



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF DELIBERATION

OF THE

ISLAND OF GUERNSEY

HANSARD

Royal Court House, Guernsey, Thursday, 9th September 2021

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

Volume 10, No. 21

ISSN 2049-8284

Present:

R. J. McMahon, Esq., Bailiff and Presiding Officer

Law Officers

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

People's Deputies

S. E. Aldwell	M. P. Leadbeater
C. P. A Blin	J. P. Le Tocq
A. H. Brouard	D. J. Mahoney
Y. Burford	A. D. S. Matthews
T. L. Bury	L. J. McKenna
A. Cameron	C. P. Meerveld
D. de G. de Lisle	N. G. Moakes
H. L. de Sausmarez	R. C. Murray
A. C. Dudley-Owen	V. S. Oliver
J. F. Dyke	C. N. K. Parkinson
S. P. Fairclough	R. G. Prow
S. J. Falla	L. C. Queripel
P. T. R. Ferbrache	P. J. Roffey
A. Gabriel	H. J. R. Soulsby
J. A. B. Gollop	G. A. St Pier
S. P. Haskins	A. W. Taylor
M. A. J. Helyar	L. S. Trott
N. R. Inder	S. P. J. Vermeulen
A. Kazantseva-Miller	

Representatives of the Island of Alderney

Alderney Representatives S. Roberts and E. A. J. Snowdon

The Clerk to the States of Deliberation

S. M. D. Ross, Esq. (States' Greffier)

Business transacted

States of Deliberation	1469
Billet d'État XVII	1469
4. Secondary and Post 16 Education Reorganisation – Debate continued	1469
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 11.55 a.m. and resumed at 2 p.m.</i>	<i>1498</i>
Secondary and Post 16 Education Reorganisation – Debate continued	1498
<i>The Assembly adjourned at 5.33 p.m.</i>	<i>1541</i>

PAGE LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK

States of Deliberation

The States met at 9.30 a.m.

[THE BAILIFF *in the Chair*]

Billet d'État XVII

The Bailiff: Good morning, Members of the States. If you want to follow suit from some Members and remove jackets during the course of the day, you are free to do so.

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION, SPORT & CULTURE

4. Secondary and Post 16 Education Reorganisation – Debate continued

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle to speak.

5

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

The three-school model – which is three 11-16 schools at La Mare, Beaucamps, and St Sampson's, with the Sixth Form Centre remaining at the former Grammar School site, Les Varendes – has several pertinent advantages. First of all, it avoids larger class sizes. Secondly, it
10 avoids moving the Sixth Form Centre from Les Varendes, the Grammar School site. And thirdly, it avoids closing a successful secondary school that currently serves eight parishes. I highly recommend this option to the States and to the community as a whole.

Very importantly, the model provides stability at a very crucial time as we go forward and begin the transformation to deliver non-selective comprehensive education – quite a challenge in itself,
15 particularly when one considers the importance of a stable and successful education system to building investment, confidence, and economic success in this community.

The comment against this model of three 11–16 schools at La Mare, Beaucamps and St Sampson's and the Sixth Form Centre at Les Varendes by the Committee's policy letter was that
20 it:

... would necessitate a rebuild requiring additional capital expenditure ...

We are asking here for an *extension*, not necessarily a total rebuild.

... the Committee does not consider that to be prudent given the current financial climate.

25 But then, the Committee itself supports the same expenditure on rebuilding the Sixth Form Centre; here, the amendment calls for minor capital investment on extension.

Of course, it was always the intention to rebuild the three high schools – St Sampson's, Les Beaucamps, and La Mare – to the level of the Grammar School, and promises by Education have been given term after term since the 2000–04 States' term for rebuilding La Mare de Carteret
30 Secondary School.

The comments by Deputy Dudley-Owen in the education debate last term were well-taken, actually, as saying:

By not rebuilding La Mare, some of the least affluent children in the Island will be negatively affected.

35 She said:

I believe that we should rebuild a school at that site, a site that sits on the edge of one of our biggest social housing estates, which provides the support that is so needed there by many families.

There is no reason, sir, to doubt that statement. I think it was just the shock and displeasure of the turn-around, with respect to Deputy Dudley-Owen, when she became the President of the Committee, announcing that in fact her Committee would not favour continuing with that particular school being open. That has affected many in the community, particularly because that school was fed by eight parishes, so you are dealing with displeasure from, really, right across – including St Peter Port—right across this community.

40 This is a superior-performing school, as well. The statistics speak for themselves, and the commitment of staff, pupils and parents has achieved high standards of education and won through very difficult circumstances, because, as you know, they had to integrate 190 pupils from the closure of St Peter Port School. That was a very turbulent period, because there was not a culture of accepting that particular move – and it affected, also, as you know, St Sampson's school, because they had to take quite a number of those pupils as well. But it is the GCSE results, compiled by the Mare de Carteret High School Management Committee, that reflect the success, and they were discussed yesterday, as you can remember.

45 One wonders how pushing these students onto other schools is going to work, because it is about retaining the community spirit in our school system, and once it goes in one school it tends to reflect across the system.

50 The school certainly has the spirit and endeavour, and it has proven to outshine others that are even brand-new builds, because it achieved better results than St Sampson's High School new build in this last set of GCSE results that we have just had this summer. It serves eight of our parishes, it is the most representative and cosmopolitan of the lot, and not only that, it has shown remarkable achievements on the sports field. It is the school of Matt Le Tissier, as you all know, and what an achievement that has been.

60 Some of you speak of the building, but it is not the building; it is what takes place within. Are you saying that Oxbridge, centuries old, still produce the most prestigious education despite being centuries old?

Surely, the objective is to provide a successful, competitive, secondary/post-secondary school system. We will not do that by increasing the number of pupils in a class, and anyone with experience of teaching secondary knows the danger of that. One only has to look at the competition in private schools to see that they keep class sizes manageable, at 20 or below.

65 As you can see from this particular document that has only just been placed for us, in terms of comparisons, you see there that the class sizes are kept at 24–25 and lower in some subjects through this particular option, whereas, unfortunately, class sizes in the proposals by the Committee increase class sizes from 26 to 28, which will have a detrimental impact on educational outcomes. That is a proven fact: large sizes are very difficult. You have got to just put yourself in the situation of seven classes in a day coming into your classroom: 28 of them are standing outside for the next lesson, or 24 or less. There is quite a difference just there in the corridor outside your room, let alone when they start sitting down and occupying seats.

70 We want to build further a world-class education system, not lose what we have, and we do not do that with closure of one of our best-performing schools and risking failure of the system as a result. Because it is about retaining the community spirit in our school system. Remember: the last secondary rationalisation of St Peter Port School led to a decline in standards across the board as

80 the pupils were re-located into neighbouring schools, and only recently has the system recovered from that re-organisation; we should not wish the system to befall that again.

Why risk re-locating a perfectly successful Sixth Form Centre? It is all as though there is a wish to fail. The model continues with the Sixth Form Centre located where it is currently.

85 In proposing this model, Deputy Leadbeater and I, like the Mare de Carteret High School Management Committee, would request that all Members of the States give due regard to supporting the immediate prioritisation of extending La Mare de Carteret High School. There are various plans that have been considered over the years offering an extension to the school with least disruption to the school and the teaching environment itself. It is a large site, and with the previously proposed new one-way road on the site itself, there are solutions to remaining on-site with an increase in student numbers.

90 This three-school model, retaining the Mare de Carteret High School, has, as I said, several advantages. It avoids larger classes and retains competition across the piste. It avoids moving the Sixth Form Centre from Les Varendes, the current site, and the risk there of a new development, which one does not know whether it will succeed like the last. And of course, it avoids closing a successful secondary school that currently serves eight parishes.

95 Rationalisation in closing a successful school has implications all around. I have seen it once before: I saw it in London, where I was teaching in a large comprehensive – 2,250 students with 250 teachers. I had the advantage there of teaching geology as well as geography, which was the advantage that one has with a large school of that nature, and enabling a very broad array of subjects to be taught within the school.

100 But the problem was, at that time, that that was a new secondary comprehensive and it had taken in three other schools: it had taken the grammar school in the local area there in Eltham, it had taken the secondary modern school, and it had taken a technical commercial school under its wing. The problem was, within the school we had three scarves flying around during the winter with the students, and of course, we had disaffected teachers, to some degree, who had lost their additional stipends for running their particular departments in favour of, perhaps, one other colleague that they probably knew in the region anyway, but that was another matter.

105 The point I am making is that any integration like that is disruptive. In London, of course, the system is so large that, probably, you can get away with to some degree, other than internally, in that particular school. But in Guernsey, a small community, it rebounds right across, particularly when the school is housed by almost the whole community – eight parishes and the Town here in Guernsey. We have to guard against that particular problem with regard to any rationalisation and closing of a successful school in this community.

110 And of course, anything like that does not really go down well with the great majority of the Island's teachers, parents, students, and trade unions. I think, if you rationalise the system, you have got to realise that what you are doing is building up the numbers in the classes – that means fewer classes across the piste, which means fewer teachers, so you have got the unions also to deal with at the end of this game.

115 Given all that and a very short speech from myself – because I could have made it a lot longer – I ask Members to support this amendment.

120 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

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

Although this would not be, perhaps – to coin a phrase from Deputy Le Tocq – my ideal solution, necessarily, I think I have been committed to putting an amendment along these lines and having them discussed; indeed, it is not a million miles away from ideas I had myself at the end of the summer term, and I will explain why.

130 One of the reasons why, perhaps, the last few States – we did, admittedly, see a big change at the last election – have had a degree of turnover of Members, not just through retirement – which

has been a setback, in many ways, because we lost four of the five – one through retirement – of the last Education, Sport & Culture Committee, for example – that has been as a result of a degree of disillusionment, perhaps, not from some of the profession, possibly, but definitely from many members of the public.

Why do the public get disillusioned? There was a vox pop even the other day suggesting that the people interviewed in the street – who may or not have been representative of everybody – were saying ‘Get on with it’ and ‘Why should we be spending any money at all?’ And yes, I do come across venerable citizens of our Island who are still working, in some cases, in their eighties and have really done their best for Guernsey over decades. One of these gentlemen said to me that where we went wrong was we lost our parish schools. Now, that is a long way away from all of these debates, but it expresses how people think.

Certainly, I think – definitely – a theme since before I became a States’ Member, even, when we knew the redoubtable Douzenier Mrs Tasker as head teacher of La Mare de Carteret, a theme in the 1990s, when Deputy Ferbrache was a member of Advisory & Finance, was that La Mare de Carteret needed a degree of reconstruction and better maintenance. It was so apt and appropriate, Deputy Leadbeater’s football tribute yesterday, because England had a great European Championship that failed in the end. And the song, of course, from Skinner and Baddiel and the others is very much *Thirty years of hurt* – or ‘Fifty years of hurt’ if you go back to 1966 – it is a sense of disappointment embedded.

I think the public have been disillusioned that La Mare de Carteret School has been promised for so long to be rebuilt – in the late 1990s, in the Torode amendment that I alluded to when I talked about my partnership with Deputy Trott in an earlier States, in various Education Ministries and Committees that have come and gone.

And it was always there: it was there in the Committee that Deputy Sherbourne and Professor Conder served on, and Advocate Green. It has been moved and moved around. It is ironical that some of the people who kind of said, ‘We need to look again at La Mare’ are now are very much promoting La Mare as being back on the table, but never mind. Deputy de Lisle, as a western Deputy, has always been consistent in his support for La Mare and so have many campaigners within this community and without – like, for example, former Mother of the House, Mary Lowe.

The main features of this are three evenly-sized schools at La Mare, St Sampson’s, and Les Beaucamps. In other words, it is an unusual – hopefully not *too* unusual – example of a big infrastructural project of the States actually moving forward and implementing a promise that has been made many times. Actually, it is a lot more than a promise, because we can think of things that were vaguely promised – like, for example, working on a new structure of GP funding, which is going forward, in a way ...

But this went deeper than a promise because Deputy Oliver will remember ... I would probably agree with Deputy Ferbrache that Deputy Oliver and her new team at DPA have been outstanding at doing some things we could have done. But Deputy Oliver will recall, in the early days of my presidency, that we actually passed La Mare de Carteret School plans. I was briefly on the Education, Sport & Culture Committee as well, and we were committed to rebuilding La Mare. I went to a meeting there; it was not particularly well attended, but nevertheless, people wanted to progress. The irony is, we are debating this in the first week, really, of the school term for 2021, and that would have been the grand opening date; so we would have seen, possibly, Deputy Dudley-Owen, yourself, sir, as Presiding Officer, opening the school and it would have been a grand day. And nothing happened, for various reasons.

