc., but they sometimes lack, because this is a gentle and passive place – and long may it continue to be a gentle and passive place – they lack that 5% or 10% bite that you got in a harder, more competitive community. Nothing wrong with that but what worries me is and we have got an example, Deputy Soulsby was given permission, quite rightly, by the Deputy Bailiff yesterday to make a statement
2265 about this possible coronavirus. We are subject more and more to outside pressures.

Now when I say forget the virus, I do not mean to forget the virus, remember the virus, but the virus will come and go: it will take a time to come and it will take a time to go. But what I am worried about is that our full employment we have enjoyed now for a number of years might not always be here. I sincerely hope it will because in my veteran years I am still an optimist and I still
2270 look forward rather than backwards, but I am concerned that there is at least the possibility that it will not be.

So our young people whether they are going to be a social worker, whether they are going to be a doctor, whether they are going to be a financier, whether they are going to be a plumber, whether they are going to be a care worker, have to be the very best at what they do. Because if
2275 they do not then perhaps not in 10 years but perhaps in 20 years, perhaps never, but perhaps in 20 years they will be competing in the real world and they will not be properly equipped. That worries me considerably. That is why I do not think any of these proposals have got the wow factor.

Now we have got ourselves into a real muddle because what we did, and I take collective responsibility for it, we brought the house of Jericho tumbling down without any idea, in any material detail. It does not have to be i-dotting and t-crossing – I have never been an i-dotter or a t-crosser in my life even as a lawyer – because it is the main thing, you have got to get from A to B as quickly as possible. But what we did, we took it down, we did not know when we were starting off whether it was going to be a two school model or a three school model or a
2280 four school model.
2285

Now, people have criticised Deputy Fallaize – and I do not – for saying in one of his manifestos, which are very long and I fell asleep three times when I was trying to read one of them, but they are very interesting – when he was saying he was in favour of a three school model; his view changed. He is an intelligent man, he is an experienced politician, his view changed over a period
2290 of time, and I find that entirely consistent and reasonable.

I give way to Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: I am grateful to Deputy Ferbrache.

In fairness actually it did not, as Deputy Lowe has never tired of telling the States, long before
2295 the 2016 Election I was in the States trying to argue in favour of two 11-18 schools when I think Deputy Dorey and maybe one or two other Members were the only Members of the States so persuaded and it was on that basis that I said I was in favour of three rather than four schools.

Deputy Ferbrache: I accept that. I was not trying to misrepresent Deputy Fallaize (*Interjection*)
2300 at all. But we have had statistics it has been said today that we used to have 30% of young – what are these lovely phrases? – cohorts. They are people: they are not cohorts; they are people. Cohorts is something that I recollect from, I do not know, when I used to watch *Tonto* and the *Lone Ranger* and stuff like that – that shows how old I am; *Dixon of Dock Green* and *Perry Mason* I also watched – but in connection with all of that the number of young people in the private
2305 colleges has fallen to 27%. I do not know whether that is behind – and I do not want to get into that kind of theoretical argument – Elizabeth College going co-educational very soon. I have no

idea whether that was to attract more pupils or not. It may have been it is the 21st century and that is the way they want to proceed, but I do not know.

2310 But the fact is that that indicates to me that the colleges in due course could be in trouble, because the amount of money they are getting from the States reduces over a period of time. This was on the basis that they would then be able to replace the scholarship children over a period of time by fee paying children, and it does not look at the moment as if that is going to happen because our population is not going to increase, so they are going to have to put up their fees, I suppose. That is probably the only way they can do it and that then might put more pressure on

2315 people who are struggling to educate their children privately so the numbers might fall again.

We are in a position today that we are dependent on Elizabeth, Ladies' and Blancheland Colleges to educate even 27%, it is a goodly proportion of our children to a very high standard in a very good way, and to bring about social mobility. Anyway I will move away from that point because we must not mention social mobility nowadays, we must all be equal.

2320 The position that the late Deputy Kuttelwascher and I offered in 2018, and it got very short shrift from this Assembly at all, was to continue with the now old system until the new system was fully up, ready and the button was ready to be pressed. The States gave that very short shrift indeed, I cannot remember how many votes we got but it was not exactly a lot.

2325 So what we did instead as a States is we decided we were just going to get rid of the old system but we were not really sure how long the journey to the new system was going to take. I still come to the conclusion that ... I think Deputy Trott, it is not for me to look into his mind, but the impression I get from Deputy Trott is that I think he was in favour – it might have been with a small 'f' – of the two school model at one time, but he like me, I think – well, I can only say for myself for sure; I am thinking what Deputy Trott might be thinking – realised that there is such a

2330 public outcry in relation to this.

Deputy Brehaut has got great knowledge of the States and if he tells me that 10,121 people signed a petition about Fort George, I accept that and that is a lot more than the 5,700 people some of them who lived in India who signed this particular ... but I assume they are over here working or something, that is all I can assume, but you just get the feel.

2335 I also agree with Deputy de Sausmarez because I may not have had the same emails as her but certainly over the last couple of weeks or so the significant balance of emails I have had are (a) from parents and (b) from parents who say support the two school model. Now they may be different things but overall – and I can only take my own judgement and that is what we are here to exercise our own judgements – I do not think that that is the view of the majority of the

2340 population in Guernsey.

That is what I am coming to say, although I commend all the good work, the criticism that Deputy Fallaize had is disgraceful. The criticism he has had in this Assembly sometimes is not good. The attack on his family, people who do that and they are out there because some of them have said ... they are gutless, spineless, cowards (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and I do not care

2345 whether they are Guernsey born or not. They are not a part of society that I want to be part of. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) So I apologise on behalf of ... I would say scum but I am probably not allowed to and those kind of people that have said that that have attacked Deputy Fallaize and his family.

2350 The position in relation to this is where I disagree with my good friend Deputy Lester Queripel, that money is a consideration because if we are talking about somewhere between two and a half and eleven and a half – whatever the precise figures – dependent upon the length of the delay, that is a lot of money. That is a lot of good, hard-earned taxpayers' money to throw away.

The Requête is not the most ... and I do not mean disrespectfully to the people who have drafted it, the most impressive of documents. Because I am turning to the body of the Requête

2355 not the Propositions and I am turning to paragraph 7 and it says:

The Petitioners request that such consideration ...

And they explain what they mean before (*coughs*) – excuse my cough, it is not coronavirus; it is a cough –

... be delivered in a report which must include a comprehensive comparison of the structure and implementation of the 1 school on 2 sites against other viable non-selective models of educational delivery in Guernsey.'

What is meant by other 'viable non-selective models of educational delivery'? I would be grateful when Deputy Dudley-Owen sums up if she could tell me.

2360 Now what appalled me was what I heard from Deputy Graham yesterday when he was speaking that certain requérants went to see him and his colleagues and he asked, and I think others asked, 'What is your view? What do you think about it? Can you give us some suggestions?'

2365 The answer was, well he diverged from Pavlovian to Kafkaesque – I think probably both were a bit long, but I understand what he meant to say – that they were just saying, 'That's for you, that's for you.' It is *not* for you. It is not for Deputy Fallaize, it is not for Deputy Graham; it is for all of us to solve those particular problems. This is not a buck that can be passed. It is something that we have to deal with. So I do not understand what is meant by that phrase.

It says this:

For the purposes of transparency and accountability it is essential for States' Members to be presented with research in totality for them to be able to make an informed decision regarding what will lead to the best outcomes for the Island.

2370 What is meant by 'For the purposes of transparency and accountability' 'presented with research in totality'? Does that mean we have to have thousands and thousands and thousands of pieces of paper? Deputy Graham told us and was right: we had 100-odd pages of a business case supported by another 170 pages, we had 370 pages of material and I think I commented at the time when it was put forward that I thought it was a well presented document or series of
2375 documents, it gave me enough information to be able to make a decision, so do we really want however many models there are 2, 4, 6 – ?

I give way to Deputy –

2380 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Sir, I thank Deputy Ferbrache for giving way. He has picked up on a point that I was going to raise but I would just like his thoughts on the actual Proposition .What has been inserted into the Proposition is quite interesting because as well as saying 'with other viable models of non-selective education', it also goes on to say 'previously presented to and considered by', and I think that is a really important point because it is not saying additional; it is saying previously presented. So I would just like his views on that, sir, and I thank him for giving way.

2385

Deputy Ferbrache: I am grateful for that comment.

2390 Deputy Roffey alerted us to that problem however many days ago it was because it is prescriptive. If it took those words out in brackets which I suggested etc. then you could have looked ... The Proposition is far more prescriptive than the paragraph that I have just read from the policy letter, but no doubt Deputy Dudley-Owen will explain that in due course, because we could be getting ourselves into a position by ending up with the position that this Requête is passed, the Committee go away and they say, 'Well, we cannot look at this model because it was not previously considered.' Previously considered means previously considered in reasonable detail, that is the only way; not 'Oh somebody may have given you an article from the such and
2395 such, *The Times Education Supplement*', if that still continues to exist, that you have read and said, 'Oh well, I have considered that now.' It has got to be properly considered. So again a good point raised –

I give way to Deputy Trott.

2400 **Deputy Trott:** Thank you.

It seems to me, sir, that it should be all models previously considered by any Education, Sport & Culture Committee, not simply the one that is currently in existence. (*Interjection*) Sir, I think that those who are looking to complicate this are doing so unnecessarily and misleadingly.

2405 **Deputy Ferbrache:** I do not just mean the individuals that comprise this Committee – oh sorry, I give way to Deputy –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I do appreciate Deputy Ferbrache giving way and I do apologise for interrupting but it is probably better that I address this matter now, rather than weaving it in later, 2410 whilst it is live.

Two decades' worth of work has been carried out by officers of the States and research based on local figures, patterns of behaviour, etc. and what has been successful and what has not been successful, and it was an attempt in drafting the Requête to make sure that that work was used as a base line and to work up the review. The review is not intended to go into the depth of an 2415 outline, strategic or final programme business case at all. The economic case as I stated in my opening speech is sufficient to be able to provide the options appraisal that would be useful for States' Members, for stakeholders, for members of the community to have a very good view of what the viable options are.

Now if we are talking about viable we could say, 'Actually, what is not viable? Okay, we will get 2420 land off Chouet and we will put a one school site down there.' Now that to me would not be viable, so it was in an effort to try and to reduce the scope to prevent completely new off the cuff ideas coming in that really had not been explored before, but there is plenty of information about previously researched models and what the requérants or certainly those of us who built it was trying to reduce that scope to something that was reasonable and that had been considered by 2425 previous committees not just this one, the one before, or the one before that, but to make use of that work that had been done.

Deputy Ferbrache: I am grateful for that but I still do not understand – I will deal with Deputy Trott's point in a moment – I will give way to –

2430 **Deputy Fallaize:** I am grateful to Deputy Ferbrache.

I think there are two considerations which may assist in the argument he is making which I agree with. The first is that although it is helpful if Deputy Dudley-Owen is now saying that the comparison she envisages should be restricted to what is the economic case in the business case 2435 model that does not include educational considerations, so that is going to be a very odd comparison I think that the committee is instructed to carry out. It looks at all the finances but does not look at the educational case.