The main features ... La Mare would have had six forms of entry, yes. Where this is different, perhaps, from some of my more expensive options is it basically retains the existing buildings, refurbishes and extends, because we know Deputy de Lisle and Deputy Leadbeater are two Guernsey representatives who do not believe in spending money when you can find more efficient solutions. That is important: it reduces the size to 26 and, of course, maintains the Guernsey Institute of Les Ozouets.

I will come onto one or two of the specific points in just a minute. One of the reasons why I flagged up – despite, I think, teacher opposition and some issues with St Peter Port – focusing the Sixth Form Centre at Les Varendes, at the old Grammar School, but not having an 11–16 entry there is, I agree, in a way, with Deputy Parkinson that we are a little bit too wedded to the partnership school and catchment area concepts. But there is another side to this, and that is that Les Varendes is an interesting site in itself: it is on all the main bus routes; it is, by Guernsey standards, on very good roads – Foote’s Lane is a wide road now, so is the main road there – and it is centrally located in the hub of the Island.

We are probably not going to have a university any time soon, as Deputy Inder implied yesterday, but we may well need Health/Partnership for Purpose hubs. What we definitely need – the Scrutiny hearing showed this quite graphically – is, at some point, a new Home Affairs/police station/central services hub that is larger and more useful for IT. That is a potential site, the half of the Grammar School that would not be needed in this. I look at it from a logistical point of view, not just an educational point of view; in other words, we are joining up the thinking.

The Education commentary – which is very helpful, and I thank them for all the work that they have done on this – puts technical points about reduced tipping points, ‘temporary staff and temporary classrooms might be needed at La Mare de Carteret to accommodate a peak’ – which, of course, might even be a longer peak if our population, for whatever reason, increases. But of course, Ladies’ College, which has had an excellent reputation for many years, for a long time had portacabins, but it did not affect their outcomes; if anything, it gave, probably, a sense of dynamism to the school. So I think we can overcome these issues. We have already been in an intermediate stage for far longer than any of us intended, and to be very fair to Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Inder, they were on a Committee that was delivering the solution and it got stopped in its tracks. *(Interjection)*

Anyway:

La Mare School would not be able to receive the full intake until after building works were completed.

Yes, but we have still got Les Varendes to bring capacity at the moment.

Significant repurposing of the existing Grammar School would be required to create a standalone Sixth Form Centre.

Well, I would argue that the canteen, for example – it is not the greatest canteen; I do not think it gives me the hot breakfasts I might like, but never mind, I am not a pupil at the school – it is not huge. I think, increasingly, sixth-formers, being adults – in the sense that they can vote and, in other circumstances, do careers, as Deputy Aldwell reminded us – actually would prefer a larger facility, rather than a smaller one.

As for the sports hall, fitness, wellness, is very important; I, myself, was using the sports hall recently to do my dance practice with a teacher, but only in the summer holidays. It is often used for political meetings as well. It is useful to have a large hall on the Island. Look at Elizabeth College: when it was rebuilt by the very forward-thinking founders 200 years ago, it only had a few pupils – at one point, it went down to one pupil – and yet, it was built on a Gothic cathedral scale. So how useful that was in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, long after the colonial people of the era had moved on, is amazing, but never mind.

I think all of the issues can be overcome. We can accommodate the repurposed swimming pool. It does not go into the music service, which I thoroughly support as a centre of excellence and great bonding therapy and career-building work; but of course that can be done at Les Ozouets, and I think it would fit very well into the Sixth Form culture anyway. The Youth Commission and Chair.. has to be considered separately.

I will end this speech – weirdly enough, *The Spectator* this month, this week, have featured not so much The Lightning Seeds, but New Kids on the Block. And they have demonstrated something I, myself, looked up a few months ago when this came before the Chamber: the enterprise of Westminster, the famous public school – and we were delighted, yesterday, to welcome a member

from the Westminster House of Commons, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. The idea is put across here that maybe Westminster School – which now has an annex, a subsidiary, a partnership college called ‘Harris Westminster Sixth Form School,’ by the ‘visionary’ Lord Harris of Peckham, so described – may well see future Cabinet ministers drawn from this school. What is this school? It is a sixth form college; it is an eye-watering £10,497 per term – £31,000-£32,000 a year – it has an incredible 2,500 applicants and only 350 places; and I do not think I would have got in, because you need at least seven A’s at GCSE.

My point, though, is that this is a sixth form college that is hitting the highest possible range of Oxbridge entrants and achievement, and it is a small sixth form college. It proves that with the will and with the right philosophy, you can indeed take a sixth form college out of schools, in unusual communities – and I think Guernsey, as a self-governing, judicially competent offshore world centre is a very special community, much more so than a town somewhere in the provinces of England – you can make a smaller sixth form work; it does not have to be in a school. And it would not be a disadvantage for Les Varendes to have a separate sixth form, to retain its sixth form, and for the 11-16s to go to another site. And of course, it is more equal: it means to say that you have all three schools in a semi-rural location on the periphery of the Island’s hub, and therefore, each school would gain a stronger sense of identity.

So what are the advantages of this amendment? It is cheaper in terms of capital, it honours our promise, it will make many teachers and parents very happy to see La Mare have a great future at a time when it has been improving significantly, and it ensures that we maximise our land most effectively and free up at least half a large site for other corporate purposes. So let us vote for this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: Thank you, sir.

The first three speakers on this amendment have made it sound like some sort of vote of confidence or otherwise in La Mare de Carteret High School, but I do not think that that is actually what we are considering. I have enormous respect for what has been achieved at La Mare de Carteret, particularly over recent years, and the turnaround since those exam results were released after the questioning by Deputy Stephens. They have done an incredible job. It is not just exam results; the sense of community down there is palpable.

But we have to look at this amendment as a whole. It is suggesting, as are ESC, that we create a standalone sixth form college of circa 400 people – different site, same concept. As I said in my speech on general debate, which I almost regret making, back in July now, I do not think that that is a practical option. To be honest, to compare it with an annex to Winchester College is, I think, fanciful. I think in the provision in Guernsey’s States’ sector, the idea that you can have an efficient, ergonomic, standalone sixth form college of 400 and heading down is absolute fantasy.

So for exactly the same reasons I cannot vote for the substantive proposals in the policy letter, I am afraid, I have to say to Deputy Leadbeater, that I cannot vote for his amendment, but it is not in any way – or I hope it will not be taken in any way as – a sign of disrespect to La Mare de Carteret or what goes on there.

The Bailiff: Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, sir.

I, too, have huge respect for La Mare de Carteret, but I just cannot vote for this on practicality, because if you look at ESC’s positioning of the schools which they have currently decided, St Sampson’s, Beaucamps, and Grammar, why would you want to cut out either Beaucamps or – you would be cutting out, I guess, St Sampson’s? St Sampson’s and La Mare are so close together in the scheme of the Island, you want them more spread out. So St Sampson’s, Beaucamps, and Les

285 Varendes, it makes a lot more sense, because the majority of kids live in town or in the north, so you have got St Sampson's for all that.

So it is purely on a locational basis that I cannot vote for it. And I completely agree with Deputy Roffey that that does not take away anything from how good La Mare has done. But also, it is going to cost a hell of a lot more money for the rebuild of La Mare, rather than repurposing the current
290 buildings that we have got. So I just cannot vote for it.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

295 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you, sir.

I am, again, struggling with this – for similar reasons to Deputy Roffey, in fact – in that it still proposes a structure which I think is flawed. Although, I do think it has some advantages over the model being proposed by the Committee, not least that the tipping point is lower – I will come onto that in a minute – and also, it would not be cannibalising the space of the Guernsey Institute – I do
300 actually think that that creates problems. I think, irrespective of anything else about the structure and how that affects curriculum in practice, etc., I think there is a standalone problem with co-locating the Sixth Form Centre with the Guernsey Institute, and this amendment at least overcomes that problem.

So although I do not think it is an ideal structure in any way – I have explained my thoughts on that previously – I do think it has some advantages over Education's proposals. Going back to my
305 rationale that what is before us is a binary choice between which we think is better, I am open to persuasion to vote for this, although I am still torn.

I would say I query some of the capital costs. I do not understand, I mean I had this with the numbers that were given to us on a previous amendment as well: I do not think applying an
310 optimism bias over a whole bunch of numbers that have previously been used in Education's model is in any way fair. If they are right, they are right; you do not need to add a further percentage onto them. Also, again, the problem that we had with the capital figures that were given to us was the assumptions were just very different. So I would take those with, perhaps, a pinch of salt.

But anyway: La Mare. I think it is worth looking at – Deputy Roffey referenced the fantastic turnaround that La Mare has made, and I do think that is worth applauding publicly. But I also think
315 it is worth interrogating – not why that turnaround was needed, but how it was achieved, because it was really impressive. I am not an expert, but to my understanding, there were several factors, several really key factors in that turnaround; probably the most important of which was money. There was a lot of money put into addressing this problem, quite rightly. I think that is the first
320 thing. There is an absolutely cracking senior leadership team, fantastic leadership. Smaller class sizes and a lower pupil-teacher ratio – in other words, more teachers per number of students.

I think those are all really relevant factors and I think it is important that we look at those factors in light of the proposals that form the substantive Propositions at the moment. If we know that a school turned a corner to quite the degree that it managed and with such success – as Deputy
325 Leadbeater quite rightly pointed out – if those factors are pertinent, these are what we are about to lose. We are being told that the overall budget is being rebalanced between secondary and primary sectors so that money is being taken out of secondary in favour of primary. We can assume that – well, we know, actually – in terms of the Education model, the Committee's model, that the tipping point will be higher, class sizes will be significantly higher, and we can also assume that – actually,
330 again, we have been told that – the pupil-teacher ratio will be less favourable.

I think those are all pertinent factors. I am worried. I am not sure how much it bears relevance to my feelings about this particular amendment, but I do think these are important lessons, these are important factors to consider when looking at the model that we are being asked to agree, and I do really worry about what we might lose. When we look at La Mare as an example of a success
335 story, we are about to U-turn on all of the things that made that school a success.

But I am still torn on this particular amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Murray.

340 **Deputy Murray:** Thank you, sir.

I want to commend the obvious passion which both Deputies Leadbeater and de Lisle displayed in their introduction to this amendment. The performance of the school, despite the circumstances of the building within which the school has had to operate, is a credit to the staff and admirably demonstrates that the most important component to affect outcomes in any school is the ability and commitment of the teachers. Indeed, my late wife was actually taught there under the redoubtable Jenny Tasker, mentioned by Deputy Gollop. But I would have to say that if circumstances were different and it was the Grammar School or Les Varendes that was actually, at this point in time, being looked at, I would expect equal passion from a number of Members of the Assembly as well on that. This is a very difficult decision to have to make, to close a school.

350 I further thank the Deputies for producing one of the only amendments that we have had so far inclusive of indicative costs, and on top of which, for an amendment which accurately reflects the conversations with officers so that the detailed projections are in line with the discussions that were held. That is important since this is a complex proposal and I am afraid it is fraught with challenges on a number of fronts, not least if we are to understand that this is intended to be an ongoing project 'when funds allow.'

355 I would remind Members that a full rebuild of LMDC was actually in scope for the Committee until really quite close to the finalisation of the policy letter; indeed, it had been our original intention to provide it as an option if the Assembly were minded to spend the considerable amount of money necessary in addition to the proposed new Sixth Form Centre. However, there were additional factors which had to be taken into account, and that is why, eventually, knowing that the additional capital costs were so significant – and clearly, that alone was unlikely to gain support – we reluctantly removed it as an option.

360 Some of those considerations were, for example: if La Mare was to be one of the three 11–16 schools in the partnership, it meant that we had to discount the Grammar School, which, from a geographical point of view – as Deputy Oliver has mentioned – would mean servicing the largest catchment area on the Island, St Peter Port, and it would likely require us having to, for example, bus students out to the west coast. That is not in itself a major issue, but our buses also have to service primary school pickups, our scheduled bus services; there is a wider knock-on impact.

365 Designing an education system gets complicated and it is full of interdependencies that are not always obvious. Further, it is widely known that the prospect of having to rebuild the primary school in the near future is also a possibility, and that raises the prospect of ongoing building works on that same site for several years, potentially; that is disruptive for children. Beyond that, the original existing plans for the rebuild of the secondary that we already had were to place it in the lower-lying area of the available space, necessitating a bund. Those plans for the school were also designed around the very large space standards to which Les Beaucamps was built, our newest school, and so plans would have had to be redrawn anyway.