Secondly, although I accept that the word 'committee' as in 'previously presented to and considered by the Committee' can be taken to mean successive committees in the way Deputy 2440 Trott states, the one model which has not been considered by any committee ever is three 11-18 schools or colleges. This is the point that will be of interest to Deputies Parkinson and Soulsby and Le Tocq and Brouard who have become attracted to that kind of model. That is not a model that has been previously presented to any committees and therefore cannot form the basis of this analysis that is being proposed in the Requête. So it is restricted to the finances only and it 2445 excludes the only other model which has threatened to get any sort of substantial support in the States.

Deputy Ferbrache: I am glad to have drawn it out from Deputy Dudley-Owen, she may develop it further when she makes her closing speech. I interpreted the words 'viable' to be both 2450 economically and educationally viable. I am just saying how I interpreted it because the words do not say that, we have got the observation.

Where I think I disagree a bit with Deputies Fallaize and Trott is that I hope I am not being too legalistic but if you look at Proposition – no, it is just I do not want us to get ourselves into a mess and come back – the Comptroller can always advise if I get the law wrong because I have always regarded myself as just a humble small town Guernsey advocate a man of limited ability doing his best, but in relation to that the way that I would interpret Proposition 2 is as follows because it reads:

To direct the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture ...

Now pausing there, as I understand it the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture has only existed since 1st May 2016 and it goes on:

...to prepare a report before the end of the term ...

– etc., and it said for consideration:

...previously presented to and considered by the Committee ...

I may be misunderstanding Deputy Trott, if I am I apologise, and it is me and not him. I believe that means they can look at anything that any Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture have considered since 1st May 2016, it does not have to be these individuals it could be the previous Committee, but what it cannot do is go back a look at the Committee *for* Education or whatever it was called pre-May 2016. I do not believe it can do that because it says the Committee, it is prescriptive in the way that it has been drafted. In due course, now I am not asking the learned Comptroller to give an opinion, but that is a matter for him if he feels wants to or if someone else asks him.

But we carry on anyway. My next point is in relation to paragraph 8 of the policy letter and it says:

If the Proposition set out in the Prayer of this Petition are approved, your Petitioners believe that a delay of one year in implementation of the 1 school on 2 sites model may be anticipated.

I can only say having been in this Assembly now for the best part of four years that would be unique –

I give way to Deputy Lowe.

Deputy Lowe: Thank you, Deputy Ferbrache. I was just about to sit down because you did not actually see me stand.

It is just before you moved on to this part where you were actually talking about the direction to Education, Sport & Culture. Of course you are absolutely right that is a direction but he would know as an existing States' Member who has been in the States for quite some time that that is a direction but that never prohibits any committee ever coming back after listening to the States they can more in and bring back a report there can be extra things there taking the sentiment of what has been expressed in the States. There is no tie that you cannot ever bring anything extra, as has happened many times previously.

Deputy Ferbrache: It may or may not have happened many times previously. I am not going to gainsay the Mother of the House, but I do not think it can because of the wording of the Requête. I am only giving my view other people are entitled to disagree with that and that will be something that they will factor in when they give their votes or they consider their vote in due course.

But anyway I am going back to point 8 paragraph 8:

If the Proposition set out in the Prayer of this Petition are approved, your Petitioners believe that a delay of one year in implementation of the 1 school on 2 sites model may be anticipated.

What I was going to go on to say is that that is just not realistic. I can remember... let me give you two, they are probably trite examples, they are probably not particularly apposite but they stick in my mind at least.

2495 I had great concerns about the Population Management Law, great concerns about that. I was one of the small minority that did not like the Stone the Crows-type principles, and we were told and I am sure in good faith by Deputy St Pier and Deputy Lowe – and I am sure in good faith – that by March 2019 we would have a revision of the paper report. Now we are now in March 2020 and we have not got one and we have not got a date to get one. That was something relatively simple compared with the education system for population.

2500 The other one that sticks in mind is and I can see the brickbats coming as I say it, is Aurigny and the PSO – *[A mobile phone rings]*

Sorry about that, I will switch my mobile off, I do not know who is calling but I shall switch it off. *(Interjections)* We were told – it is probably somebody phoning me about Aurigny! *(Laughter and interjection)* But we were told that the PSO would be ready ages ago. The first run around the track did not bring up – and I am probably using the wrong terminology but people know what I mean – would probably bring about ... So people did not put in tenders that were sufficient whatever it was.

2510 So we have run round the track again, but we are still running round that track because we do not know when we are going to get to the finishing line because only a few months ago – I do not blame P&R – they had passed to them from Economic Development their recommendations. That is what we were told. I do not know what they are.

2515 Deputy St Pier said in a recent States' meeting that 'I think it is April at the earliest and it may be later' and I accept what he says. If it is later I think it is going to be September because we are going to have a new States. By the time it gets round, it will be September, that is my best guess before we have a PSO. That has already impacted considerably on what Aurigny could do for Alderney this summer and Aurigny have done their best to address that but it has caused significant problems.

2520 Here we are talking about a blinking, bloaney education system and we are expecting to do it in a year, which means ... I think it was Deputy Fallaize who did the analysis, there would have to be a policy letter by October, bearing in mind we are now March, they have got all the work to do of the Education Department anyway. We have got an election in June, we have then got all the elections and we have got the summer holidays ... October is completely utterly unrealistic.

2525 What we are told is that they have asked ... The petitioners have requested from the Committee for Education estimates of the costs associated with a one year delay. Well we have been given that estimate: if it is one year it is £2½ million; if it is longer than that it is £11½ million. We are going to go into a delay of two or three years at the least. That is my best guess, and I feel sorry for parents who have got kids who are in Years 5, 6 or whatever. Two of my grandchildren are at the wonderful school, Castel Primary and they are a boy of going to be nine in April and another boy who is going to be eight in June, so it is not that long before they go through that system. It is only a year or two off. They are probably going to have completed their education. One is going to be a footballer; I do not know what the other one is going to be – and one of them supports Arsenal, for which I will never forgive Deputy Fallaize *(Interjections)* – but they are probably going to be well involved in their education before that has happened.

2535 It is awful for parents I know. I am concerned about parents. It is awful for kids, because it is their education. We have been educated. For good, bad or indifferent, we have been educated. That is such a crucial part of your life from the age of about eight or nine until you are about 16. That is such an important part of your life. It is a difficult part of your life, you have got hormones and all the other things, puberty, and all the other things you go through and you have got ... what you want is certainty at home and you want certainty at the place you go to school and we are not going to give that.

2540 But all of that, and I think I am in the Deputy Trott camp because of the overwhelming, I believe, opinion both of teachers ... and I saw the teachers, they came and signed their things

2545 before me and I have absolutely no doubt that they are genuine and because of the overwhelming view of so many people of Guernsey I have got to support this Requête but it is with a considerable degree of regret.

Amendment 4:

Carried – Pour 28, Contre 4, Ne vote pas 4, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Green
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Le Tocq

CONTRE

Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Inder
Deputy Paint

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Brouard
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Trott
Deputy Smithies

ABSENT

Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowden
Deputy Le Pelley

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting on amendment 4 proposed by Deputy de Sausmarez, seconded by Deputy Merrett was that there were 28 votes in favour, 4 votes against, 4 abstentions and 3 absences. That is why amendment 4 was carried.

Deputy Gollop.

2550

Deputy Gollop: Yes, thank you.

I find a lot to agree with Deputy Ferbrache in his speech, even though I am a requérant. I would agree it is not the most perfectly written document in the history of the States but it is essentially a vehicle that has been, in a very busy period, put together by a group of very concerned States' Members who have been reacting to what has been a degree of public disquiet, unprecedented, I think Deputy Trott used the word, in modern times and a degree of teacher dissatisfaction with the implementation. What that means we do not need to go into.

2555 One Member earlier said that there was no great trade union support for the Requête or the amendments. I do not know for certain about that but what I do know is many of us who signed the Requête had a very useful dialogue with a key unionist who was not that enamoured of most of the amendments but was supportive of the Requête going through at this stage to allow everybody to cool down and re-assess. That is not the union supporting a three school model or a two school model or anything else, it is more about the process.

2560 I am a little disappointed Deputy McSwiggan did not put forward her amendment because I think it is useful because at no time does the Requête *per se* seek to interfere in the evolution of the Institute or delay the La Mare de Carteret Primary School or any other investment of that kind.

2565

Again I was perhaps even keener personally and I think the requérants were generally not against the other Deputy de Sausmarez amendment she did not place, about the need to reassess travel, because one of the considerations that Parish Douzeniers, people who made planning representations, the community in different schools at rallies and meetings and so on has been about the logistics of dropping off, buses, travel. I think that her sentiments about looking at active travel plans, making that idea work better for us, at looking at healthy alternatives, at improving public transport systems and the neighbourhoods, and investing maybe in infrastructure both small and large is a positive way to go. So I hope whatever happens that more work on that will be done.

Moving forward, somebody gave me a lunchbox today, a Butterfield lunchbox, even though I had a lunch somewhere else, because I missed the lunch talk, and I put an orange ribbon on it as distinct from a green ribbon because we need to move on with healing so that we do make for the foreseeable future the consensus model work. But for the consensus model to work that Deputy Roffey and Deputy Fallaize and other Members have spoken about requires a degree of compromise and meeting of minds rather than hard and fast split votes.

I am glad we are coming to the final part of this debate. But I of course voted to not put selection back into the equation because, although there are many distinguished people in the community who prefer to look at that and there may well be candidates at the election and so on who will put it as a priority, I think we have gone through a lot of division on the issues and the community needs to heal on that. The focus of this Requête is clear it is on logistics of the plans and the model and the implementation of the model, not about more fundamental issues.

As I say the Requête is fundamentally a vehicle for managing change more effectively, and I think that is the approach we should take to it, because it offers a period of healing a period of reconciliation and a period to reconsider various options.

I know this might offend some people, but in a way you have to take Deputy Lowe's approach and realise that the Requête might not be perfectly worded but you have a Committee that has common sense and courage, it will give a militant yet moderate interpretation of what it means. In that sense they have to make it up as they go along because the Requête might not specify three schools of 11-18 but as this debate has progressed and in the last month or so, I have become aware that maybe that is the Guernsey way forward which keeps the strongest aspects of the 11-18 model combined with a smaller scale which is less threatening to some professionals and some parents with children with special needs and some communities. So we have to have a degree of common sense in interpreting this.

If we walk out of here with the model still intact and the Requête lost, not only will elements of the community be disconcerted by that but we are ignoring the realities of the situation about the business case about the planning meeting and about the very limited timeframe before maybe a different committee has to be selected whether we like it or not.

I think the sensible way is to support the Requête and give it hopefully a way forward that the current Committee can use and remember the wording of the Requête when you go into it does not even rule out the two school model. It just says pause and reflect and review, it is not about making irreversible decisions on the floor of the Assembly.

It is absurd we are still talking here five days in and tenders are coming in. We have to put the brake on the tenders. That is the only sensible way to go.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

If Deputy Gollop thinks that passing this Requête will launch a period of healing and reconciliation I think he is very much mistaken. This is not going to be pouring oil on troubled waters, it is going to be pouring oil on troubled flames. Because Deputy Ferbrache was half right and he was half wrong. He was right that the delay that this is going to actually engender is going to be for a period of years and it is going to be very expensive and very destructive.

Where I think he was probably wrong ... I mean he was right in his assessment that certainly from my inbox the emails over the last few weeks have been very largely from parents and those that are in favour of the model, but overall over the last couple of months more people have written to say that they are against the project. But Deputy Ferbrache, like me, has been round the block: you hear an awful lot more from people that are against something than you hear from people who are in favour of something. You always hear from people ... we have established States' policy here – people do not tend to write to their Deputies and say, 'We support established States' policy', because they think that is what is going to happen.

I believe that if this goes through and the sort of delay that he rightly identifies is engendered there is going to be a heck of a reaction from people whose families are actually impacted, not a period of healing. Yes we need a period of healing; this is not a route to it. This is a route to inflammation, not healing.

Of course, we are not just talking about delays for the 11-16 or 11-18 schools. Deputy Ferbrache again was right: the ESC will be directed to compare the models that have been presented to this Committee. Now this Committee from 2016 to 2020, what is the other main model that has been presented? One that treats post-16 tertiary education totally differently to the way it is in these plans and therefore, if that is to be re-examined and regarded as a runner again, it absolutely has to put the brakes on what happens with the Guernsey Institute, even though I do not think anybody in this Assembly wants to do that. But that is the upshot of passing ... Well, Deputy Trott apparently does – I do not why – he was pointing at himself when I said I didn't think –

No, I do not – I think you have had your quota of 100 give ways in this –

Deputy Trott: On a point of correction then, sir, I –

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Trott.

Deputy Trott: And it is a genuine point of correction because I seconded an amendment that enabled the green light for the Institute which was wholeheartedly rejected by the Education, Sport & Culture Committee, so I think that is a relevant point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Roffey to continue.

Deputy Roffey: It is not, how is that entirely relevant? What we are discussing now is whether to pass a requête which instructs ESC to consider a model seriously as a comparator which means that we have to stop work on the Guernsey Institute because to do otherwise would be to completely stymie it.

Now also we have to stop work really on the La Mare Primary School because that other model that we have to consider involved the rebuilding of La Mare Senior School and really that is the whole question of where ... and it is only when we decant from the existing La Mare that we are able to build the new primary school on the site of the secondary school where it is now.

Sir, I am not going to do a long speech here because I think over the last few days, even though we have probably been wrong to do general debate through the amendments, I think that most of us have actually put forward most of what we wanted to say.

What I will say though is if we walk out of here with this Requête passed, with these vague instructions; with these years of delay; with these huge extra costs; with the transition models blown out of the water; with young people who thought they knew their route through the educational system no longer having any route marked out for them; I think after we have twice passed by big majorities, the fact that this is the right way, largely on the back of a well organised and angry campaign, it will be a real low point in the government of this Island. If the States want to do it I cannot stop them, I am going to vote the way I think, but it will be on Members'

2670 consciences and you answer – not you, sir – they should answer those that actually say, ‘How did you do this to my family?’ Because I just do not have an answer to that.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

2675 **Deputy de Lisle:** Thank you, sir.

I want to be quite short on this but just to make the first point which is I would like to commend the department actually and its officers and the Committee itself for actually taking the de Lisle/Le Pelley/McSwiggan amendment. I would like to also thank Deputy McSwiggan for filling in for Deputy Le Pelley and I am sure all here wish Deputy Le Pelley all the very best and a speedy recovery. (Several Members: Hear, hear.)

2680 But to the department for actually just in that week turning around an updated assessment of like-for-like comparative costs associated with the two educational models, the two school model and the three school model, and providing that within a week and showing actually that the comparative costs were fairly close to one another; but also indicating other areas that had to have further assessment in terms of costings. The fact is it was done and it was done within a week or so.

2685 Secondly I would like to just say that in the interest of the education system in this Island for the future that the model that we take forward must take consideration of all levels of abilities, learning difficulties and disabilities within an embracing open and fair educational system that will enhance our current level of education so that each child can learn and develop to their very best and to their full potential. I think that is extremely important.

2690 The third point that I would like to mention is that the rationalisation of secondary education along the lines of a two school system I feel is too much. We have four secondary sites with superb playing fields and with structures on them also, and these have been paid for by the Guernsey taxpayer, that very large facility at the Grammar School at Les Varendes, a huge area really of sporting facilities outside the actual buildings themselves. To throw that away makes relatively little sense in my consideration. We do not have to restrict our future secondary education to just two sites.

2695 The problem of traffic and crowding: surely to goodness that can be overcome by using more than two sites. So I think that is something that we have to seriously consider here and this is where I feel that the three school model has much to offer us. I believe that this can be accomplished in the three school model in smaller community based schools than two very large comprehensive schools.

2700 So I ask that those few points are taken aboard and that we work to accommodate and utilise the facilities that we have, and that we have paid for, into the future so that we do not find ourselves crowding our students and our teaching staff into small spaces and having the traffic concerns of congestion and so on around those particular facilities. Open it up become as transparent as possible in terms of reflecting what the public want that surely is what we should be looking at in terms of our future secondary system.

2705 Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Le Clerc.

2710 **Deputy Le Clerc:** Thank you, sir.

2715 I hope to just make a few quick points. I firstly wanted to pick up on what Deputy Ferbrache has said about the years of delay and also what Deputy de Sausmarez said when she spoke before the lunch break, and this is about the effect of decisions on children and their families – I think in particular families, because we agreed in this Assembly a way forward and families will have made financial decisions based on the decisions that we made in this Assembly.

2720 Sometimes we have flip-flopped over the years: we are flip-flopping again with a requête on the L’Ancresse Sea Wall. That does not affect families, that does not affect the finances of families,

and that does not affect the emotional wellbeing of families. This sort of flip-flopping affects families.

As I say, people will have made decisions, they will have made decisions where they are going to live on the Island, they may have already sold their house to move into a catchment area where they think that their children will be going to school because they prefer that school. There will be decisions made by people that have come to work on this Island based on our educational model that we currently have. That is not fair to those people.

I think the other thing is it sends out this message that we do not know where we are going. We will need over the next few years immigration, we will need people, key workers coming to this Island not just on education, but in nursing in the care community, and again what message are we sending out to those people saying well we cannot make up our mind it is still all up in the air what we are going to decide on education.

So I would just ask Members to think really carefully, we have made decisions that others in our community will have made financial decisions and an impact and we are affecting their lives.

I think the timeline in this Requête is completely unrealistic to come back before the end of 2020. We have got an election, we will have new committees in place and we have got the summer break when we know that a lot of this work will be down to the officers at ESC. They will be going on their summer break, it is not the right time to be putting in a time critical timeline on this.

So what will happen is the future Committee of ESC will come back and make apologies to this Assembly, 'I am really sorry, we could not do it in the timeline.' We are just setting up the next Committee to fail before they even start.

So, sir, this has been a terrible debate, I do not know how people will vote. I am just concerned that we are flip-flopping on a decision that is one of the most important decisions that we will make. I am more or less certain that I will not be able to vote for the Requête. Again I am open-minded if someone comes up with a fantastic reason why.

One last thing and that is talking about the educational outcomes. I feel a lot of the emails that I have received have focused on the space and the travel plans rather than on the educational outcomes. And for me that is a real shame because I am sure those teachers will have valid reasons on the educational outcomes but that message has not really come through to me which is a real shame.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Smithies.

Deputy Smithies: Thank you very much, sir.

Here we are late in the afternoon on the fifth day of the session and I thought it unlikely that there would actually be any open minds left, but I am delighted to hear that Deputy Le Clerc still has an open mind. In the hopes I might persuade one or two others who have not made up their minds yet, I will have an attempt.

Since September 2019 several questions have been asked and some unexpected events have arisen, questions about space, traffic, curriculum delivery and issues arising from stakeholder unrest and uncertainty have put ESC on to the back foot, defending their position and possibly leading to a series of apparently ill-considered responses and decisions – my opinion – and by the Committee's own admission a breakdown in communications.

It is time for a pause and a period of reflection. This need not be a long period. To suggest as some have that there will be years of delay and cost is to deploy project fear and project fear is so last year and rather like the *Wizard of Oz* a much overblown midget.

I suggested in a previous speech that the basic work exists and can be updated fairly quickly. Before taking irrevocable steps I would like to see a fully justified case which will compare the alternatives. The last amendment attempted to limit the range of those alternatives and I could just accept that and I might have supported it if the timescale was shorter.

In closing Deputy Fallaize said just a few minutes ago that the one model which had not been considered by his Committee was the three 11-18 schools. How then in the ESC letter of comment on 21st February 2020 are the Committee able to comment so authoritatively about this option. For example on page 3 of the letter the three times 11-18 model is referenced and quote:

... detailed assessments... are set out in [Appendices] 4 and 5,

Indeed Deputy Dorey held up and referenced Appendix 5, comment 3 of which examines the benefit analysis of the three times 11-18 model.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Soulsby, do you want to speak now rather than towards the end of the debate when I can call you in any event under Rule 28?

Deputy Soulsby: I am happy to speak now, sir.

I have to say I do take objection to Deputy Smithies' comment there about, 'Oh I am glad somebody has still got an open mind', if everybody is to come in here and it is so easy, there is one group of people on one side that support the Requête and do not ...

Deputy Le Clerc has just said it has been difficult for her. I can absolutely say it has been really difficult for me from day one when this Requête was even thought about. My heart sank and I thought golly, we are going to have all the debate going either way and it is not something – I do not have a strong ideological view point, I had nothing to do with this, so probably resurrecting this has really – and I am not going to give way; I think we have been debating this long enough and sooner we get on with it and vote the better, but I do need to say this.

I just think yes, some of us do have an open mind and go in to debate with that open mind and I think that is as it should be. I am really angry that we have spent four days and have got absolutely nowhere – absolutely nowhere. People have decided again we know what we do not like but we do not know what we do. We have really got to come out... I was hopeful that we would have a compromise I know Deputy Inder can sometimes be a bit like a Jack Russell and get loud and angry but I think what he tried to do with his amendment was good and it could have come up with a compromise, and I am just sorry that we seem to have two sides polarised against that actually happening.

I can see Deputy Dudley-Owen moving but I think I would recommend that she sits in her seat because I have got some questions for her in part of my speech.

So I do not know how I will vote even now. I think the only way I will be able to decide is by listening to the response to the questions that I have for Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Fallaize and possibly from P&R.

So from Deputy Dudley-Owen, I want to know will she admit that this Requête will lead to years of uncertainty and significant cost. If she does not then she has lost my vote immediately because I think despite what Deputy Smithies said this will lead to years of uncertainty and significant costs. We have already heard even though I was happy to support looking at two 11-18 schools or three 11-18 schools, Deputy Dorey said how that would cost a minimum of a million pounds, and that was basically the express version of having a pause and review.

This Requête is not seeking an express version. This could go on for a very long period of time, something Deputy Ferbrache admitted and he will be happy to support the Requête and live with that. But for me as I have said all along that uncertainty is an issue.

But then if she does admit that it will lead to years of uncertainty and significant cost, why does she think this uncertainty is worth it, what is it that it will resolve? Because pause and review is a process – that is all it is. It is a process, let's pause and review, but it is not what we should always be looking at and so often do not, what is the outcome that she is seeking? I have not heard much debate about what outcomes we are seeking. At this moment in time I do not see what outcomes the Requête will provide us. So I am concerned about that so I would like to know the response to that second question.

For Deputy Fallaize there is considerable, if not overwhelming opposition to the current plan and I say plan because I think it is the plan not the model. I am not sure, I am honestly not sure because I think it is mixed up in the whole idea of two is worse than three because of traffic and size of schools but I think generally from a teacher's point of view I think it is probably more to do with the plan and the implementation than it is over the model itself because we had none of this when we debated it two years ago the difference between two and three schools, and conceptually teachers I think could live with it. But I think the problem is the implementation.