370 Beyond that, though, the most cost-effective location for any future rebuild of the primary is actually where the secondary now stands. This particular proposal does not talk in terms of rebuilding a school which dates back to the early 1970s – I think it was 1974, according to Deputy Leadbeater. This proposal suggests that a two-form extension could be built and that the original building could be reworked to accommodate not the four forms that it was designed for, but the six forms that it would require. If we leave aside whether attempting to refurbish a building getting on for nearly 50 years in age is actually an appropriate investment, the logistics attached to the proposal are very complex when trying to migrate students from the existing Grammar School as and when that extension and the refurbishment work can be planned.

385 Then of course, there is the considerable work necessary at the Grammar site, as proposed in this amendment. Because the Sixth Form was never built to be a standalone facility, much work will have to be done within the Sixth Form and adjacent Grammar site to provide access to the 60% of

390 necessary facilities that the Sixth Form Centre does not currently have. On top of that, although it has not been stated, the Committee's proposal to move the Music Centre, SHARE, and Youth Commission to the swimming pool area of the Grammar would still appear to be viable in this proposal, but unfortunately, since it would only be servicing the Sixth Form students, it is not the most effective place to site it – other than, of course, it would still have the Princess Theatre at Les Ozouets campus within reach.

395 Due to the sequencing of the building requirements and the very complex transition, this approach is likely to take about five years to come to fruition, leave us with a great deal of unused space at the Grammar site, enshrine the upkeep of a building already approaching half a century old into the future, and geographically not be in the right place to facilitate the town feeder schools. And even though it is not being proposed as a total rebuild, it is not going to be cheap. Even without
400 any optimism bias, we could be looking at the thick end of £60 million, and we certainly cannot and would never ignore optimism bias on a project of this scope.

Sir, I see this as a well-intentioned attempt to keep the LMDC on the table. But this solution is, unfortunately, impractical and therefore unsuitable on a number of levels – none of which reflects at all upon the obvious commitment and professionalism and success of the staff. I would therefore
405 ask Members not to support this amendment.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, sir. I will be brief.

410 Like Deputy Murray, I commend the proposer and seconder for attempting to do what I had sought to do many years ago.

I think, however, time has moved on, circumstances have changed. I was on the La Mare de Carteret – both the primary school and secondary school – Committee for many years and even 20 years ago, the secondary school buildings were in a dire condition. To put an extension onto that
415 only makes me think of silk purses and sows' ears; it is quite clearly not appropriate. Similarly, whilst the primary school actually is in far better condition than the secondary school, there needs to be, I think, a focus pretty soon after whatever decision we make on this to rebuild that school in an appropriate way, and I think the only way that can happen effectively is if there is not a major rebuild happening to the secondary school on that site.

420 This is very much not an ideal position to be in, but it also reminds me of some of the motivation of why I have sought to say what I said yesterday and to bring amendments: there have been promises after promises by successive Assemblies, and of course, it is fine if you pass on to someone else – you can point the finger at them if you are not in the next Assembly; but the promise back in 2001, when the Assembly then decided to retain selection, the focus was then on, 'The problem is
425 we have a load of schools that are not of the same quality as the Grammar School' – which at that time was one of the newer schools. And so the promise was there that the rebuild would make the whole difference.

Now, it is true that the quality of buildings and certainly the space available within to be able to teach, and some of the sizes of the classrooms at La Mare – I used to go in occasionally to help with
430 RE lessons years ago – are unbelievably cramped. But we know that that is not the whole picture at all. The sad thing was, of course, that the next Assembly – or the Assembly after that, I think; it certainly took a long time – decided to rebuild, first of all, St Sampson's, and then Les Beaucamps, and then La Mare was left. And it was in, arguably, I think, the worst condition. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) So there has been promise after promise broken there.

435 It would be tempting, perhaps, therefore, to feel sympathetic to this amendment and say, 'For the sake of it, let's rebuild it.' But the fact is, the circumstances have changed quite dramatically. School numbers: the school roll is changing. The size of the school becomes an issue in the future unless feeder schools and catchment areas are changed. And in my mind, if we just look at the snapshot of La Mare, we will be taking our sights off the bigger picture, which is far more important.

440 But I am concerned still that this Assembly could make the same mistakes of that Assembly back in 2000–04 of making promises it cannot keep.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

445 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, I think the two speeches which have – I was already of that mind anyway – emphasised the point are those of Deputies Murray and Le Tocq, having regard to the practicalities. But I would like to say this – and it is an indulgence, but I do not make any apology for that – happy birthday to Deputy Leadbeater, happy birthday to La Mare de Carteret School, and happy birthday to my granddaughter Matilda, who are 51, 47, and four respectively.

450 In relation to that, when Deputy Leadbeater speaks, when Deputy de Lisle speaks, they speak with passion, they speak with integrity, and they speak well, and I am very influenced by what both of those gentlemen said; they have made their case as well as it can be.

But as Deputy Le Tocq says – and I have criticised this Assembly, I have criticised previous Assemblies – but we go back to the 1970s, when La Mare was built, why do you build schools that
455 are only meant to last 25 or 30 years? That was a crazy decision; we cannot do anything about it. But as Deputy Le Tocq has said eloquently, really, all La Mare building is fit for is knocking down. If you are going to have a long-term school there beyond the next two or three years, you have got to rebuild it. That is going to cost many millions that we do not have.

I thought all of Deputy Leadbeater's speech was good, except I think he should leave the poetry
460 bit and the music bit to Deputy Queripel, really, (*Laughter*) but other than that, he still said it well. I think, probably, the result of this amendment is going to be a bit like the Euros: that he will get to the Final but lose the Final, in respect of all of that.

The point, again, in respect of this is that – and I can remember, I think, the political mentor of Deputy Trott and certainly a person I respect considerably, Deputy Bury, once saying – we had a
465 debate about whether we were going to retain Conseillers – Deputy Bury – we did not have *Hansard* in those days – Deputy Bury then went back and listened to the tape, and I had said something about 'Conseillers should be abolished,' 'They have had their day,' 'People love titles,' and all that kind of thing. And of course when I was a Conseiller and I voted to keep Conseillers, and Deputy Bury reminded the Assembly of what I very ably said. And that was done a bit to Deputy Dudley-
470 Owen and others yesterday. And that is a fair point, but times have moved on.

But what I want to say to the people – the pupils of La Mare de Carteret, the parents who send their children there, and particularly the teachers – you have all done a fantastic job. It was a basket case several years ago, and Deputy Leadbeater said with pride and with ability how well it has been turned around in the last five or six years. So I commend that, but we have got to move on.

475 Deputy Gollop was talking about the parish schools, and I can remember, at Amherst, we used to go to St Peter School, St Saviour School, Torteval School to play football, etc., and those were about the only teams we could beat; we would go there. And those schools have gone because we have moved on from parish schools because the Island – I do not share the Deputy Parkinson thing that 'It does not really matter in Guernsey; you can go anywhere because we are an Island
480 community.' And again, perhaps that is for another issue about, 'If it was a free-for-all, where would the children go?'; you would have people – 'I want to go the Varendes,' 'I want to go to St Sampson's,' and they would be filling out forms with alacrity.

I say to Deputy de Lisle and to Deputy Leadbeater that I am going to vote against your amendment, but I very much respect the sincerity of both of you in bringing it.

485 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

I echo the words of the last speakers in saying that I think the movers of this amendment have
490 done a sterling job of proposing and seconding it, and I think that we all admire very much the

work that has been undertaken at La Mare de Carteret. But sadly, I think the time has moved on and that school cannot be rebuilt.

When it comes to the vote, I am going to abstain because I live almost opposite the entrance to La Mare de Carteret School and it might be considered that I have a personal interest in the decision.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Just briefly, sir. I am going to thank Deputy Leadbeater for his passion, and certainly Deputy de Lisle as well, because I know it is one of the most genuine amendments that we have seen over the last couple of months; it is from the heart. And someone who was a member of one of the ESCs, and is right, Deputy Gollop, said had the failed two-school policy letter not been adopted, La Mare de Carteret would probably have been built right now and I think we would be taking pupils into school, accepting it was not perfect in its own way, but when you have got a politicised decision where you do personality over politics, as we are seeing here, that is why we are here today.

It is also worth reminding some of the history that Deputy Le Tocq has forgotten, actually, or possibly – yes, he probably did forget. Back – I think it was – in 2015, it was Deputy St Pier who brought in the four-into-three schools. At the time, in the *Hansard*, he made the point that he did not believe La Mare de Carteret should be rebuilt, and at the time, on the *Hansard*, Deputy Le Tocq at the time said, ‘Do not go so fast in the direction, it is purely down to three schools and La Mare might be one of them.’ Unfortunately.

And I think, having walked around that school – and it was myself who recognised the absolute deterioration of the huts at the back. You have heard me say it before: I am a countryman. I walked into those huts, and those teachers and those pupils were living, working, and studying in rat-infested huts. There were black spots on the wall; we had asthmatic children walking into those schools coughing; and I know what rat urine smells like, and that dance hall had it.

Now, we were under 355; we were not allowed to do anything about it. But as soon as – in terms of the personality politics that we dealt with last time – as long as they got rid of the people that they did not want in, the chequebook was opened up and it was fixed, but that is the politics that we are in at the moment. And I think it is absolutely disgusting the way La Mare de Carteret has been treated as a building – it has been left to go to rack and ruin – how the teachers have been treated – and I am afraid, the pupils and the teachers of this Island have been used as political footfalls by people who should know better.

But Deputy Leadbeater and Deputy de Lisle, I absolutely respect the amendment that you have put in here today because it is the most genuine, it is the most genuine of the teachers and some of the most difficult of our pupils, but unfortunately, I am not going to be able to support it for the reasons mentioned by Deputies Ferbrache, Le Tocq, and others in the last three or four speeches.

The Bailiff: Deputy Aldwell.

Deputy Aldwell: Thank you, sir.

Happy birthday, Deputy Leadbeater; happy birthday to your granddaughter; and happy birthday to my daughter, also – get that in! (*Laughter*)

Sir, this amendment asks Members to replace the Committee’s proposals with three secondary schools located at Les Beaucamps, St Sampson’s and La Mare de Carteret, keeping the Sixth Form only at Les Varendes site. This amendment does not seek to rebuild La Mare de Carteret, but keep it hobbling along, continuing to apply sticky plasters, which has been the case for the past 20 years. As mentioned previously by Deputies in the *Hansard* transcript in 2015 on the Education debate, it stated that La Mare de Carteret should have been rebuilt 10 years previously. There were health issues, water seeping through the roof, and the buildings were probably riddled with asbestos. It also stated at that time it was not fit for purpose.

The amendment also seeks to add a two-form entry on the site and expand this as a phased development when funds allow. This would cause a huge amount of disruption for the students and staff without the knowledge of when the situation would ever come to an end.

545 Sir, the Committee's plans are very straightforward. We have been on a very long journey, we have spent an enormous amount of time looking at what has been proposed before to understand what is needed for the future. The Committee did not design our strategy around a table on our own, but with a whole team of educational specialists under the educational strategy advisor, Laurie Baker, over many months, where we learnt to challenge what was and what was not possible using
550 information we had gained from our staff as guiding principles.

The three schools which were chosen from the Education estate were for various reasons: with Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's being the newest, the third school was chosen as Les Varendes because it was the largest catchment area and would allow students to walk or cycle to school. It also had been well maintained and had a programme of ongoing works. It had the space to
555 accommodate the Youth Commission, Music Service, and SHARE, who all work within and alongside the schools and make a huge contribution to all our students.

Once this had been decided on, we then worked on the numbers for the pupil school feeders into the secondary schools and found that our models worked comfortably for a smooth transition. We have taken onboard that six forms of entry would work well at each school and using Les
560 Varendes, we had the room to expand as this was required.

Sir, I have the highest regard for the students and staff at La Mare de Carteret. I had been on that committee for three years before becoming a Deputy. They are the hardest working and the most passionate about their schools. It is a wonderful community.

But all of our high schools have a wonderful community, and each year, different schools have
565 different results. Every secondary school is a high-performing school. As an example this year, the average for GCSEs A–C was 69.6. St Anne's actually had 77.8; Beaucamps 63.3; and La Mare 50. That is not to take away anything from the wonderful things that they have done, because they have done an amazing job. But each year, different schools have higher levels – but that is just for the cohorts; different cohorts, different levels. But it does not take away from the staff all the amazing
570 job that they do, because they are amazing.