So my questions are does he believe he will be able to turn this opposition around? I think it is important. I think this flattening people right down and saying it is our way or the highway will not be a great start. If so, because it was not clear from the ESC amendment how he will do this with his Committee, because greater engagement ... it was unclear from that amendment, and I thought that was one weak point of the amendment. So I need to know how he will be able to turn that opposition around.

Thirdly does he have the resources to do so? Then that leaves me with if he does not, my question to P&R would be: would P&R provide those resources?

So, sir, I want the two school model to succeed. I still think it is the best model. The meeting that I went to on that Saturday afternoon – another wet Saturday afternoon – with Deputy Ferbrache, clearly showed that it restored my confidence that I thought I had made the best decision at the time from all the evidence that was available, and there is a lot of evidence. There is not a right or wrong, though, in that you balance things up and in that balance of what you see, you can say, 'Well, I think that the two school model will work better for children and for their outcomes than other models.'

But clearly things have gone very wrong in the execution. So the question for me is how is it best turned round? Is it through the Requête or more engagement with the community? Even though I am not certain how I will vote, it will be determined by the answers I get.

Thank you.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: Thank you, sir.

I will start by just speaking to what Deputy Soulsby just said because I do believe, on that wet Saturday afternoon at the meeting which I was also at, that if members of our community or even Deputies who are members of our community had gone along to that meeting with an open mind, then a lot of the concerns that have been raised could have been answered openly and honestly and apolitically, meaning without political interference or spin.

I got great comfort from that meeting on that Saturday afternoon. I remained behind and I spoke to the educationalists there and they were able to answer all of my questions and in a manner that gave me great comfort and support for what they are trying to achieve.

I think Members might be able to enjoy the pun of doing one's homework, especially in an education debate because Deputy Hansmann Rouxel has recently I think in the last 24 hours or so sent out an amazing bit of homework where she has correlated a lot of the data and compared and contrasted – and I think a reasonable amount of us in this Assembly do our homework as well, so what confuses me is that what Deputy Dudley-Owen is asking for in the Requête is asking for someone else to do the homework. Proposition 2 says prepare a report, that is ESC:

... that must include a comprehensive comparison... with other viable models... previously presented to and considered by the Committee ...

Now my understanding is that the Committee that currently hold the seats have been working on this model as directed by the States so that means to me that the previously presented to the Committee would be the Committee that Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Meerveld were vice-President of in this political term, so really they should have that information and data, but then

when Deputy Ferbrache spoke, it drew down to actually it is an economic case and then from the side-lines of the Assembly, I think actually Deputy Dudley-Owen said well, it is also about the educational case, I think that is what she was saying whilst Deputy Ferbrache was speaking.

2875 So the viable model but how about being politically viable or viable to our community or educationalist because it appears that when Deputy Ferbrache spoke on the Requête he was speaking about is it viable to our community or educationalists. So it could be educationally viable it could be economically viable but that will make no difference in this Assembly if it comes before us and (a) is not politically viable or if Deputies or politicians are prepared to say, 'Well, look our community did not find it viable'. So I am staggered for words on that.

2880 Originally I think Deputy Dudley-Owen said in response to Deputy Ferbrache, 'Well, it is the economic case', but I think we are in the realms of knowing the cost of everything and the value of nothing. So quite what the viable thing is, I look forward to Deputy Dudley-Owen summing up because I am sure, even though it took a couple of weeks to meet with ESC, that when Deputy
2885 Dudley-Owen sums up she will be able to tell us what that actually means, it would be quite helpful.

So what the unions have asked for is a full review of models against other options but they want to conduct it in partnership with the workforce. So do the requérants really believe, after listening to debate and to Education, Sport & Culture, do they still stand by these years' delay? I
2890 think this has been questioned by Deputy Soulsby. Do they honestly believe this timeline is achievable? If the requérants do but Education, Sport & Culture do not, then I would look to the requérants to step up and they would deliver it to this timeline.

Now we have heard from three Deputies, the requérants, that they will step up to the plate if they need to, obviously a committee is five Members so we are going to need five people to step
2895 up to the plate to deliver it or unless Education, Sport & Culture suddenly change their minds and say they can deliver it in the timeframe.

Now I am not adverse, sir, to spending more money if it is needed to improve the facilities and the opportunities for our children and young people. I am not averse to that, if a case were brought before us, I am not averse to that. But the cost of the Requête, I am averse to that
2900 because I do not know what it is going to really truly achieve. I believe it will have years of uncertainty. So I have to ask myself does the benefit of delay sufficiently outweigh or counterbalance the disadvantages that the 1,400 of our children may experience. Deputy Lester Queripel said he does not see a problem: well I do, because I believe that stability and certainty is important and a potential policy void is not acceptable.

2905 So we would have no determined model; we would have no staff structures; and our children and young people in a holding pattern going in theory, sir, to four catchment area schools until we manage in this Assembly to resolve this.

I ask, sir, who will be writing to these parents advising them that, 'Actually your child will be in a holding pattern'? I would advise, sir, that that letter does not use that terminology. I advise that
2910 whoever writes that letter is a bit more subtle in terminology and I also advise it is Year 7 and Year 6 for certainty – that is only a year then on to the Year 5s as well.

Sir, I honestly believed we had already determined the best model for secondary education. The title of this Requête is 'Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education' – maybe it should be entitled 'Derailing the Best Model for Secondary Education' or 'Disrupting the Best
2915 Model for Secondary Education' but 'determining', sir, it is not. We are not being asked to determine the best model, we are being asked to and in a bid to be constructive change our minds and defer the determination of the best model of secondary education to someone else to the next political term.

So it is to derail the current transition model, disrupt the opportunity for our first and future
2920 years of non-selective students to have the equality of opportunity – I am just speaking, you have had that opportunity, thank you very much, Deputy Leadbeater – to access the [\[16:21:28\]](#) facilities and the broadening of curriculum offer and enhance the vision of the students with special educational needs and students with communication challenges.

2925 Arguably, as I have said, sir, the delay could last long enough for the first year group of children and others and other year groups they will not be able to choose the GCSE options with any equity. Now we now, sir, that currently only at the Grammar School site can students choose to study three languages or take psychology, photography can be studied at two of our four schools, business studies at three, but these are facts, there are reasons why this is the way it is, but from a student perspective the fact remains there is less opportunity to study the same breadth and width of curriculum becomes more equitable.

2930 Well my preference, sir, would be to have the same options available for all of our students, supported by the teaching profession and their guardians to make informed and individual decisions. Of course our four schools could have the same curriculum offer but the resourcing would be problematic as would achieving optimal class sizes.

2935 For clarity, sir, the resource is not just about teachers; it is also about the money to enable this to happen. So when P&R speak I would ask in these years of delay is there any opportunity of having our current Year 7 children and in September Year 7, Year 8 by the time they choose their GCSE options that they would actually be able to have any parity of provision. It will be a resource which I just cannot imagine, we have come to accept the fact that four schools will not work and yet we are saying potentially if you vote for the Requête that is okay, let's just go out and look at it again and we will come back.

2940 So I applaud Deputy Soulsby for her questions. I think she has articulated them better than I have. I agree with the majority of what Deputy Ferbrache said but I have come to a different conclusion. My conclusion at this stage in the debate is if we are going to have a long delay, if we are going to have between £2 million and £11 million, I prefer to invest that in the model that we have already agreed in stakeholder engagement, in using the money to try to address the real concerns that I have had with comprehensive correspondence with the teachers. I mean space, as we say, is the final frontier but it is not just about additional space; it is about the configuration of the space, and to actually deal with those concerns and spend the millions and millions of pounds and the time on that rather than spending it on looking at models which I do not believe, from the last couple of days, debate will be politically viable. I do not believe unfortunately that the community will coalesce around one model or even that educationalist will coalesce around one model and I think if we try to get majority ... if we try to ask the community and the teachers to lead this rather than for us to set the policy direction ... I think we need to set the policy direction and they need to work to implement it. In fact the unions said, 'We will implement any model you ask us to, we will do that. We are professionals, of course we will, we will implement whatever you want us to implement.'

2950 If it is going to be £2 million to £10 million, if it is going to be two to five years, then I think at this stage in the debate I will not be able to support the Requête unless somebody is going to pull a magic wand out, unless somebody is going to find that unicorn that I have been chasing for years and can actually say we are going to do this within this year, we are going to do ... etc., we are going to get the model of education sorted before the first year group, our current Year 7 actually get to choose options for GCSE and we are going to deliver this and we are going to get the community on board not only educationalist but also parents and it is also going to be politically viable.

2965 So I look forward to Deputy Dudley-Owen summing up.
Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Prow.

2970 **Deputy Prow:** Thank you, sir.

Sir, I can be brief I have made two lengthy speeches – well, not as lengthy as some, sir, so I just want to summarise a couple of points.

2975 Before I do so, just one thing that has occurred to me during this debate that there has been a lot of emphasis on Deputy Dudley-Owen as the lead requérant but there were six other

requérants and I would like to just say having worked with her through this process, I have found her to be very considered, very calm, economic with the use of the media. I think what this Requête has done is highlighted that the process has gone badly wrong, and I think it is a responsible government that recognises that, instead of going 'La, la, la' with their fingers in their ears; that we actually look at what has gone wrong.

In that vein, sir, I would like to turn to the questions, and very valid questions, put by Deputy Soulsby and I am sure Deputy Dudley-Owen is very capable of answering them but I just want to bring out one point around the boring old chestnut of the business case.

Sir, I was rather surprised when a colleague that I highly respect in Deputy Graham made a bit of a personal attack around the interpretation of it, but he does actually have a point. The point that he made is that in the business process the first ... Never mind when the Deputies get to see it, that is not the point I am making, the point is about how we as a government should deal with a business case. He is right to point out that I think the point he was making is there are two aspects to it: one, we should consider a well prepared programme business case, and that should lead to a well prepared project business case, and in the context of the Requête and indeed, when interviewed by the media about it, in the context of the well prepared business case, the requérants are really making the point.

The President of P&R has rightly informed us that the full business case has not yet been submitted. Now this is where I believe the project has gone badly wrong, because if we go back to the programme business case and these are not my words; I am quoting from the information that is available and the guidelines. It says and in the sequence of events the first thing we do is a programme business case and it says:

... enables organisations as key stakeholders to understand and influence the direction of a programme early on in the planning process...

– key stakeholders, the end users. This, sir, in my submission is where this project has gone badly wrong.

Now, whether that is because the model is flawed or because the process is flawed and the problem is that in September ... Again do not listen to anything I have got to say; go back to the Scrutiny Management letter which I thought was a very good letter, which basically pointed out that around the lack of information we had to make the decision to pass delegated authority over to P&R. What was lacking, and what has come back to haunt this Assembly, the public and everybody else, is this lack in the beginning of this process of the stakeholder end user engagement.

Sir, so we have not got a full business case yet. In the full business case it tells us what we should do in a proper structured way through stakeholder end user workshops, then we should also build using that consultation and then that is how we must or we should go through the process.

I think, sir, this is the message from the professionals and we have had reference to the letter of 25th February and I apologise to Deputy Roffey because he does not like me referring to it. But I will again, sir, because it says quite clearly and this is following a consultation and this is recent and they said this that they wished for there to be a period of pause and review to enable alternatives to be considered with the then draft Requête presenting the political means to achieve this. When they talk about the then draft Requête, what they mean is made clear as you go further down the letter: what they mean is the unamended Requête.