But I am afraid to say the school building is no longer fit for purpose and adding a two-storey block somewhere on the site is not going to help the situation. This proposal does not serve our students well. We have a small transition window which would allow students to have one move, with the three cohorts moving to Les Varendes in September 2024 and the new take from La Mare
575 de Carteret 2024 then moving on to St Sampson's High.

I do not see that it would be possible to ask the students from Les Varendes in the 11–16 part of the school, if closed, to move to La Mare de Carteret, as per this amendment suggests, while the site is being redesigned to make half of the site into a standalone sixth form, and I question if permission would be given. It also concerns me that all the work would go on at Les Varendes while
580 the students are still working on the site at the sixth form. With the curriculum using across four sides of that site of the 11–16, including the labs, I wonder how the school could still function.

La Mare de Carteret students cannot be left in limbo any longer; it is not fair to our students or staff. It would be unforgivable to have students on a continuous building site stretching into the future, waiting for the next phase of work to be planned.

585 **Deputy Leadbeater:** I thank Deputy Aldwell for giving way.

I did not want to interrupt anybody. There is many things which I completely disagree with, some things that Deputy Aldwell has said I disagree with. But the one thing she cannot say is that it is unfair to continue on that site, 'It is unfair to the teachers and the students to continue on that site,'
590 because if you ask every single one of the teachers at La Mare de Carteret School, they would prefer to keep that site, even in the building it is, in the condition that it is, rather than to knock it down.

I just thought I would need to correct that, sir.

595 **Deputy Aldwell:** These plans are not fair foundations to build our future education strategy on coming out of COVID; we need well thought-out plans, a confirmed direction. The Committee have well thought-out plans, moving students smoothly into three secondary schools without disruption of building extensions, where students will be known by name and need, the schools will have their own personalities and be communities so students feel they belong, with schools of equal size. They will have a broader curriculum.

600 No one likes change, but COVID has changed everything. We are now in a non-selective era. We certainly need to invest in our young people, give them the skills to reach their potential. We must push forward with a vision for the future skills required and a workforce well trained and fulfilled, allowing our economy to thrive.

I ask you to reject this amendment.

605 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

610 It seems that today is an auspicious day for birthdays: I would also like to wish my daughter a happy birthday today! (*Laughter*) It would appear that we all had some good news, perhaps! (*Laughter*)

I am a little bit torn about this amendment. It does appeal to me on one hand, but on the other, I think I am going to make the decision, unfortunately, not to back it, because mainly around the capital. And I follow Deputy de Lisle's passion, certainly, that La Mare de Carteret is a well-performing school. But to follow his argument, it is the people in it, not necessarily the building, so perhaps, if the people in it were relocated and nurtured, they could still perform and have that ability.

620 But to me, it strikes me that spending an extra £30 million-odd and bringing up the optimum bias, to include that, to £83 million is a far too significant amount for this school. It also commits us to further expenditure 'when funds allow,' and to be realistic, I do not think funds will allow, looking at the future, unless we make some significant changes which are already planned which are certainly going to be unpopular. So this, sort of, commits us again into more spending. I am not going to say that spending on our future and our children is unnecessary, but it is certainly committing us to spending.

625 So that is where I am. Thank you very much, and as previous speakers have said, it is a relevant amendment and has a degree of sense to it and it is well thought-out and there were some passionate speeches, so I thank Deputies Leadbeater and de Lisle for raising it.

630 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir. I will be brief; I was not going to speak on this, but at least I have got to say that phrase now.

635 I was brought to my feet primarily to make clear that the 'Deputy Bury' that Deputy Ferbrache was referring to was not myself, although I am happy to offer my mentorship to Deputy Trott if he needs it!

I was not going to speak on this; it is tricky for me to speak, with my daughter being a student at La Mare de Carteret. However, she is fairly pragmatic on the matter and has said that we just need to do what is best for everyone, and hopefully, we all feel the same.

640 I would like to thank Deputy Leadbeater as well, and Deputy de Lisle, as many other speakers have. I think this is an important conversation to have, not centred around the emotive matter of closing a school, but the bigger picture of what it is we want to invest in in this education restructure.

I am also torn, because I am not comfortable – as Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Roffey alluded to – with the overall structure that is being proposed by ESC with the standalone sixth form, which this amendment replicates. However, for those of you that are comfortable with that, I think

645 this amendment, therefore, merits consideration for the reasons of the performance and the community of that school that we are now about to shut down, by the feel of it.

What is it we want to invest in? As Deputy Leadbeater explained to us yesterday, 50% of our students do not go on to further education, so this section of our education system is the last mandatory area. So with the limited funds that we have, are we going to invest in that or in a section
650 where half the people are not going to benefit?

So I am torn and I am not sure which way I am going to go, but I think, for those of you who are comfortable with this standalone sixth form option, that the community and the success that La Mare have displayed over the last few years should be something that should be taken into account.

Thank you.

655 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Fairclough.

Deputy Fairclough: Thank you, sir.

I agree with Deputy Bury that this does merit consideration, particularly for the reasons that she
660 has mentioned. I do not have as much of a problem with the standalone Sixth Form Centre as some of my colleagues.

I commend Deputy Leadbeater on his speech yesterday, and I have to say, I was disappointed to hear concessions that if it had not been for COVID, then La Mare de Carteret School may well have been rebuilt. Now, COVID has had an effect on public finances – we all know that far too well –
665 but surely, not to the extent that we have to redesign an education system and estate which has to last us decades – generations, even.

The school was, as a number of other speakers have alluded to – and I will not be repeating a lot of the things that have been said – promised by the States that it would be rebuilt after St Sampson's and Beaucamps; that never happened, the promise was never kept. And I feel for the staff, students, and parents at La Mare, I think, as we all do, and as a States' Member, I want to apologise to them that their school was not rebuilt years ago, when it should have been.
(**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Put simply, they were sold short.

We cannot keep looking backwards. So what do we intend to do to reward the school, its staff, and students, after turning it around to become one of the best performing secondary schools, as
675 we heard Deputy Leadbeater explain yesterday? We plan to close it. And the way we are told that was communicated, to my mind, left a lot to be desired; that is putting it politely. And now, here we are with a school facing closure and all that goes with it. But these are more than schools: they are communities within our community, as we found out to our cost when St Andrew's Primary School was closed and St Peter Port Secondary School was closed.

I am always proud to say my mum taught there, at St Peter Port Secondary, before it was closed, before finishing her career as a Home Economics and Domestic Science teacher at La Mare de Carteret Secondary School; these subjects probably do not even exist anymore. It was a job she loved. She is still friends with those she worked with decades ago. We heard Deputy Murray talk about one of the teachers there; there was a real community, and I still believe that there is. But for
685 years afterwards, when I was out and about with my mum, people would come up to her and say, 'Hello, Mrs Fairclough,' and tell her they still made their own Christmas cakes using the recipe she had taught them years earlier and tell me she was their favourite teacher; I am sure they said that to all the teachers.

So while I may not be an expert in education, I do know the value of a good school and its place
690 in the community, both geographically – although all of these things are relative to Guernsey, and we have heard some of the distances that have been alluded to; nowhere is far, really, is it? – but also in the hearts and minds of those who work and study there; the value of good teaching staff; the feeling of belonging. And I ask myself, are we going to get that as a result of ESC's proposed model? We will see. I hope, whichever model we come up with, that this almost intangible aspect is
695 taken into account in a small community like ours.

I do not intend to stay on my feet for much longer, but I thank the Education Committee for this document; I found it very useful. As you will see from pages 33 and 34 of the side-by-side comparison, this amendment most closely aligns with the staff survey feedback from July 2020.

I have nothing more to say, really, other than to commend those who have spoken in favour of this and urge those Members who have not yet made up their minds to support this amendment.

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, sir.

Before I start to speak on the amendment, I just wish to reassure Deputy Fairclough and all other Members and anyone listening in this community that change management and support of our students, our school community, and our staff are absolutely key in any plans going forward for the Committee to make sure that change is managed as smoothly and as well as it possibly can be, and we will commit to making sure that everyone is updated on a regular basis about how things are managed going forward.

I really want to reassure Deputy Fairclough of that because he is right: it is intangible. But Deputy de Lisle has also referred to issues around the closure of St Peter Port School, which we know did not go as smoothly as it could have down and left students disenfranchised for many years with a detrimental effect on their adult life, and that is not something that we can afford to repeat again with this States.

Going into commenting on this particular proposal, I must say that Deputy Leadbeater and Deputy de Lisle have engaged really wholeheartedly with officers from the Education Committee and they have reflected the facts and figures given to them by officers in their amendment. And I really respect that, because the two Deputies have come to this with an open heart and been wholly sincere and displayed utmost integrity in their presentation, and I commend that. And I have utmost sympathy with wanting to retain a really important part of our school community.

But the proposal is not what I expected to see. It is not a rebuild of the school; it is a new extension onto an existing facility, and that makes for a very complex plan, an expensive plan, and an elongated plan. And it is undeniable that neither the condition of the building's fabric nor the facilities currently on offer are acceptable for the Island's learners at La Mare de Carteret. A period of prolonged underinvestment due to the promise of a never-delivered rebuild have taken their toll. For that, successive terms of Government must be held accountable.

We want to ensure that all our students have a similar quality of opportunities, because that is fair, and that would not be the case if we continued to use La Mare de Carteret as it is today. Deputy Leadbeater is correct that I have supported the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret, and that was right up to crunch time, when we as a Committee had to make a decision as to whether or not we would bring its potential rebuild to the States as our preferred option. When weighed against a very serviceable school building at Les Varendes with a much more modern extension to the current Sixth Form Centre, which can be readily repurposed as high school accommodation to rehome all the students who will be displaced by the closure of La Mare de Carteret, and other issues as well, I very reluctantly had to accept that the rebuild option was not one that we could take to the States.

The Committee considered carefully the site options for the three 11-16 schools, and although it was in the running for quite some time, La Mare de Carteret site was discounted from the Committee's preferred option for the following reasons.

Using the site of the current high school would necessitate a rebuild requiring additional capital expenditure of a minimum of £30 million-35 million, which the Committee does not consider to be prudent given the current financial climate.

The combination of the transition arrangements and the current primary school feeder model could place more families in a position of having to choose whether a child transfers to secondary school with their group of peers or attends the same school as a sibling.

Although it would reduce the distance students in La Mare de Carteret Primary catchment area would need to travel to school, it would increase the distance students in Town are required to travel to school relative to the Committee's preferred option – including students in the Island's other social priority area, which is Amherst – as there would no longer be a secondary school located at Les Varendes, the Grammar School site.

As I have mentioned, the current building at Les Varendes requires only minor upgrades to continue to meet required standards for education. In a model where La Mare de Carteret was the third site, Les Varendes site would not be used as a school building, which is contrary to an inefficient use of the estate.

Looking to the longer term, potential developments in housing supply, which might include variations to the type and tenure of housing in the area – especially at Le Genet – could mean that the advantage of locating a high school on La Mare de Carteret site will lessen over time.

The option of a rebuild would not have been fully implemented until September 2025, but that is on the basis that we did a clean sweep and we rebuilt the school in one go, and that is not the proposal in front of us; the proposal in front of us is to build a new extension onto the existing school and then to phase a rebuild. That builds in a large amount of complexities and challenges to overcome and it means that the 'go live' date for this proposal would be September 2027; this is two more years than if you rebuilt the school as we have explored.

Appendix 2, on page 42 of the comparison document, outlines the sequence of actions that have to be undertaken in order to get to the 'go live' date in as smooth as possible a way, and I would encourage Members to look at that and to see that detail.

La Mare is undeniably a school which has come a very long way and has seen significant improvement in the last decade. Exam results matter but we cannot and should not rely solely on those as an indicator of success, and we need to be looking at a far broader set of outcomes than just that A*-C measures. States' Members who attended the Curriculum and Standards session in our webinar series, which is still available for you to view if you have not already seen it, will have had an introduction to this and will be aware of this already.

But let us be clear: as Deputy Gabriel has alluded to, it is not the building itself that has brought about those improvements; it is the dedicated and hard-working staff. It is the support from the Education Centre as well, and the diligent students, and the parents supporting those students who have done that together.

Let us also be clear that one of the reasons that La Mare de Carteret's outcomes have improved so much is as a result of substantial targeted investment over successive years to bring about that change; it did not happen by accident. That investment in our people, our most valuable resource, will not be lost.

We know that the staff at La Mare de Carteret are hugely committed to their school and the excellence in teaching, as Deputy Leadbeater has acknowledged will ensure that those staff will support the children from that school through the transition period as they move *en bloc* to the site at Les Varendes, at the Grammar School site. Let's bottle the magic that is in La Mare de Carteret and share it. The ethos that we want to instil in our system is about partnership: sharing good and excellent practice, working together to make improvements for all our Island's children in the States' school sector.