So Deputy Soulsby asked us the question well okay, what will this achieve? Well, sir, I hope that this Assembly does support the Requête and that we do have that review, pause and review and that sensible people who are willing to take on that stakeholder engagement and change and listen to it and come back with a report to address those concerns is something worth having, is an end goal worth achieving from this Requête.

I had prepared something for closing but I am going to jump around it a bit, we have been here long enough.

Sir, the other point is that the professionals' concerns are not just limited to space standards, in fact I do not think I have heard much use of the word from the professionals around space standards.

3030 Deputy Inder has gone through the challenge letters from the teachers not the unions. Deputy Ferbrache has gone through a process where he got signatures and how sincere they were.

3035 Sir, the message from those professionals and perhaps going back into Deputy Soulsby's very valid question was the message was they wanted to consult with Education, Sport & Culture on the transformational model – that is what they said, transformational model – and to meaningfully engage in any review and that, sir, from the meetings that I had it was deafening that that was what they wanted to do. They did say that the position of the teachers they represented had hardened and in their words almost unanimously supported the Requête.

Sir, picking out the point about their concerns were not just limited to space standards, they said in their experience of the presentations they have had and the dialogue they have had with ESC they were not saying they had not had any, they just said it was not stakeholder engagement.

3040 There is no more money so no change to plans in relation to the footprint or choice of sites – yes, thank you for that interruption, Deputy Roffey – I am going to explain that it is not just about space. There is no more money, they talked about the footprint or choice of sites to address issues that are raised about overcrowding, lack of identified infrastructure, lack of outside space – yes, that is space – lack of ESC clarity around what the actual model in reality will mean, lack of
3045 safe operation of lunch breaks.

Sir, they went on and they spoke about other concerns that they had and they wanted to be able to in a proper structured stakeholder engagement setting to engage.

3050 Sir, what has disappointed me, I think, and I commend this Assembly – yes, it has been a long horrible debate and yes, as a requérant I am heavily responsible for that – but to me, sir, there has been no recognition of the fact that there is a massive problem that ESC have got with this project.

3055 What has happened is that the space in which to conduct and not only write the business case but actually go through the engagement process has so been so squashed because we have a General Election coming and because they want in indecent haste – I am sorry to use those words, sir – to try and get to a position where their model has actually caused this situation – sorry, do you want me to give way?

Deputy Merrett: It is a point of correction, sir.

3060 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction Deputy Merrett.

Deputy Merrett: It is not their model; it is a model the States of Deliberation have asked them to deliver.

3065 **Deputy Prow:** Sir, I completely accept that –

The Deputy Bailiff: Just a minute, Deputy Prow. That is a point of correction that has been made a number of times now. It does not need to be repeated because it has been put on the record.

3070 Deputy Prow to continue.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir. I will move on.

3075 Sir, I am disappointed that not one inch seems to have been given in the amendment they put forward by ESC. That is why I believe the only option we have is to pause and review this. ESC needs to talk to their staff and their model agreed by the States, you will find that the educational professionals are begging to get involved in delivering a better way forward.

Sir, in fact what has also disappointed me is that ESC have brought on an unprecedented media campaign utilising the States central media machine championing their model and trying to justify it going out to tender whilst ignoring the public protest of concentrated on the professionals, that we cannot ignore, we have to listen –

Deputy Tooley: Sir, point of order.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of order, Deputy Tooley.

Deputy Tooley: Sir, I am just wondering in what manner we are expected to correct assertions which are being made which are incorrect if when we attempt to do so we are told the point of correction has already been made but the comments continue to be repeated. I wonder if you could explain please, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, Deputy Tooley that is not a point of order because you are not suggesting that anyone has broken the Rules, other than me. *(Laughter)*
I will allow Deputy Prow to finish his speech.

Deputy Prow: Thank you, sir.

I am getting there I promise you, sir.

Why the pause and review is so necessary, we just keep hearing that ESC want to champion their model which was agreed by the States I am not trying to argue that, and trying to justify going out to tender whilst ignoring the public protests. It has been a massive public protest when you compare it with other protests in the past well happy days, sir.

I submit, sir, to continue with their plan is just an irrational reaction to their predicament. You cannot in an Island of this size deliver the outcomes outlined if those who have to deliver them within it clearly do not believe in it. End of, sir.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Before I call anyone else let me just try and clarify the point that has just been raised by Deputy Tooley.

It is permissible for a Member to interrupt another Member who is addressing this meeting in accordance with Rule 17(11) to raise a point of order which is defined in the preceding paragraph or a point of correction. But it is a matter of judgement for each Member as to whether they need at that point to stand up and raise a point of correction. It is not really a necessity to raise the same point of correction in respect of a number of Members who have fallen into the same trap, which Deputy Prow arguably had done there, by referring to it as a particular group of people who have a model in mind, but the point had been made, everyone understands the point and it does not really need to be repeated, which is why I said what I said.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, may I move a motion under Rule 26(1) please.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy St Pier wishes to test: those people who wish to speak in this debate first of all will be invited by me to stand in their places, that is those who have not yet spoken who are entitled to speak.

It is still Deputy St Pier's wish to put the motion that debate be curtailed at this point and that we go into the wind up pursuant to Rule 28(3). I will put the motion to you first *aux voix*.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well, once again, I think we are going to have to have a recorded vote on that just to be on the safe side, Members. Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 18, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 3, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Le Tocq

CONTRE

Deputy Brouard
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

ABSENT

Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Le Pelley

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, the vote on the motion pursuant to Rule 26(1) proposed by Deputy St Pier was there voted *Pour* 18, *Contre* 15, 3 abstentions, 3 absentees, and therefore the motion is carried.

We therefore move to Rule 28(3) and go in reverse order of those who are entitled to speak.

3130 Now I called Deputy Soulsby earlier: is there anything, Deputy Soulsby, you wish to add on behalf of the Committee for Health & Social Care?

Deputy Soulsby: No, sir.

3135 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Brehaut, as one of the Presidents of Committees *for the* Environment & Infrastructure, do you wish to speak?

Deputy Brehaut: Very briefly, sir,

3140 The traffic and particularly the traffic impact assessments are always presented like an insurmountable problem that can never be resolved. If the States did really embrace and go by the wording in the Integrated Transport Strategy it is about moving people, and moving people to and from a certain place at a given time is not too complex if you play by the rules and the policies that are within the Integrated Transport Strategy –

I will give way to Deputy de Sausmarez.

3145

Deputy de Sausmarez: I am grateful to Deputy Brehaut for giving way.

3150 I wonder if he would agree with me that something that is often overlooked with regard to traffic impact is the fact that travel plans as advocated in the amendment that I did not lay are actually already part of Education's plans, it is already in position that they will happen anyway and that travel plans can be incredibly effective in fact from even quite a small sample the average reduction in car use was about 23% and many over 50% reduction so they can be incredibly effective mechanisms.

3155 **Deputy Brehaut:** Yes, I would accept all of that and that could have been a longer speech than I intend to give actually.

With regard to the bus services mentioned a couple of times during debate, and bearing in mind we are looking at a number of models potentially if this Requête went through, which I

cannot support, but the bus service is the remedy. You cannot have the contradiction where people say there are not enough buses to get children to school – as I said in my speech the other day what a fantastic problem to have. With a scheduled bus service, with private provision of mini-buses and other buses, that is achievable.

Just on a personal note, I am not too sure of the ruling on the Requête exactly what I am allowed to say when speaking on behalf of the Committee. I was listening to Deputy Ferbrache, I think he summed up the case perfectly not to support the Requête, then I think on this occasion his heart may be leading his head just a little bit – he was motivated to vote this way he says by dealing with teachers directly and overseeing their signatures or whatever and perhaps that interaction with him led him to adopt the position he has. What I would say to him is: the huge amount of people whose children are in transition, imagine you gave your afternoon over to meeting them. Imagine you gave your day over, your week over to meeting those people, how would it feel.

I just ask anyone who is contemplating supporting the Requête to sit down and mentally write in your head the letter that has to go to each parent, because you are asking someone else to do that.

I would ask Members not to support the Requête, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Next I turn to the President of the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Thank you, sir.

I think what I have to say will be a bit incoherent or not very orderly because I was anticipating a very short debate in general debate, I thought probably that everything that needed to be said had already been said in relation to the amendments, but I will try to respond to some of the points which have been made.

Deputy Prow said that the key problem is stakeholder engagement. Now how on earth does the Requête address the issue of stakeholder engagement. That issue is not mentioned in the Propositions on which the States are being invited to vote.

In fact not only does the Requête fail to deal with the issue of stakeholder engagement, it makes it less likely because the Committee – whether it is this Committee or any other Committee – will be directed to get into this period of review about models of education that will be a distraction from the challenge of trying to deal with stakeholders concerns. It is even under a longer timeline than set out in the Requête and I will come back to that in a moment – I mean the timeline in the Requête is hopelessly unrealistic – but even if a more realistic timeline is adopted for the Committee to return to the States, if that time is taken up reviewing numerous models for delivering education, there is not going to be the time or the space to engage with stakeholders and particularly with staff on the matters which concern them most. So whatever the problem is whatever the question is, the prayer of this Requête is not the answer.

Deputy Prow also rejected that most of the concerns that have been raised are about space and operational issues. He then read out a letter which I think he said was written by the teaching unions which included a list of their concerns and almost all of them were in relation to space and operational concerns, which probably ... I think there is a disconnect here between the request of the unions for pause and the prayer of the Requête, or the intention of the signatories of the Requête, which quite clearly is to scrap the model. They have not made any bones about that, with the exception of Deputy Smithies who has previously been in support of the model. The other signatories to the Requête have fought at every stage against the two 11-18 colleges and some of them, in debate over the last few days, have made it very plain that they remain totally opposed to that model.

Well, that is the intention of the Requête to end up in a place where the model is scrapped. Actually, that is not consistent with the request of the unions for pause. It might be that some teachers from some schools have started writing to Deputies saying, 'We are attracted to this

3210 other model, we are attracted to that other model or this other model', but whereas the unions are talking about a pause to deal with concerns which when they set them out are primarily about space and operational issues, the Requête proposes reviews of further models.

It might be seen by the teaching unions as the lifebelt that allows them to get into more discussion about the things which concern them but the actual wording of the prayer of the Requête is not an adequate response to the unions concerns. In fact it is more likely to distract the Committee from addressing those concerns.

Deputy Prow has also said, and he has said this repeatedly, we – by which I think he means the whole States' Assembly – have not seen the full business case. Well no, that is because the full business case comes at the end of the process even after the tenders have been received.

3220 I do find it extraordinary that Deputy Prow who sits on the Committee for Health & Social Care and is responsible for the Hospital modernisation programme which is not a dissimilar transformation programme albeit at an earlier stage ... The process that that Committee is going through is identical to the process which the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture is going through. Delegated authority has been provided to the Policy & Resources Committee in relation to that capital project which Health & Social Care are overseeing after consideration by the States of a programme business case, but nobody is standing up saying to Deputy Prow, 'Well, this is not adequate because we in the States have not seen your full business case; therefore the whole process is inadequate.'