I would like to take a few minutes of your time to explain how these proposals will work in practice under Deputy Leadbeater's amendment.

We will have to add a sizeable extension to the school to accommodate two more classes in each year, so that is 10 more forms of entry. That means we need to add specialist rooms, such as science labs and arts rooms, as well as general-purpose classrooms. But this amendment also makes it clear that, 'when funds allow,' the idea would be to rebuild the remainder of the school over time.

There is nothing wrong with this as an idea, but in practice, schools work because we put faculties together. So it is not as simple as adding some new rooms; we would need to repurpose existing rooms so that we could add to the building one faculty at a time, and doing a school build piecemeal like this is really quite unsatisfactory, and it also takes time. So we would need to keep the student

800 numbers on the site low to create enough spare space to make alterations around the students studying on the site, and I do not think this is the right thing to do for our students or for that school.

Similar issues arise when repurposing Les Varendes as a sixth form centre. Based on current and projected numbers, we can only fit about half of the sixth form students into the Sixth Form Centre, so we would need to use some of the lower school site for the sixth form – and I think Deputy 805 Murray has alluded to this already. But the science labs are in a very different part of the building to the art rooms, and they are distanced from the sports hall and the refectory.

My point is this: it is not as simple as saying, 'We will close a corridor and everything to the left or right is the Sixth Form Centre and the rest can be reused for some States purpose, such as' – what has been mooted, I think – 'a police station or other, or maybe a health hub, etc.'; we would 810 either have a building that was way too big for its purpose or we would have to spend money ripping out specialist rooms and reinstating them in a different part of the building.

After we have done all that, we would have an education estate that meets the needs of today's learners but has no eye to the future, with no in-built flexibility. And it will cost more to deliver than the Committee's proposals, which have none of those issues.

815 Sir, we were in different financial waters to those that prevail today when I previously supported the rebuild of La Mare de Carteret, and our economic prospects are uncertain. This is not a rebuild on the table in front of us; it is an expensive extension and an unsatisfactory solution to housing the sixth form. Leaving Les Varendes, which is fit for purpose and the right size for use as a high school, half-full under this proposal, with only 450 children, and severely underutilised, under 820 capacity, is not a good use of our resources.

The complexities in transition, the high cost of the rebuild, uncertainty about whether the makeup of the community that it serves at Le Genet still remaining as it is today in the future, the extended 'go live' date, uncertainty over the feeder school model are all significant factors which I have taken into consideration. Members must also weigh up these factors when coming to their 825 decisions on whether or not to support this very well-meaning but complex proposal.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: As no other Member is standing to speak on this amendment, I will turn to its proposer, Deputy Leadbeater, to reply to it, please.

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

I have just scribbled a few notes that I will go through from the speeches that have been made.

Deputy de Lisle tells us that the school serves eight parishes. He speaks of 'spirit and endeavour,' the policy letter speaks of 'culture and identity'; all of these aspirational terms in the policy letter 835 can be applied to this amendment, so anybody else who wants to chuck any of these in, feel free.

I just want to look at the building of La Mare de Carteret because Deputy Dudley-Owen is right: it would make more sense to rebuild the school as a whole, obviously. I did not think that was sell-able to this Assembly; this is why Deputy de Lisle and I spoke with Education officers and looked at doing an extension – but not an extension that you bolt onto the side of the school; a campus-style 840 extension so you can drop the old one and rebuild that in the future. La Mare de Carteret originally was a campus until the early 1980s, when the cloisters were built; it was two separate buildings. So you could continue that thing; it is achievable.

When you look at the capital costs here – and I always really pity the people who have got to put these costs together, because clearly there is an optimum bias in there anyway, but clearly they 845 do not want to be held to account if the figures are too low. So this is why we get these astronomically high figures. I have looked all through this here and I think the total cost of the rebuild is potentially £74 million-£83 million.

I went through it and thought, 'Well, actually, we could do that for £34 million completely'; that is being realistic. But then I thought, 'If that is not the case, I am getting back into construction,' 850 *(Laughter)* 'because Jesus Christ, there is a hell of a lot of money here! £15 million on the programme

works! Whoa!' (*Laughter*) 'That is incredible! I want a job in construction management tomorrow!' (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

855 So it is really difficult, but I really do not think we can go by these capital costs. Obviously, they did not have a great deal of time to put them together, but even if they did, I really do not think these are too relevant. Talk about 'We have to refurb La Mare de Carteret School' – we have done it! We have spent millions over the last couple of years on it. The roof has still got a guarantee for another 25 years. Deputy Inder alluded to the money that was spent on it last term. We do not have to refurb La Mare de Carteret School. There will be some refurbishment works to all schools ongoing during this summer holidays.

860 That is another thing as well: talking about the works going on at Les Varendes, because there will be some repurposing works, obviously; those can be done in short spaces in the summer holidays, like they generally are anyway.

I know that whatever I say here is not going to sway the people who are going to support the Committee's model or are still convinced on 11-18; I know I am going to sway them. But I just need to outline that a lot of these facts and figures are not facts or figures. But there we are.

865 I think it has been pointed out, the Music Service, SHARE, and the Youth Commission were factored into this amendment and they were to be located exactly where the ESC policy ... all we have done from the ESC policy letter is taken away the two silly things they have done: that is, move the sixth form up the road and close our best school. If you take those two silly things out, that is all we have done and kept it as it is. Anyway, you are not going to agree with me on that one.

870 Deputy Roffey – and I understand: he is an 11-18, he does not see any sense in a standalone sixth form, and I can understand that. But at the moment, we have a binary option – this amendment or the other one – both for a standalone sixth form, as Deputy de Sausmarez has pointed out. We are where we are. I am not convinced Deputy Roffey is to support this anyway; he will probably abstain or just vote against all of them.

875 Deputy Oliver's was interesting because she said it was the location of La Mare de Carteret that concerned her. But La Mare de Carteret came out as the best site for a secondary school when they did the survey for the two-school model. It is by far the best site, and the fact that you believe it might be too close – that *she* believes, sir – that it might be too close to St Sampson's, I struggle to understand the logic behind that, I really do. But anyway, I can just reassure Deputy Oliver that there was a traffic impact assessment done at the time and there were consultants brought in and they both confirmed that the Mare de Carteret Secondary School site, as is, was the best site out of the existing sites that we have got in our estate for a secondary school. I doubt that is going to change her mind anyway, sir.

885 Deputy Murray talks about the capital costs. One thing that has not been factored into is the cost of dealing with a redundant La Mare de Carteret site after it is left; that is going to have to be knocked down, that is going to be a few million quid to be spent on that, and I have not seen it in any of these figures.

890 The timescales, as well, of five years; now that is nonsense, that is absolute nonsense. You are building a tiny little two-form entry extension, campus-style extension, down at La Mare de Carteret. It is not going to be any longer than it is to build the sixth form. Obviously, you would have to build that one before you can move the students into that one, but you would have to move that one before you can move the students into that one. So a lot of the arguments based within this comparison document kind of fall flat on their bum. (**Several Members:** Ohh!)

895 Deputy Ferbrache's points said that we cannot continue to use the Mare de Carteret building for more than a few more years. But as I pointed out, we spent a lot of money on it and the roof has got a guarantee for 25 years, so we could quite easily use that building for five – even 10 – years if we wanted to – not that I would envisage using it for that long, but it is potentially possible.

900 I think I pointed it out before: Deputy Aldwell said that the amendment does not rebuild the school. But if ESC thought that rebuilding the school 100% from the start was a good idea, they should have had that in the policy letter. But they could also go away, if the amendment was successful, and come back and say, 'We prefer to do it this way'; there is still that possibility.

Deputy Gabriel mentioned the costs, and again, I would just reiterate what I said: these costs here are not accurate whatsoever and I honestly think that the figure of £34 million-£35 million that I put ... that is including the realistic £15 million on the two-form entry. Some of the costs they have got in repurposing Les Varendes, £12.6 million-£13.6 million; that is virtually a new sixth form. It is incredible where these figures come from. Again, I will not continue; I will just say that those figures are nonsense.

Deputy Bury pointed out as well that we are talking about the 11-16 phase here, which 100% of our students go through, and if this massive focus on the 11-18 – or the *academic* part of 11-18, because we solved the more ‘vocational’ – if you want to put it that way – with the TGI. So that focus is on that sixth form, on those 50% or less children that go, rather than on the 100% of students in the 11-16.

All I can say is repeat those wise words from Deputy Mooney and say, ‘It is never too late to do the right thing, but after today, it maybe will.’

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, we come to the vote on amendment number 2, proposed by Deputy Leadbeater and seconded by Deputy de Lisle.

Any request for a recorded vote? Thank you. We will have a recorded vote.

Members of the States, it is important when we have a recorded vote that there is as much quiet as possible whilst the votes are being taken, and I simply remind Members that under the terms of the Rules, you switch your microphone on immediately before voting and switch it off again, please, immediately after voting. We will try and do it so that the Greffier can hear clearly each vote that is cast.

When you are ready, please, Greffier.

There was a recorded vote.

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

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Parkinson	None
Deputy Trott	Deputy Taylor	Alderney Rep. Roberts	
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Vermeulen	Alderney Rep. Snowdon	
Deputy Burford	Deputy Aldwell		
Deputy Bury	Deputy Blin		
Deputy Cameron	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
Deputy de Lisle	Deputy Dyke		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Ferbrache		
Deputy Fairclough	Deputy Gabriel		
Deputy Falla	Deputy Haskins		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Helyar		
Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy Inder		
Deputy Matthews	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller		
Deputy Oliver	Deputy Le Tocq		
	Deputy Mahoney		
	Deputy McKenna		
	Deputy Meerveld		
	Deputy Moakes		
	Deputy Murray		
	Deputy Prow		
	Deputy Queripel		
	Deputy Roffey		

The Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting on amendment number 2, proposed by Deputy Leadbeater and seconded by Deputy de Lisle, was as follows: there voted Pour 14, Contre 22, 3 abstentions, and therefore, I declare amendment number 2 lost.

Members, the next amendment on the list is that numbered 9, proposed by Deputy Matthews and to be seconded by Deputy Gollop.

Is it your wish to seek to lay that amendment, Deputy Matthews?

935 **Deputy Matthews:** Yes, sir.

The Bailiff: In that case, the first thing is that there is a motion under Article 7, paragraph 1, of the 1948 Law to suspend the Rules of Procedure necessary to permit the amendment thereafter to be laid.

940 Do you have anything you wish to say in respect of that?

Deputy Matthews: No, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop, do you formally second that motion?

945

Deputy Gollop: Yes, I do, sir, thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen, do you wish to comment?

950 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, sir, I do.

I would like to encourage Members not to support the suspension of the Rules in this instance. Deputy Matthews has had considerable time to be able to lay the amendment in the time given in the lead-up to debating the policy letter in July (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and was given significant officer support. I have also spent a lot of time, which was really helpful, speaking to Deputy Matthews about his idea since the beginning, I think, of the year.

955

So I really do think that there has been ample time to be able to explore and chew over this very complex, very unusual, and – I would almost say – left-of-centre proposal which would have significant impact on the current proposals for the Guernsey Institute. So I would encourage Members very strongly *not* to suspend the Rules on this occasion.

960

The Bailiff: I will invite you, as the proposer of this motion, Deputy Matthews, to reply to that if you wish to.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

965

I would suggest that we do suspend the Rules to look at this. Actually, the proposal that is there – although you are right about talking about moving the Guernsey Institute – it is in several parts and it does not necessarily mean moving the Guernsey Institute; in fact, one of the options is merely moving the sixth form.

I think that there are some very good reasons to look at this amendment and I would urge Members to vote to suspend the Rules.

970

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Members of the States, I will put to you the motion under Article 7(1) of the 1948 Law, proposed by Deputy Matthews and seconded by Deputy Gollop, to suspend the Rules of Procedure to the extent necessary to permit the amendment numbered 9 to be considered.

975

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Could we have a recorded vote, please, sir?

The Bailiff: And there is a request for a recorded vote. I simply remind Members as to what I said just previously. Greffier, we will have a recorded vote on this motion, please.