Now, sir what the Requête actually proposes – this business of reviewing models previously presented to Committees – I think Deputy Dudley-Owen has never really set out which models these might be, but models previously presented to the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, using the interpretation which Deputy Ferbrache placed on it, i.e. those which have been presented since 1st May 2016, include things like middle schools. So we go into a system where primary education goes to 11, then there are middle schools which go to 14, and then there are senior schools or whatever they would be called after that.

Those models include the previous Committee's model, including the post-16 proposals which were widely considered to be unworkable and the four school model because both Committees, our Committee and the previous Committee, have had to consider that model for comparative purposes because it is the *status quo*.

3240 So, in response to the concerns of unions about the implementation of the model agreed by the States twice, why does the States now want to vote for a requête? I hope it does not – but why are we being presented with a requête which says that the correct way of responding to those concerns is to have a review of models including middle schools, unworkable post-16 proposals, four school models which almost nobody is now advocating? It is just not a sensible, constructive response.

3250 I object to this use of the term 'holding pattern' which Deputy Dudley-Owen has referred to which is where students will be if this Requête is successful. We know that there are multiple weaknesses in this model; we know that annually it is more expensive than almost every other conceivable model; we know that some students in this model are in very poor facilities; we know there is no prospect of equality of opportunity at GCSEs; and if this Requête succeeds this is the model in which students will be – as Deputy Dudley-Owen puts it – in a holding pattern, basically until another set of politicians, might be the next States might be the States after that, finds the conviction and the courage to decide what should be the future model of secondary education and sees it through. We do not know for how long this holding pattern will be maintained but it will be indefinite is the best that we can say at this stage.

Proposition 1 in the Requête proposes that the States should stop:

... any elements of the 1 school on 2 sites plan ...

Now, I accept that that means the two sites plan and that is quite clear – that is, what the signatories are after in that bit of the Requête is clear. But it also includes the one school plan. I have not heard many or maybe even any States' Members arguing against the concept of one

3260 school operating on a number of sites and yet the terms of the Requête stop the development of one school. The attempt to try to get greater consistency between secondary education whether it is on four sites or three sites. That may not be the intention of the Requête but that is what is set out in the wording the States are being asked to vote on. The wording is to stop any elements of the one school on two sites plan.

3265 The States' Resolutions which create one school are bound up in the Resolutions which direct the development of two 11-18 colleges, so I do not see how the plans around the two 11-18 colleges can be stopped but the one school plan can continue, because they are bound up on the same States' Resolutions.

3270 We know that the Requête will cost millions of pounds. Deputy Smithies, I think disputes that because he disputes our arguments around the timeline but I do not think very many other Members of the States really do dispute the time it would take for this review to be carried out.

I wrote down models versus plans next to which I wrote down a quote from Deputy Prow again. He said at one point:

I do not know whether the problems are about the model or the plan ...

3275 Well, that seems to me a bit of a flaw given that he is a signatory to a requête which focuses all of its attention on the models. What happens if the Committee gets two months into discussing other models, including discussing them with stakeholders only to find out that most of the concerns were actually about plans.

3280 Deputy Smithies said that there needs to be a pause, but there does not need to be a pause for a long time. Look, I can conceive of relatively short pauses. I think if the States had confirmed the direction of travel in relation to one school and perhaps had voted for an examination of whether it should be on two sites or three sites, I think that could have led to a reasonably short pause. The pause that is proposed in this Requête is not short. There is a timeline in it but it is a meaningless timeline. The fact that it is in a States' Resolution will mean nothing. The States if they wanted to could resolve that the sun must shine every other Tuesday but it does not mean it is going to happen.

3285 The fact the States may make a Resolution to say there should be a report back by December 2020 is going to mean nothing. It is not a realistic timeline. It has taken successive committees with each of their models around about 18 months to work up the details to allow the States to come to informed decisions. That is working up one model, this is a piece of work which would require analyses of multiple models. It cannot be done in months. Possibly it could be done I would suggest in about 15 months, but that will only get the next States to a stage where they are being asked to agree in principle to what the future model should be before then a whole load of detailed work has to be carried on. If this Requête is successful we are going in not to a pause but to a halt which will last years.

3295 I am staggered that the signatories to the Requête have not laid an amendment to it to put the Guernsey Institute beyond the scope of the review in this Requête. This is the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture and this is the Committee which is being directed to carry out the work that is set out in the Requête. In the event that this Requête passes this Committee is going to have to stop the work around the development of the Guernsey Institute.

3300 We cannot sensibly allow that work to continue, allow the development of the Guernsey Institute to continue while at the same time spending quite considerable sums of money and allocating staff time to re-examine models of education which would require further education to be delivered in a way that is completely different from that set out in the Guernsey Institute

3305 Those two things are wholly illogical. It would be like saying carry on with the tender process for the two school model, accept the tenders, start the construction, but then undertake over the next several months a review of whether we should actually have a different way of delivering secondary education. It is not a credible way to proceed.

If this Requête is successful in this form the development of the Guernsey Institute as presently conceived will have to be paused or stopped alongside the development of one school in two 11-18 colleges.

As I said in an intervention earlier it is ironic almost that the one model which this Requête does not provide to be analysed is three 11-18 colleges and if this Requête is successful and it is my Committee that is required to carry out this analysis it is not going to be analysing three 11-18 colleges, because the work that it will have been directed –

I will give way to Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, Deputy Fallaize, for giving way.

I thought from Deputy Smithies' interjection earlier in his speech (**A Member:** Microphone.) that as it was put out in Appendix 4, it is something that has crossed the desk and therefore it will be now included.

Deputy Fallaize: But, sir, if the actual direction is going to be anything that has crossed the desk of the Committee (*Laughter*) – I am not exaggerating – we could be talking about 30 options here, we really could be. Because we could be talking – there are lots of options which crossed the Committee's desk which are one school in two 11-18 colleges with lots of different configurations about which sites should be used. So does that have to be included.

Well okay, look, Deputy Brouard and other Members cannot have it both ways if it is anything that has crossed the desk of the Committee we are heading in ... this work will not be done not only by this Committee, it will not be done by the end of the next term of the States. If that is how broad the number of models or how great the number of models is which has to be reviewed.

Under our reading of the Requête because that model has not been presented to the Committee ... What happened is the Policy & Resources Committee wrote to the Committee when the Requête was submitted and said, 'Would you mind giving a bit of an indication about what might be anticipated in three 11-18 schools?' That cannot possibly constitute a model presented to the Committee. But if it does, if the Committee following this Requête accepts Deputy Brouard's interpretation we are looking at, I would think, at least two dozen models to analyse as part of this Requête which makes the timeline even less realistic.

I will give way to Deputy Smithies.

Deputy Smithies: Would Deputy Fallaize not agree that the moment to actually say we do not accept this model that has been presented to us was when P&R asked you for that information? The Committee could have said no, this is not part of our consideration. But the Committee chose not to; the Committee to respond to that and put in three separate models into their letter of response to Policy & Resources.

Deputy Fallaize: Well, I do not think the Committee could have done that. We received a letter from the Policy & Resources Committee asking for some educational and financial information and we felt obliged to try and provide it to the best of our ability. If we had just written back to say no, I am sorry, we are not doing that because we personally do not have an interest in it, I think the Policy & Resources Committee would have had every right to have been very critical about that.

The wording in the Requête is unclear. There is no clarity about what is meant by a comprehensive comparison. I do not know, we have not been able to establish that from the signatories to the Requête we would have to take our best guess at what that means.

I think another thing that has been established over the four days of this debate is that there is no majority in this Assembly for any other model. Ultimately in a parliament you can only make progress if there is a majority for something.

Now, there are clearly some Members who are very opposed to the current reforms but there have been amendments with all sorts of different models in, one 11-18 and two 11-16s; three 11-

3360 18s; three 11-16s in different configurations of sixth forms, and none of them have secured anything close to a majority of votes. That is consistent with what has happened previously. The only model of education which has come anywhere near to obtaining a majority of support not just in this Assembly, but in successive Assemblies is one school in two 11-18 colleges, the other models four school models and three school models have all lost by large margins.

3365 Now, the most important point really is Deputy Soulsby's because the question is how are you going to engage with the stakeholders, how are you going to deal with the crux of their concerns? This is really where this debate now rests. We know what the strategic policies of the States are and it has not been possible for any Member to get a majority to change the strategic policies of the States in this debate.

3370 But alongside that we know that there are concerns I think we are particularly concerned by the concerns raised by teachers and staff in schools but there are concerns which are quite wide ranging from stakeholders which clearly need to be addressed. I do not think anybody on any side of the debate is going to say they do not need to be addressed. But the issue is are they best addressed by the Committee continuing with the strategic policy.

3375 Now if the proposal in the Requête is that the concerns of the teachers are best addressed by directing the Committee to review numerous models of education previously rejected. Our Committee cannot see how that is a sensible or even a viable response to the concerns raised by stakeholders.

3380 We will soon as a Committee be out of this period of writing business cases, that will free up some resources which can be deployed more effectively in stakeholder engagement. Because we are moving to a more advanced stage of the transformation programme, the transformation team is increasing in size. That is all part of the plan agreed by the States for which the budget has been agreed by the States. That will also allow more resources to be dedicated to engaging with stakeholders.

3385 Some of the operational issues which are being raised by teachers concern matters where actually no decisions have yet been made, they are around the length of the school day, exactly how lunch will operate, what the staff structure will be. I understand entirely that there is uncertainty and there is anxiety among teachers about those things, but that is because we have not reached the point of making any decisions about them.

3390 There is still consultation going on about those things. There are options for how lunch can be organised; there are options for the length of the school day; there are concerns about enrichment for example which has an effect on the length of the school day. In the implementation of this plan if it is necessary for us to pause that element of it and push the implementation of enrichment out further than it is currently scheduled we can do that. If it is necessary not to organise lunch in the way originally suggested because there are concerns about teachers in relation to how it can be managed, we can change that.

3395 The staff structure: a lot of staff are saying, 'Look, we do not know what is happening in relation to the staff structure, we want to see where we might fit in to the new two 11-18 colleges.' There is good work going on between officers and union leads at the moment on the staff structure and this month the staff structure is due to go out to all staff for a period of consultation, then following that period of consultation we will be able to continue to work with union leads to develop a final staff structure. But this is work which is in train.

3400 Now, during this difficult quite complex transition and implementation period in a sense concerns are being raised about some of the suggestions which are being made or about the fact that some people do not know what it is going to look like at the end of the process, but that is in the nature of transition models.

3405 I also would say, sir, that – and we are setting up – we either have just set up or are in the process of setting up focus groups with staff around lots of areas of concerns, enrichment, travelling, infrastructure, vertical tutoring, behavioural policies.

3410 I accept completely and I do this on behalf of officers and senior leaders in education in the new model and the Committee that clearly together we have not done enough either to engage

key stakeholders in particular teacher or to secure their confidence in relation to the new model. I mean only a fool would stand here on behalf of the Committee and deny that.

3415 What I am suggesting is that the Requête is not going to put that right. The only thing that is going to put that right is our Committee working with officers and working with senior leaders to apply more resources to stakeholder engagement to accept there are some things which we have got wrong in terms of implementation, to make changes to some of those plans and to work more closely with teachers in particular to take more of them with us.

3420 I would suggest though that while this Assembly continues to hang out the possibility that other models need to be reviewed and that the strategic direction of the reforms might be changed it is going to be very difficult for us to work constructively on making modifications to the implementation of the plans, because we are stuck in this debate about models.