980

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 13, Contre 24, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 2

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Soulsby	None	Deputy Haskins
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Taylor		Deputy Moakes
Deputy Bury	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Cameron	Deputy Vermeulen		
Deputy de Lisle	Deputy Aldwell		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Blin		
Deputy Fairclough	Deputy Burford		
Deputy Gabriel	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Dyke		
Deputy Kazantseva-Miller	Deputy Falla		
Deputy Leadbeater	Deputy Ferbrache		
Deputy Matthews	Deputy Helyar		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Inder		
	Deputy Le Tocq		
	Deputy Mahoney		
	Deputy McKenna		
	Deputy Meerveld		
	Deputy Murray		
	Deputy Oliver		
	Deputy Parkinson		
	Deputy Prow		
	Deputy Queripel		
	Alderney Rep. Roberts		
	Alderney Rep. Snowdon		

The Bailiff: Members of the States, the voting on the motion under Article 7(1) of the 1948 Law, proposed by Deputy Matthews, seconded by Deputy Gollop, is as follows: there voted Pour 13, Contre 24, 2 Members were absent, and therefore, I declare the motion lost, and therefore, amendment number 9 cannot be laid, which means we come to the last amendment, which is amendment number 8, submitted by Deputy Trott, to be seconded by Deputy Parkinson.

Is it your wish to lay that amendment, Deputy Trott?

Deputy Trott: It is, thank you, sir, and I would also appreciate listening to the States' Greffier's dulcet tones.

Amendment 8

1. *In Propositions 1 and 2, to insert the words "in principle" after "To agree".*

2. *To delete Proposition 4 and substitute therefor:*

"

4.

a) *To note that the Requête entitled 'Determining the Best Model for Secondary Education', which was signed by Deputy A C Dudley-Owen and six other signatories and which was approved by the States on 3rd March 2020, was critical of the States approving a previous model of secondary education (in January 2018) "without being presented with a detailed plan for its implementation" and (in September 2019) "without full details of the planned implementation being presented" and argued that "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";*

- b) *To note that, despite the important premises of the successful Requête led by Deputy A C Dudley-Owen in 2020 and despite requiring substantial capital and revenue expenditure at a time of considerable pressure on public finances, the Committee's propositions continue to face significant and sustained opposition from key stakeholders and the Committee's policy letter clearly includes inadequate information to allow the States to provide its final approvals for all aspects of a project of this size;*
- c) *To note that in Section 9 of the Policy & Resources Committee's Government Work Plan 2021-25 ('Investing in Islanders, our Island and our Future') it was set out in paragraph 9.8 of Annex 5: Funding and Investment Plan, that "The Policy & Resources Committee wishes to ensure that the States can consider, at an appropriately early stage, the direction which certain schemes need to take.....Therefore, each scoping document will need to set out any requirement for States' decisions which is likely to be dependent on risk, value, public interest and political judgement."*
- d) *In the interests of good governance, having regard to c) above generally and the risk, value and public interest in this project in particular, to direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and the Policy & Resources Committee to include within the project's scoping document, alongside the scope, goals, objectives and estimated timescale, a requirement for and timing of a States' decision with suitable Propositions to allow the States to be sufficiently informed to provide final approvals to proceed with the project.*

"

The Bailiff: Thank you very much.

If you could read this amendment, then, please, Greffier.

995 *The States' Greffier read out the amendment.*

The Bailiff: Greffier, thank you very much.

Members of the States, this is the last of the new amendments.

Deputy Trott.

1000

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

I am a natural risk-taker and thrill-seeker, whether as an aerobatic pilot in my late teens or as a City trader in my 20s and 30s. Calculated risks can pay, but they must be able to be weighed up; otherwise, it is simply gambling.

1005

Sir, this amendment is not about which model the States should or should not approve; it is about good governance around a decision to spend tens of millions of pounds of taxpayers' money. Sir, the circumstances are unprecedented in my 20-plus years of experience in this Assembly, because never before has a Committee asked the States to approve expenditure of tens of millions with such little detail about the outcomes and benefits of that investment. If we behaved this way in the private sector, we would likely, and rightly, be removed from positions of authority and influence on the grounds that we had failed collectively in our risk assessment, value for money assessment, and basic good governance oversight principles.

1010

Deputy Parkinson and I are not seeking to defeat the Committee's proposed model or replace it with another model; the amendment allows the Committee to continue developing its preferred model. But it adds the necessary rigour and discipline to the decision-making process by allowing the States to provide its final approval for the expenditure in due course once the Committee has laid a reasonable amount of information before the States.

1015

Now, sir, when I was on the P&R Committee last term, I always pushed for the big decisions to be made by this Assembly; in fact, on one occasion, it was as a direct approach from my friend,

1020 Deputy Dudley-Owen, when working on her 'Pause & Review' requête, which I voted for. It is
important to remind Members that all of us in the Assembly are our Government; all of us in this
system of government, all of us form the executive. All of us are accountable for the consequences
1025 of this expenditure. The 34 Members who are *not* members of the Committee cannot credibly say
they have enough information and assurance in the current policy letter to approve tens of millions
of pounds of expenditure. Now, sir, I contest that they would not with their own money, and they
should not with taxpayers' money.

Now, sir, I used to be paid considerable sums of money to take risks, and I think I did it reasonably
successfully for more than a decade. However, I would not have gambled in this way then, with my
organisation's resources – and I was paid to do so. I certainly would not, and I will not do so today.
1030 We are not paid to gamble; we are paid to make objective, evidence-based decisions.

It is said that the Committee's proposals, in their current form, do not enjoy the support of the
teaching profession, which will have to implement them. It is said that they do not enjoy the support
of head teachers, who will have to lead them. Sir, the public, our community, famously tend to
engage with big changes of this nature only at the 11th hour.

1035 All these things considered, it is premature – and, indeed, reckless, in my view – for the States
today to approve this entire plan and all the expenditure associated with it while there is so much
work to do to persuade key stakeholders. If the States do this, they are setting the Committee up
to fail, because if stakeholders remain unpersuaded, history will repeat itself and plans approved by
the States will be dragged back to the Assembly by popular demand.

1040 Far better to put in place the correct decision-making initially, allowing the Committee to
continue developing its proposals but acknowledging that the States must be able to provide final
sign-off once further work has been done and once stakeholders' concerns have been addressed.
That, sir, is how to deliver good governance. That is how we should make objective, evidence-based
decisions. That is how we do our job and that is how we avoid a £40 million gamble on a model
1045 without precedent.

I ask for a recorded vote, sir. Thank you.

Deputy Inder: Sir, I am just going to invoke 24(4) – sorry.

1050 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Parkinson do you formally second the Amendment?

Deputy Parkinson: Yes I do, sir, and I reserve my right to speak.

Deputy Inder: Sir, I would like to invoke 24(4), and if that fails, straight to 26(1).

1055 *[Lost Audio 11:22:30 – 11:23:10 - The Presiding Officer asked Members who supported debate on
the Amendment to stand in their places. Noted that there were more than seven Members who stood
therefore the motion under Rule 24.(4) was unsuccessful.]*

1060 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, will those Members who would otherwise be entitled to
speak on this amendment and who intend to speak stand in their places?

Is it still your wish, Deputy Inder, that I put a motion under Rule 26(1) to the Members?

Deputy Inder: Yes, sir.

1065 **The Bailiff:** This is to bring debate on this amendment to a close, Members, save for the
opportunity of the President and the proposer of the amendment to speak once again.

Those in favour; those against.

1070 *Members voted Contre.*

The Bailiff: I will declare that lost.

Deputy Inder: Recorded vote, please? Thank you.

The Bailiff: There is a request for a recorded vote from Deputy Inder on the Rule 26(1) motion. Greffier, when you are ready, please.

There was a recorded vote.

Not carried – Pour 12, Contre 27, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 0

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy St Pier	None	None
Deputy Taylor	Deputy Trott		
Deputy Vermeulen	Deputy Blin		
Deputy Aldwell	Deputy Brouard		
Deputy Helyar	Deputy Burford		
Deputy Inder	Deputy Bury		
Deputy Le Tocq	Deputy Cameron		
Deputy Mahoney	Deputy de Lisle		
Deputy Meerveld	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Moakes	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
Deputy Murray	Deputy Dyke		
Deputy Prow	Deputy Fairclough		
	Deputy Falla		
	Deputy Ferbrache		
	Deputy Gabriel		
	Deputy Gollop		
	Deputy Haskins		
	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller		
	Deputy Leadbeater		
	Deputy Matthews		
	Deputy McKenna		
	Deputy Oliver		
	Deputy Parkinson		
	Deputy Queripel		
	Alderney Rep. Roberts		
	Deputy Roffey		
	Alderney Rep. Snowdon		

Deputy Queripel: Sir, while the votes are being counted, could I seek clarification, please? If this amendment succeeds, will the remaining amendment fall away?

The Bailiff: No, not necessarily.

Deputy Queripel: Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: It can still be laid. If it were successful, there might need to be another amendment if this amendment were to carry.

Members of the States, on Deputy Inder's motion pursuant to Rule 26(1), there voted Pour 12, Contre 27, which is why it was declared lost to start with and is still declared lost.

Who wishes to speak on the amendment?

Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Sir, Deputy Trott likes to tell us about his risk-taking and how much money he made and how good he is at good governance. I have taken so many risks in my life – and I have made lots of mistakes, but I have taken risks – and for him to use hyperbole and adjectives to boost

his case does nothing, because this is a well-researched policy letter. You may agree with it or not agree with it and that will be a matter for a vote in the due passage of time, but it is well-researched.

1100 I think my understanding of good governance is just as good as Deputy Trott's; I have been involved in many commercial enterprises, both professionally and as an investor, and I realise the need for good governance. So to say that this is something that we would be taking a massive risk on – we would be risking £40 million on, all the other things that Deputy Trott said – I think is just frankly ridiculous – and I am sorry, I have got to use that kind of language. It is a delaying tactic.

1105 Deputy Trott and I started on the same route in relation to the Education debate: we both voted for selection or to maintain selection, we both voted initially – well, I voted initially, I am not quite sure how he voted; we may have voted the same way – for the two-school model. Then I changed my mind, as I have said many times publicly and in this Chamber. We both voted for the Deputy Dudley-Owen requête, we both voted for that. That only passed by one vote, and if Deputy Parkinson had not abstained, it would have failed, because the onus would have been to get one more vote if you are bringing something.

1110 Where we differ, I believe, is that now, we have got to make a decision. Where I would agree with him is, you do not recklessly make decisions just because you think you have to. The people of Guernsey have had enough – overwhelmingly, they have had enough – (**A Member:** Yes.) of this Assembly procrastinating. We have had debates before about Deputy Le Tocq telling us what happened 20 years ago has come back now in very similar form in 2021.

1115 We can *always* find a reason for delay; we can always say, 'Do it tomorrow. Forget it for today, let the people be in a state of abeyance.' If this amendment passes – Deputy Dudley-Owen will no doubt have her own estimate of time, and I will bow to that, because she is obviously immersed in this every day and I am not – it will be a significant delay. What good would that do? And then when it comes back with the detail, 'That is not enough detail. We need something else. You didn't look at this; you didn't pay due weight to that.'

1120 The greatest growth in the finance sector in the last 15 to 20 years has been compliance officers. We have got compliance officers to the left of us, we have got compliance officers to the right of us; into the valley of compliance officers we will ride every day. And what has it done for the finance sector? What has it done for business? It has stultified it, it has mitigated its growth.

1125 We have to have good behaviour, we have to have good standards, but enough is enough. Let's get on, let's reject this fanciful amendment. If I may respectfully say so to the person I do respect, Deputy Trott, this is not his finest hour. Let's move on and debate the policy letter.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gollop.

1130

Deputy Gollop: This does strike me, I must admit, as an old-stager, a little bit of a political amendment, in many respects, because it is continuing a trend we saw yesterday which made me a bit reluctant to support it, even though there is a degree of merit in continuing to be open-minded about the final outcomes.

1135 This includes this whole business about 'noting' – and noting not just a report that has been, perhaps, prepared by Civil Service officers or a Committee or a body or an external consultancy, but to note in a way that is quite politically subjective, and I am not sure we want a trend of amendments like that. It might be a matter that we would have to consider, the States' Assembly Committee, as to how wide that kind of amendment needs to go.

1140 Nevertheless, the gist of it is clear. It acts not necessarily as a break, but as a few extra boxes to tick as a process, as a safeguard. And point (d) – which, in a way, is the only really substantive point requiring us to do something, rather than 'noting' previous requêtes and so on:

d) In the interests of good governance, having regard to c) ...

1145 – which relates to –

... scoping document ... dependent on risk, value, public interest and political judgement ...

– above generally and ‘the risk, value and public interest in this project in particular,’ to direct ESC to work with the Policy & Resources Committee to include within the project’s scoping document, alongside the skills, ‘a requirement for and timing of a States’ decision with suitable Propositions.’

1150 Effectively, in a way, it takes us back more to the grand old days of – as we were reflecting earlier – not Deputy Tina Bury, but Deputy Roger Bury, when the States had many opportunities to be informed about procurement matters, tenders, exact costs, and timelines. And I think this report that came to us from ESC is a different kind of report; it is more of a conceptual report, it is more about looking for educational outcomes and balancing things on that level – and perhaps in general
1155 debate, I will say more about that.

I do not see this amendment as particularly harmful, and if it acts as a clearer of minds, if it enables Education, Sport & Culture to convince more people in the community that their vision is, on balance, the best available one, then I cannot see any significant objection to this; indeed, in the last few days, as I have always praised, ESC produced a good document, it went some way to the
1160 Pause & Review wider-encompassing views that some of us wish to see and got, perhaps, frustrated with earlier in the year.

If you work on the assumption – and I think we have to – that the political team in Education, Sport & Culture, their good working relationship with Policy & Resources, and their excellent officer team and specialist management team are all very well-informed and clear in their mind about what
1165 they want to achieve, then it surely cannot be too much of a Herculean ordeal or arduous task to encourage them to codify these thoughts further and come back at the earliest available opportunity with a more detailed presentation/portfolio/report on all the costs and benefits and particulars – and that way, it will not only, perhaps, clarify where Education, Sport & Culture are, but will enable greater engagement with all the parents, stakeholders, businesspeople, young people,
1170 and everyone else in the community.

So actually, although this might have been put across in a politically robust way, it should actually help not just good governance, but the progression of the States’ overall aims. So on that basis, I am minded to support this amendment.

1175 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Dyke.

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

In terms of personal history and attitudes, I think I am in sympathy, to a large extent, with Deputy Trott: I also hate spending taxpayers’ money, as some of it is mine. I also have, in my life, done a
1180 share of gambling with my own life, in terms of leaving London back in 1982 from a nice, big law firm to go to the Cayman Islands, where nobody even knew where it was.

But gambling is not what Deputy Dudley-Owen and her Committee are doing with us now. The gambling on the Education debate happened in the last States, when we decided to blow up a current system that was working quite well with no idea what was to replace it; that was the
1185 gambling. Deputy Dudley-Owen and her Committee have done huge amounts of excellent work, I can see, over the last year. Their initial presentation, I thought, was very good, and the work they have done over the summer in trying to summarise for us all these miscellaneous amendments is also very good.

So we are not gambling with the education if we follow what the Education Committee has said with as much research as it can be expected to give us. Some of the figures are not going to be exactly precise – the precise amount that the Institute will cost, or the sixth form at the Ozouets site; hopefully, the figures, if we get our procurement systems better, might be less than are stated – but
1190 it is not fair at all to call this gambling. We have enough information.

In business, you cannot know every single thing that will happen, every single thing that will go forward. You cannot work it all out before you take a decision; at some point, you have to use your
1195 intellect and say, ‘I have got enough, now let’s get on with it.’ I think we have got enough to proceed with making a decision in this session and not sending it back; I think it would be totally irresponsible to waste more time going back on this.

Perhaps I could just address one point: a lot of narrative has developed over the last seven weeks that the teachers are all against this project, that they do not like what the Education department has said. There are various points to make on that. To start with, it is for the Committee to make the decisions. I am absolutely certain that they have talked to enormous numbers of teachers respectfully and taken on board their various points and made a decision and a presentation to us; that is their job.

And it is not correct to assume that the teachers are all against this or have a view that something else should be done; I have been to one of the teachers' meetings at the Varendes site, and it seems to me that the teachers are actually all over the place on this. Everyone comes to a project like this with their own prism. The teachers at Mare de Carteret would love to save Mare de Carteret – and Deputy Leadbeater has spoken very well on that. They might well wish to do that and that would be their view. The teachers at the Varendes site – some of them, anyway – would like to keep the Sixth Form right next to them; that is their view from their prism. The teachers at Beaucamps probably like to have a rather luxurious amount of space with a fairly small number of pupils there relevant to its size, so they would probably like to keep that as closed as possible. So this narrative that the teachers are against the Committee is completely wrong and misleading.

So I would say that this amendment to defer everything – which will, effectively, just go on and on – must be thrown out, and it must not be assumed that the teachers have some view that something else should be done. The Committee must make the decision, they have given us some good proposals, and we must get on with voting and getting this job done. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Roffey.

Deputy Roffey: I do not think, sir, this is about gambling or not gambling; I think it is about what level of information we need for informed decision-making, and the narrative has changed enormously.

I hate to go back to the last Assembly, because I know there are Members in this one who think everything they did was the work of Satan, (*Laughter*) but when the policy letter came forward on the 'one school, two site' model, it had enormously more detail than in the policy letter before us. It did have detailed designs for schools, it did have traffic assessments, it did have transition arrangements in there, and it was still criticised heavily by those who were opposed to the plans for not having enough detail. And one of those strongly criticising it was the President of the Education, Sport & Culture Committee.

So I tend to agree with Deputy Dyke: I think what this policy letter does is give us enough information to make a decision in principle; I absolutely agree with that. And I am pretty sure that we will make a decision in principle and I am pretty sure I know which way it will go, and it probably will not please me and I do not think it will please, despite what he says, the vast majority of the teaching profession.

However, as Deputy Trott said, we are the Government. We have this weird system in Guernsey that nobody else has: we are the executive – Policy & Resources are *not* the executive, we are – and we are asked to make a final sign-off today with no idea about traffic assessment; really, only the most hazy idea about costs; only outlined plans that are being presented. Of course, you can make a decision in principle about whether the structure, the general approach, is correct, but if you are signing it off finally, never to come back before you, on the basis of what we have today, then our standard of evidence on which we want to make our decisions has plummeted from what it was in the past.

I am pretty sure that it has and I am pretty sure this amendment will not get traction, but I am going to vote for it because I do not think I have anywhere near the detail to actually sign off this 'as be'. And it is not just the money; it is also the impact it will have in every other way on the future of our Island. I am happy to give an overarching opinion one way or another on whether the

1250 structure is right. I do not see how anybody on this really scant level of detail can actually sign it off, and sign it off finally and say, 'That is it. Never come before this Assembly again.'

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

1255 **Deputy Parkinson:** Thank you, sir.

I want to address this issue of alleged delay. In our processes, a Committee that is engaged in commissioning a major capital project has to build the business case for the investment they want to make, and if the policy letter, as presented to us today, remains in its current form unamended, they would have to take the business case for each element of the proposed redevelopment of the educational estate to the Policy & Resources Committee for sign-off and their approval. So those business cases are going to have to be developed whether this amendment succeeds or not.

1260 The issue of alleged delay is, frankly, a red herring. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) The question that this amendment poses to the Assembly is, 'Do you want to leave it to the Policy & Resources Committee alone to sign off on the final plans that are presented, or do you want those final plans to come back to the Assembly for approval?' The additional delay in bringing it back to the Assembly is only the delay in turning the plans into a policy letter and bringing them to the States; it might take four weeks.

Now, the question is: if we do not ask or demand that the final approval, the final sign-off, comes back to this Assembly, that is a considerable abdication of our responsibilities. And it is also, in terms of gambling – Deputy Trott's term – a huge gamble on the part of ESC and the Policy & Resources Committee, because they alone will be taking political responsibility for whatever happens. If there are any hiccups in the road, if it turns out that some parts of the plans do not work well, the only people who will be blamed for whatever has gone wrong will be the 10 Members of the Assembly who signed off.

1275 Frankly, I think it is just politically unwise on their part to resist this amendment. If they were sensible, they would say, 'Okay, the Assembly should have the final sign-off and then we have all bought into the decision,' and if there are any problems – if there are budget overruns; if there are practical problems in delivering Education's model, which I am sure will be approved today – then the whole Assembly would have taken responsibility for those plans and we would all share in the responsibility for whatever has gone wrong and sorting it out. Actually, from their perspective – I think – they would be in a much more comfortable position.

Now, it may be – because it appears the 'coalition,' if I can call them that, are going to vote against this amendment – that some Members do not want that responsibility. They want to be in a position, when this is all done and dusted and the new Sixth Form Centre is built and all the other facilities have been built, they would like to be in a position possibly, where, if it goes wrong or if it turns out to be millions of pounds over budget – 'Well, it is not our fault: we didn't sign it off.' Well, fine. If that is your position, that is understandable; I do not think it is very creditable. I think the States needs to observe proper governance processes, because if it does not, there are grave risks, politically.

1290 But more importantly, at the end of the day, this is about doing the right thing with taxpayers' money. At the end of the day, we are all responsible for these tens of millions of pounds; shouldn't we have the final say on the final push of the button? 'Yes, those plans are okay.' We do not need detail in the nth degree about exactly where each teacher is going to park his or her car; we just need sufficient detail to be able to make an intelligent decision about 'Are we going to go and push the button and spend all this money on this project?' And I do not think anybody could possibly contend that the policy letter, as it currently stands, provides anything like the detail anyone would need to make that decision responsibly. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

1295 We are accepting, I think, today the argument that a lot of the development of the plans is operational stuff, that will be done after the decision in principle is made. I will forever regret that we appear to be turning our backs on 11-18 schools in the States' sector; I personally think that will

be a disaster for States' education in Guernsey, but that may very well be the decision the Assembly arrives at.

But having made that decision in principle, we have been told that most of the detail is in the operational stage and they will go ahead and work up that detail after the decision in principle is made. Well, fine, okay. Let them go away and work up the detail; come back with costings that are more accurate – at the moment, we have, effectively, ballpark estimates – come back with detailed plans, detailed costings; and ask the States to sign it off. I think it would just be an abdication of good corporate governance for us to say, 'No, we don't want to see that stuff. No, we're very happy to let Deputy Ferbrache and his colleagues approve it all and we'll just accept if it is good enough for them, it is good enough for us.'

So I think this amendment should be very uncontroversial; all it is asking for is good governance. And I do not think it requires a lot of extra delay. The point is, this work has to be done anyway; the question for you is, 'Do you want to approve the final plans, or are you happy to delegate that approval to someone else?'

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Taylor.

Deputy Taylor: Thank you, Mr Bailiff.

I am going to start with my negative parts on this. I really do not like – similar to the amendment that was amended by Deputy St Pier yesterday – these 'to note' Items – basically, Items 4a, 4b, and 4c. I do not think they really add anything. I can totally understand why they are in there and the theory behind it; I just do not think it adds anything constructive. That is my feeling on those. So on first of read of that, I was ready to screw it up and stick it in the recycling. But I did get all the way through to (d) and that did peak my interest, so I am pleased I gave you the time of day there, Deputy Trott.

Also, in Deputy Trott's opening speech, he did kind of bring me on board. Naturally, I have got to disagree with him on something: he did say he has not seen a policy requesting such sums without clear benefits – not his exact words, but the general gist of it. I am fairly sure we were both sat in the harbour debate, which requested a considerably larger sum of money with considerably less detail on what the benefits actually would have been. But that is a different story, we will leave that there.

Where I think I have now been lost on this amendment is with the speeches, now, from Deputy Parkinson, and I kind of feel – that is why I am rising to stand – I need to justify my reason for my vote against this Proposition. It is mainly because I am happy to delegate my vote, so to speak, to members of Policy & Resources and the Education, Sport & Culture Committee. The reason is, I do not see that as gambling. I have not been in the investment banking world or anything like that, but when I leave my business on a day-to-day basis and I leave my members of staff there to do the job that has been given to them, I trust them; I do not think it is gambling, leaving them to do their job. I believe the members of ESC were appointed to do this and Policy & Resources have the final say on signing off; I personally do not have a problem with that. And if it does go horribly wrong, I will still accept responsibility for delegating my vote in that way.

So I just wanted to outline my reasoning for voting against this Proposition, and I would also urge other Members to vote against it too.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

I think there are few people in this Assembly who have been as passionate about the education debate, in both the last time and this, as myself – except, possibly, Deputy Dudley-Owen. There is

no other issue that has certainly consumed as many hours of my political career to date than education. So I am very passionate about it.

1355 But having said which, I have not participated greatly in the debate over the last couple of days because I have not felt I needed to. But this amendment does drive me to my feet because of what I perceive to be political machinations and the whiff of hypocrisy.

We are being presented with – if I can speak over the Red Arrows – a policy letter that does ask us to make a decision on fairly high-level principles on how we want to proceed. Deputy Roffey pointed out that the two-school model had a lot more detail –

1360 I give way to Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Terribly sorry – we have got Red Arrows, and Deputy Trott has told us he was an acrobatic aeroplane pilot, *(Laughter)* so perhaps he could go and help them. That is all, sir. *(Laughter)*

1365 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld, it is a matter for you as to whether you compete at the moment with the sounds from outside. We are trying to get the windows shut, which might move some of the noise away from us.