3425 There will always be some people opposed, there will always be some of the public opposed whatever model of education is adopted, there will always be some teachers who are opposed. I accept this, I understand it. We know what the challenge is, the challenge is to respond constructively to the stakeholder concerns and challenges and to try to increase the level of confidence there is, in particular among teachers in relation to this model and its implementation. We get that.

3430 But I think the path that we are on in the second year of a five-year transition plan under the leadership of this Committee I think is a better more constructive way of trying to address these concerns that set out in the Requête.

3435 The Requête offers only years of uncertainty major disruption to the transition model for students from Year 7 down to ... well, from Year 9 actually down to Year 3 or 4. Major disruption and if the Requête is successful the Committee or another Committee will have no idea what transition model to put in its place because there will be no clarity about the destination.

That, sir, is not a response to the stakeholder concerns and it is not a sensible way to proceed when we have already twice agreed the strategic direction and spent millions of pounds trying to deliver it.

3440 I say one other thing because I think we understand the challenges and we are ready to face up to them and do our very best to meet them in relation to stakeholder engagement and addressing the concerns of teachers, but I also think we now know that the Policy & Resources Committee and the Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture is going to have to have a period of discussion about the way in which the submission and consideration of the full business case or final business case is handled.

3445 It may be that there is an opportunity to vary the timeline for the implementation of this model in a way which provides an element of pause without significantly disrupting the transition model for students. That may have to arise anyway because if the Policy & Resources Committee says, 'Actually we are not going to consider your full business case in this term of the States', then that period of time for that to happen will arise in any event. So I do not rule out the possibility
3450 that it may be possible to adjust the timeline for implementation extend it so to some extent that creates a pause and more space for stakeholder engagement but if it is going to happen it has got to happen in a managed way, in our view, in a way which does not significantly disrupt the transition plan for students. That cannot be done through this Requête because it basically is a kind of scorched earth policy – just scrap everything; we do not know what is going to emerge in
3455 its place, we want all the models that have previously been on the table to be reconsidered and we have no idea what the destination is going to be.

That is not the right approach, sir, and I ask Members to reject the Requête.

3460 **The Deputy Bailiff:** I next turn to the President of the Policy & Resources Committee Deputy St Pier.

Deputy St Pier: Sir, I shall be very brief indeed.

The Policy & Resources letter of comment I think is self-explanatory and was obviously published some time ago. There is no Policy & Resources position in relation to the final votes on the Requête.

I will be voting against the Requête, as I indicated in my speech however many days ago it was and will be trusting in the process and as Deputy Fallaize has said it is inevitable that there will need to be a process of dialogue between the two Committees in relation to the full business case process in view not only of this debate but where we are generally, and indeed the tender process which I think is due to close today. That of course will need to be taken into account as indeed will the dynamics of the building industry itself, which I think is an issue which I think Deputy Trott was going to speak to because obviously the industry is a lot busier than it was and that will no doubt be reflected in the tenders.

I only have one question to answer, which was in relation to that from Deputy Soulsby, which was: would P&R provide the resources to enable the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to do what they need to do to ensure the proper engagement they would need to? Certainly in relation to the discharge of this Requête, if the Requête is successful; and the answer is I do not really know because it depends on what resources are required. Clearly to the extent that resources are available within –

I will give way.

Deputy Soulsby: I thank Deputy St Pier.

It was not in relation to the Requête; it was in relation to ESC themselves being able to engage properly with members of the community should the Requête fail.

Deputy St Pier: Ah, I do apologise, I had misunderstood Deputy Soulsby's question. In that case I think I can give a different answer, which is affirmative. I think the resources are available within the overall capital vote in the delegated authority that has been given. There is certainly sufficient at this stage to do all that should be necessary in relation to the engagement piece. Clearly if that has a knock-on effect later in the process that means that the delegated authorities are bumped up against, that would be a challenge for a future P&R Committee and possibly for a future Assembly. But certainly at this stage there is bar to the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture engaging whatever resources they need to engage, and clearly they do and they admit it themselves, in relation to the engagement piece.

I hope therefore that addresses the one question that I needed to answer and thank you Deputy Soulsby for clarifying your question.

The Deputy Bailiff: So finally, Members of the States, I turn to Deputy Dudley-Owen as the lead requérant to reply to the entire debate.

Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

Sir, this debate has been the verbal equivalent of an Island tour, we have been everywhere and we are coming back now and I hope that we will get to where the requérants intend.

I do acknowledge the immense work that the Committee has done since they took their seats. I have sincere respect for the energy and conviction that they have displayed in regards to the plan, and commend them for that.

I deplore any personal attacks towards Members of the Committee or any Members of this Assembly. It is inevitable that a minority in the community will stoop to that level but it is entirely unacceptable. **(Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

I stated in my opening speech that I hoped to convince Members to support the Requête. I hope that during this four day debate, we have explored the issues and Members understand these better.

3515 During our proverbial Channel Island tour we have heard much debate, assertion, warnings and concerns. We have been warned of paying too much heed to the unions and that Deputy Roffey has become more of a Maggie than an Arthur, Deputy Inder more of an Arthur than a Maggie and potentially Deputy Trott more of a Corbyn than a Trott. *(Laughter)* God forbid! *(Interjections and laughter)* It is now on record.

3520 We have been told that we must be strong against populist opposition and should ignore the masses, we have been told that the crowds are nothing compared to what has been seen on many occasions before, never mind that the Fort George protest was –

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: Point of correction, sir.

3525 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction, Deputy Hansmann Rouxel.

Deputy Hansmann Rouxel: At no point has anyone in this Assembly said ‘ignore the protests’.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen to continue.

3530 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** I take your judgement on the matter, sir, thank you.

We have been told that the crowds are nothing compared to what we have seen on many occasions before, never mind the fact that the Fort George protest was well before I was born.

3535 We have been warned that requérants and/or their supporters unwittingly – or is it wittingly, perhaps? – are opening the backdoor to selection; we have been told that teachers’ opposition to the plan is inevitable. Sometimes I have thought that it has even been dismissed as almost trifling. It is not a matter of implementation and a slight concern perhaps over space. We have been told about the abyss that we will fall into and the massive cost of delay; we have been told that there are masses of research but that any review will take an age to conduct. The Committee, though, 3540 have produced some good work and it is inevitable, and we have seen it, it is obvious, in the space of the last few weeks, which indicates that they do have access to research and figures from their files. Deputy de Lisle and Deputy Hansmann Rouxel have acknowledged this and we have seen it in the letter of comment from the Committee.

3545 We have been told that the problems are the politicians and it is we and our successors who are incapable of making a decision and sticking with it; we have been told that no-one can ever coalesce around a single model, it is inevitable that the one school on two sites model would encounter this level of opposition; we have been told that the Requête most definitely will affect the rebuild of the Guernsey Institute and the La Mare de Carteret Primary School, even though the plans have yet to be drawn up, let alone passed. We have been told about the lack of parity but 3550 know that this has been strongly refuted by one of our head teachers; we have been told about the benefits of the one school on two sites model, but I have yet to see the proof of this.

3555 Finally, we have been told about the effects on children and families regarding the delay, and I absolutely regret that, in the same way I do for families when the promise of La Mare de Carteret School rebuild were never delivered; as I do for the upset regarding the introduction of the one school on two sites model for some parents. There have been many regrets in this debate for our community and the way that successive States have handled this most important matter.

3560 Deputies Ferbrache and Le Clerc have asked what are viable models previously presented to and considered by the Committee. I interjected at the time, kindly allowed by Deputy Ferbrache, and I have explained this to be models that have already been researched and considered by the Committee and I think that if we accept that this would be successive recent Committees responsible for Education, then that should limit the scope, rather than going back beyond the 20 year period, and it also limits the scope of the amount of models that would be presented for use in the report. I have been advised that use of an economic case would be the best way to provide the comprehensive analysis –

3565 I will give way to Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

I was just wondering if Deputy Dudley-Owen knows that if the three 11-18 model has ever been discussed prior –

3570 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, sir, in response to Deputy Oliver, I will come to that in a second thank you.

So I have been advised that the use of an economic case would be the best way to provide the comprehensive analysis and objectivity that would be the best value to States' Members. The purpose of the economic dimension of the business case is to identify the proposal that delivers
3575 best public value to society including wider social and environmental effects. This ensures that outcomes are a focus of the work. If you do not consider your outcomes then doing the work is meaningless. The work cannot be done without stakeholder engagement. The process ensures that the profession as one of the key stakeholders are engaged and will give their views to ensure that the best outcomes of any model are at the forefront of considerations.

3580 As Deputy Oliver has just alluded to, it is worth commenting at this stage on the three 11-18 school model. This model amongst others was considered by the previous Committee but was one that was seen to have deep inefficiencies and was not popular amongst the profession. It was therefore not included amongst the options that were taken forward into the short list –

3585 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction Deputy Fallaize.

Deputy Fallaize: Sir, after that claim was made, I asked officers to see whether they could find
3590 any work at all done in the files on three 11-18 colleges by the previous Committee because obviously we know that we have not done any work on it, notwithstanding the thing we knocked up a week ago – well, that is not, Deputy Brouard holds up dozens of pieces of paper most of which have nothing to do with three 11-18 schools (*Laughter*) – and the answer I got back was no, we cannot find anything in the files about an analysis of three 11-18 schools.

3595 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Deputy Dudley-Owen to continue.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you very much, sir.

Well, this was an item for discussion, so whether it is in the Committee minutes buried from quite a few years ago is what I would have expected as opposed to a full file of research. As I
3600 stated the work was dismissed as not being popular with the profession and therefore not taken forward for further consideration.

The current Committee, though, have clearly considered this 11-18 model in their letter of comment dated 21st February this year on page 8.

3605 So the idea of defining models as needing to be viable was so as to reduce the scope of the review and not to introduce wildly different models which have no basis in previously conducted research which would be relevant to Guernsey.

Deputy Soulsby has asked will I admit that the Requête will cause uncertainty and cost? Well, I have already stated in my opening remarks that it would be inconceivable that there would be no
3610 sunk cost associated with the pause, in the same way that we have written off costs of replacing the three school model back in early 2018. We can, however, ensure that some of the work done in the last decade or so does not go to waste.

Deputy Soulsby: Point of correction, sir.

3615 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Point of correction Deputy Soulsby.

Deputy Soulsby: I did not say would Deputy Dudley-Owen agree that it would cause uncertainty; I said years of uncertainty.

3620

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

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

Thank you to Deputy Soulsby for that clarification. May I finish my comment? Thank you.

3625

So Deputy Soulsby has asked if I would admit that the Requête will cause uncertainty and cost and I have already stated and repeat in my opening that it would be inconceivable that there would be no sunk costs, but we do not want a decade or so of work to go to waste. It is clear that the scope for review has now narrowed to non-selective three school models or viable combinations of which have been reviewed in detail by previous committees.

3630

Expediently carried out work on this report will ensure that we do not have guestimates of delays running into years and the resultant costs of up to £11 million. I do not seek to defend that position those are the costs estimated and the timelines estimated by the Committee based on worst case scenarios.

3635

We might find that the review reveals cost savings up to tens of millions by adopting some of the elements in previously researched models.

3640

Deputy Soulsby asked why this is all worth it. Well, if 90% of health care staff and a large amount of the community were opposing the new Partnership of Purpose reforms importantly stating that the plans were not fit for purpose, i.e. that the quality of healthcare could not be delivered, then would Deputy Soulsby not think that it was essential to revisit the plans to ensure that they were really the right ones. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) The only way that we can ensure this is via this Requête.

3645

This is an opportunity to re-affirm the one school on two sites model if it really is the best option or to identify a better alternative. In either case it will be with proper engagement with the support of the key stakeholders. In this way and for the purposes of transparency and accountability States' Members and the community will be presented with objective research in totality for them to be able to make an informed decision regarding as to what will lead to the best outcomes for the Island.

3650

Deputy Laurie Queripel, I think it was, yesterday said that most Members will have made up their minds already and that was about the ESC amendment. Well, I think that the same is true now. I know I have, because I have heard nothing in the intervening period since this debate began, further back since the September debate, and I have listened, I have listened really hard for the silver bullet from the Committee but nothing has been said that would change my mind that this model needs testing and challenging in the face of such opposition.

3655

Sir, I ask Members though you that if this Requête fails, do you think – do Members think – that this one school two sites plan has a future? If the answer to that question is no, then stop it now. Vote for the pause and at least allow it to be reviewed, the model needs to be judged on its merits or otherwise.

3660

The nursing union have voted on strike action. Our largest teaching union has not ruled out strike action from their members. Is this what we want in Guernsey? The very backbone of our public services, education and health threatening to walk out – something that has not been seen before and something that the professionals themselves would so strongly resist unless they felt they had no other choices that their backs were to the wall. How can we proceed with a model that 90% of the teachers do not want? Whether their opposition is to the model itself or to the implementation as a number of speakers have said, the Committee must realise that the concept and implementation are inextricably linked.

3665

It is true that as we have known more about the implementation the concerns regarding the one school on two sites plan have grown.

Let's think about the interesting idea of a tunnel to Jersey, the benefits of which could bring a new Island on an existing outcrop and which would be a shared airport with Jersey, an amazing

3670 level of interconnectivity between the Islands and even the mainland of France, we have been told. We have been told it could double the Channel Islands' current GDP and address recruitment and population worries by creating a new Normandy economic zone and commuter belt stretching far into Northern France. Wow! Great concept. But I would say at this time a non-starter in terms of delivery, in implementation, but there are better minds than mine that can go through the huge challenges in delivering that project and which go far beyond really the cost of many billions.

Sir, the same is true for this project. It is the message echoed by teachers, support staff and unions in relation to the one school on two sites. Unfortunately for the Committee therefore it is impossible to separate the concept from the implementation.

3680 It appears that the Committee has been operating in a vacuum and has missed what has been going on at the coalface and they seem to have missed the slow erosion of confidence and good faith that the professionals had originally in the model. It is with regret that I say once confidence has been lost in a Committee it is difficult to regain it.

3685 The Requête, however, provides the Committee with an opportunity to re-engage with the teachers, the support staff, the students the wider community and to bring them along on the journey of reviewing the model. They can regain lost trust and restore lost confidence. If we do not support the Requête, sir, then this cannot effectively be done. We will be merely ignoring the substantial opposition.

3690 I have overnight received messages from teachers asking me to represent their view that is not just the space, not just the implementation, both of which I would say are pretty fundamental to the success of this plan. This is also about the enrichment and how to square that it is compulsory for children but not for staff. This is also about the adoption of Attainment 8. It is also about curriculum changes to a curriculum that was brought in not so long ago –

3695 **Deputy Fallaize:** Point of correction.

The Deputy Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Fallaize.

3700 **Deputy Fallaize:** Sir, the Requête does not say anything about Attainment 8; the Requête cannot possibly be a response to concerns about Attainment 8 and the reason that enrichment does not need to be compulsory for staff is because when staff were asked whether they would wish to volunteer for the enrichment arrangements, enough staff volunteered to provide a full staff complement for those activities, so there would not be any need to make it compulsory. In any event, making it compulsory would change terms and conditions and that cannot be done outside of negotiation with staff bodies.

3705

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen to continue.

3710 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Sir, thank you, I defer to your judgement on that matter; however, I did state that I have received messages from teachers asking me to represent their view and that is exactly what I was doing.

They have also said it is about curriculum changes to a curriculum which was brought in not so long ago. It is about what one teacher called mismanagement of the process, being told what will happen rather than being asked for their professional input.

3715 So how can these amongst other issues be dealt with and, sir, I believe firmly that we can only do this via the Requête which calls for a pause and review. If the Requête succeeds today there will be two actions that will be put into play immediately one being the pause on all tender and contract awards, the other is the review which will need to start quickly and be managed tightly to deliver in the timeframe, ensuring that meaningful stakeholder engagement is carried out and the limited options that have been decided on – apologies, I wrote this before the amendment did not pass, so that was in the hope that the amendment might narrow down the options – but the

3720

options are not excessive, that there will be a couple of reviews ... there are a couple of reviews that are under way being the Education Law Consultation and that of the special educational needs and disabilities support that was announced last month and actually I see has come through today.

The timeframe for undertaking the Requête review allows for the outcomes of the SEND review and the Law Consultation also to inform discussions about any changes to secondary schools, something that has not happened in sufficient depth in any education debate on the delivery of secondary education. Both of these important pieces of work will help to further inform the report.

Sir, I will conclude as I opened. We need to build an education system fit to meet the challenges of the 21st century. I want to see a structured and open approach to this because we need to be clear about what the purpose of any education reform is.

If building an education system fit to meet the challenges of the 21st century is the vision statement, then the objectives and outcomes that we are seeking are easy to define and a route map of how best to achieve these can be created through consultation research and the scope of the review.

A pause and review is the only way to achieve this to present a well consulted, well researched report that objectively appraises the options back to the States within the timeframe given. This is our chance, sir, once and for all to deliver on that vision, that purpose and to get it right for Guernsey.

I ask Members please to vote for this Requête.

Thank you, sir.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, as far as I can work out, all three Propositions stand or fall together, but if anyone wants a separate vote on any of them now is the time to ask.

Did I hear somebody saying could we have a recorded vote please? Yes, all right. *(Laughter)* I thought it was inevitable. So a recorded vote on all three Propositions taken together. So that is 1 and 2 from the original set of Propositions and 2(a) that has been added by the amendment 4. Greffier please.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 18, Contre 17, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 3

POUR

Deputy Brouard
Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Trott
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint

CONTRE

Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Merrett
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel
Deputy Graham
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Le Tocq

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Parkinson

ABSENT

Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Le Pelley

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting on the three Propositions was as follows. There voted *Pour* 18, *Contre* 17, 1 abstention, 3 absentees. Therefore I declare all three Propositions duly carried.

**Procedural –
Adjournment of sitting until next day –
Motion lost**

3755 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Members of the States, it is quarter to six. We cannot conclude this meeting without doing the Schedule for Future States' Business and that is what I am going to invite the Greffier to put to you, unless anyone leaps to their feet to persuade me that you should continue with debate on any of the other three matters.

3760 **Deputy Oliver:** Can we have a vote, sir, and see if we can finish the debate on all the other matters.

The Deputy Bailiff: Deputy Green.

3765 **Deputy Green:** Sir, I do not think it is ideal for us to be starting another matter but I had indicated earlier if you will remember I was looking to move the Item in Billet VI ahead of the other two requêtes in Billet V. I do not think it is ideal to be starting a debate now, but I would like to perhaps test the patience of the States in terms of whether we might come back tomorrow to commence the Item in Billet VI.

3770 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Very well. Let me ask – because I do listen to Deputy Dorey – those Members who would be inconvenienced or unavailable if the States were to adjourn to tomorrow to stand in their places. Is it your wish, Deputy Green, that I put a motion to the States to see whether they are minded to adjourn further to tomorrow or do you accept that that is likely to be lost?

3775 **Deputy Green:** I would like it to be put, sir, please.

The Deputy Bailiff: Well I will put – Deputy Le Tocq.

3780 **Deputy Le Tocq:** Sorry, sir. Can I point out that Deputies St Pier and Trott have left on States' business and they had an amendment to lay to that particular motion.

3785 **The Deputy Bailiff:** That is a fair point to make. I assumed that Members would be aware that both Deputy St Pier and Deputy Trott had already left and therefore did not stand in their places, but Deputy Green is still asking me to put the matter to the vote. So I will on the basis that I am very conscious of how much business there is coming up and therefore if it were the will of the majority of Members still present and voting to adjourn to tomorrow rather than conclude the meeting today then I understand that that would be something that could be accommodated.

3790 I will simply put it to you *aux voix* to start with. Those in favour of adjourning until tomorrow; those against.

Some Members voted Pour, others voted Contre.

The Deputy Bailiff: It was so marginal that I would rather be sure one way or the other by taking a recorded vote, Members of the States, if I am not trying your patience.

So Greffier can we call the roll please.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 16, Contre 16, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 6

POUR

Deputy Dudley-Owen
Deputy De Lisle
Deputy Roffey
Deputy Prow
Deputy Oliver
Deputy Gollop
Deputy Lester Queripel
Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Merrett
Deputy Meerveld
Deputy Inder
Deputy Lowe
Deputy Laurie Queripel
Deputy Smithies
Deputy Green
Deputy Paint

CONTRE

Deputy McSwiggan
Deputy Langlois
Deputy Soulsby
Deputy de Sausmarez
Deputy Ferbrache
Deputy Tindall
Deputy Brehaut
Deputy Tooley
Deputy Parkinson
Deputy Le Clerc
Deputy Mooney
Deputy Stephens
Deputy Fallaize
Deputy Graham
Deputy Dorey
Deputy Le Tocq

NE VOTE PAS

Deputy Brouard

ABSENT

Alderney Rep. Roberts
Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Trott
Deputy Le Pelley
Deputy St Pier
Deputy Hansmann Rouxel

3795 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Well, Members of the States, the voting is as I thought it was, which is that you adjourn this meeting to tomorrow morning at 9.30 a.m. and there voted *Pour 16, Contre 16*, 1 abstention, 6 absentees now. Therefore the motion is lost on the principle that any motion with an equality of votes is declared lost. So there will not be an adjournment to tomorrow.

3800 What I am minded to do though is to see whether it would be your wish to bring Billet No. VI in front of the two requêtes so that it would be the first item of deferred business as opposed to the third item of deferred business. So can I simply put that to you *aux voix*? Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: So that means that the order is such that Billet VI comes before the two requêtes that will now be deferred to the first substantive items of business in the next meeting.

3805 But before we close this meeting we do have to deal with the Schedule for Future States Business. So I invite the Greffier to call that item.

POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

XII. Policy & Resources Committee – Future States' Business approved

Article XII

Whether, after consideration of the attached Schedule for future States' business, which sets out items for consideration at the Meeting of the 18th March 2020 and subsequent States' Meetings, they are of the opinion to approve the Schedule.

The Greffier: Article XII – The Schedule for Future States' meetings

The Deputy Bailiff: Is there any comment at all?

3810 **Deputy Le Tocq:** No, sir, just to formally lay it on behalf of P&R.

The Deputy Bailiff: Members of the States I will put the Schedule for Future States' Business to you. Those in favour of approving it; those against.

Members voted Pour.

The Deputy Bailiff: I declare that duly carried.

3815 Thank you all for your patience and particularly sitting late on a number of occasions. We will now close this meeting.

Deputy Lowe: Sir, before we do so, could I thank you for the way you have conducted this debate over the last five days and I thank you on behalf of the States' Members.

3820 **The Deputy Bailiff:** Thank you very much Deputy Lowe.
Greffier.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.54 p.m.