1370 **Deputy Meerveld:** May I suggest that we, potentially – because the air show is on at the moment – convene now for lunch? I would be happy to take up and continue after lunch. So break early and come back early?

1375 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, I will put to you the motion that we adjourn at this point but resume at 2 o'clock. Those in favour; those against.

Members voted Pour.

1380 **The Bailiff:** I think that is declared carried. So if people want to get outside and see what is going on, then we will now adjourn, but resume at 2 o'clock, when we will continue with Deputy Meerveld's speech.

*The Assembly adjourned at 11.55 a.m.
and resumed at 2 p.m.*

Secondary and Post 16 Education Reorganisation – Debate continued

1385 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Meerveld, this is your opportunity to continue your speech that was so rudely interrupted not by the Red Arrows, but by a typhoon which was perhaps even noisier. *(Laughter)*. Deputy Meerveld.

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you, sir.

1390 So yes, just before lunch I opened with a provocative statement that I was being driven to my feet to give an opinion on this to debate this by my perception of hypocrisy and political machinations. Let me start off with hypocrisy. I have been disappointed ... well, surprised and disappointed, by some of the voting I have seen over the last couple of days that have led before this amendment where colleagues from the previous term have been voting in favour of things which in the previous term they were dead against, like such as a rebuild of La Mare de Carteret. Sorry, I will not be giving way.

I suppose it is summed up in some ways in this amendment. So, again, hypocrisy. In the last term, the people who are proposing this amendment and the people who have spoken in favour of it are the same individuals who voted for the two-school model and to give delegated authority to the then P&R to oversee implementation of that policy for, I think it was £154 million, about £20-plus million more expensive than the overall cost of the current proposals in front of us. But they were quite happy to delegate that responsibility at that time. Deputy Roffey would say, 'Ah yes, well we gave a much more detailed proposal.' But if you want a really detailed proposal, look back to Deputy Paul Le Pelley three-school model. Plans for buildings finalised and approved, ready to go out for tender, every detail pinned down on everything bar the post-16 section. But as far as our secondary schools it was ready to go, literally ready to go out and it would have been built and populated by now if it had gone ahead. Now we have come full circle. We have the two-school diversion and we have come back to a model that is very similar to that, and we are being asked to approve that in principle to go forward. Well, approve it in principle? No, approve it at the high level.

Deputy Parkinson alluded to the comments from the unions about car parks. We do not need detailed ??? 14:03:11 for car parks. I am sorry, that is exactly what the unions would like. So what are we trying to do here as an Assembly? Are we trying to be an executive who oversees every detail of the implementation of a plan? Do we seriously want to debate on this Assembly floor how many car parking spaces, what shape the building should be, what colour it should be, and that level of detail, or are we an executive? Because in a company, in a corporate structure, the board of directors do not make that of detailed decision. They have staff that do that, they delegate it downwards to dedicated personnel with the expertise to do the actual building and implementation. The executive makes a decision on the business case whether to proceed and then hands off the responsibility with delivery. And yes, if there are errors in that delivery, if there are cost overruns, if it is not delivered in the way that the executive planned, then it would come back up to them to review at that stage and see whether they want to make changes or take a different direction or learn lessons for the future.

This amendment – and let us go on to the political machinations side of my perceived reasoning for this amendment – I do not think this amendment is here so this Assembly in reality can check where every pound will be spent. I do not think it is even appropriate that this Assembly tries to micromanage projects at that level. I cynically believe that this in-principle agreement requiring Education to spend probably another year working up incredibly detailed proposals, bringing them back to the Assembly, is to have a repeat of this debate. Another opportunity to pull every thread and possibly undermine the current Committee and to try and find ways to amend it or redirect it or reverse it. That is the reality.

So anybody voting for this amendment is voting for that process, and I personally do not see any value in it at all, and unfortunately the majority of the amendments over the last few days, again going back to that hypocrisy and political machinations, the majority of amendments laid in the last two days, if you look at them they are all over the shop. Now some of them, I believe like Deputy Leadbeater's and Deputy ... (**A Member:** Matthews.) Matthews. Sorry, my mind went blank there for a minute. Some of them, I think, were heartfelt and were well planned and also done in consultation with committees. But a lot of the other ones, were literally shotgun approach, 'We will vote for anything except what the Committee is proposing.' What is the motivation for that? Well, to me, it is the formation of partisan opposition politics designed to try and prevent the current Policy & Resources under Deputy Ferbrache and the current ESC under Deputy Dudley-Owen making a success and finally resolving the thorny issue of education.

I do not see the best interest of our Island in these discussions. I do not see the best interest of our students in it. I see political machinations going on for personal political benefit (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I am disgusted by it. I want to see what is best for our Island and our people. I think this amendment needs to be discarded and I wish it had never been laid. To me, it is the latest in a sequence of bad amendments designed to derail, not to actually allow us to move forward which we desperately need to do, which the public are looking to do.

It also does something else that is very negative as well. Coming back to this Assembly with all the detail effectively plays into the hands of the unions, because, again the unions – and the teachers are very right; we have some excellent teachers in Guernsey, but they are concerned, they are nervous about change, and ever since selection was removed change was inevitable. But the unions would like to see every teacher's position and terms and conditions guaranteed as part of the negotiation process. They are not going to approve any model, they did not like the Robert Sillas model, they did not like the Paul Le Pelley model, they had objections with the Matt Fallaize model, they now are objected to Dudley-Owen's model. Of course, whenever you ask them to say, 'Well, can you unions recommend what you would like?', 'Oh, it is not our job to design a school system, that is for you to do', but, 'What about our terms and conditions? Where is my car park to be? What is the transition model? How are you guaranteeing our management bonuses?'

And again, if you ask this Committee to come back in that kind of detail, you are asking them to commit to ... well effectively, they can be arm-twisted by the unions to try and negotiate terms and conditions which may not be in the best interest of our Island, to earn the endorsement of their plans or to reduce the objections to their plans. Again, no company in the world, or corporation or corporate management group or board of directors in the world would do that, would hold them out to ransom in that way.

So whatever you do, Members, I petition you to reject this amendment out of hand, and let's get on with finally transforming our education system and delivering for our teachers, for our students, for our Island. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Matthews.

Deputy Matthews: Thank you, sir.

I listened with interest to Deputy Meerveld and his account of how these decisions might be made and a company did not quite fit with the sorts of decisions that I think I have encountered in the corporate world before. It is quite often the case that when an executive decision is made, yes, it might well be the case that the decision to go ahead or not is made at a lower level. But that would be delegated, it would still be the responsibility of the people who made the initial decision. I have been a part of those sorts of structures where something is designed, and it is an approval in principle. I think, you corrected yourself, but I think you were right the first time around. It is an approval in principle. But having said that, once the designs are then drawn up, you would then have a 'go, no-go' before you finally committed to go live with something.

I think there are good reasons why people would put in place governance structures like that. It is not just a case, people might wonder, is this just a case of ticking a box and creating work for work's sake, just to have some box-ticking exercise where you say, 'Yes, we will go ahead with something' or not. And it is not. There are quite often very good reasons why you might want to put some checks and balances in place. One of the very mundane reasons that you could give as an example as part of this proposal is it was not possible to carry out a traffic impact assessment due to COVID at the time that the proposal was put forward.

I will give way, sorry to –

Deputy Meerveld: Thank you Deputy Matthews for giving way.

Would Deputy Matthews agree with me, though, that in a larger corporation, because effectively we are ... we have 5,500 civil servants, we have a population of 63,000 people, we are the elected executive that sits over that. A project would come to that board of directors and present it as 'Here is a budget, here are the objectives, here are the things that need to be built or done to achieve that', and then the decisions of the actual implementation down to how many car parking spaces would be very much a lower level. I believe that is what this Assembly is, because I think Deputy Matthews hopefully will agree with me, none of us are experts in building schools or education systems and we have to rely on the professionals who will be delegated authority after we have chosen the direction of travel.

Thank you, sir.

1500 **Deputy Matthews:** Sorry. I think that actually their decision, before something went live, would always come back up to the top. And as I was saying before, one of the examples of that might be when that traffic impact assessment is possible to be carried out, it might well be the case that the results come back and show that it is going to cause ... the roads around there are already known to be very busy, Collings Road is a solid road, it could well be that there are all kinds of problems of traffic around there that have not been anticipated as part of this proposal. So when it comes back, it might well be a reason to say, 'Well actually, perhaps we need to rethink what we are going to do here.'

1505 So I think there are good reasons for it to come back. I would like to assure those Members who may be concerned, this is not part of any political machinations on my part. I think whether you approve of the proposal or not, there is a good reason to have some checks and balances and for the detail to come back before it finally goes ahead.

So for that reason, I would support the amendment. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

1515

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

This seems to have touched a nerve. (*Laughter*) I am just flabbergasted, actually, at all this talk of hypocrisy. I have not been able to suppress a few giggles, really, at what I am hearing and I keep shaking my head in slight disbelief. I have just looked up *Hansard* and in the debate on the requête, Deputy Meerveld himself said:

1520

I believe that it is wholly irresponsible for the States to have adopted a plan for transforming our education system on the back of an envelope, and then for it to have the implementation of that plan to be initiated before working out the details on how to deliver it. I would describe that as wholly irresponsible, and the fact that this irresponsible approach was followed was amply illustrated by the lack of implementation details available.

And that was off the back of a policy letter with considerably more detail on the implementation. So I have to say I am a little bit surprised at accusations of hypocrisy, and particularly surprised by the rabbit hole it then went down about partisan politics and I believe Deputy Meerveld was instrumental in the creation of more than one political party! (*Laughter*). It is just extraordinary.

1525

(**A Member:** It is embarrassing) (*Laughter*).

But to come back to the point, I agree with Deputy Parkinson. I am surprised that this is in any way contentious. This is our job. This is what we are elected to do. It is absolutely – the main arguments of the pause and review were based on the principles of good governance, and there was so much talk at the time from Deputy Dudley-Owen and Deputy Prow, I remember, about needing far more detail and robust interrogation of that detail, and we do know that that detail, as Deputy Parkinson quite rightly pointed out, needs to be worked up in order to create the business case. So there is not going to be a delay, it is literally just a case of accountability, responsibility, good governance.

1530

Do we want to take responsibility for our decisions? Do we want to interrogate that detail? Well I do. I am a Member of this Assembly and irrespective of what I think of the concept, I want to make sure that we are spending taxpayers' money wisely. I think we should be open and transparent, I do think we need that degree of accountability. I therefore do think it is the place, as it has been for some considerable time, the place of this Assembly, to interrogate those details. So I think this is an incredibly uncontroversial view.

1540

I just also need to address one other point that Deputy Meerveld raised, which was that votes on amendments have to be seen in the context of where you are at that particular point in time. So when you are voting on an amendment – and this is the third time I have said this so I do apologise for repeating myself but it is relevant – you are voting on whether you think the proposals in the amendment or the Propositions in the amendment are preferable to the substantive Propositions at that time. And so really, that is the only valid context in which to look at voting patterns. It is as

1545

simple as that. And so it is perfectly acceptable for ... because it is a relative thing for people to vote one way in one debate and another way in another debate if the context is different, and my memory might not be serving me correctly and I do stand to be corrected and he is right beside me so I am sure he will, but I am pretty sure that Deputy Meerveld might have even had an amendment in terms of saving La Mare at some point. *(Laughter)* So again, the word hypocrisy I think is apt, but perhaps not in the way it is being used. Thank you. *(Laughter)*

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Just very briefly, I think it is more likely to come up in SACC's policy letter about the rise of these parties and how it has changed the colour of the States of Guernsey. I have noticed there have been three Members who have taken to Twitter overnight criticising me pulling a parliamentary – or maybe me ... is the 24-4 and the 26-1. Well there is a reason for that, Members, because I do not think the voting pattern has changed since the Cameron and – who was the other person involved in that? – the Cameron and de Sausmarez amendment. So to a degree, even though Deputy de Sausmarez calls this an Assembly where we are all open and we are all here to make decisions, I think in the main most of us came into this Assembly on this debate exactly knowing how we were going to vote.

Now, of course Deputy Meerveld was slightly more fiery than I usually am, so he has taken ... there is nothing for me to make it as ... or make it even worse. But I do not like to use the 'h' word with the exception of the Grammar School and those children who I note those who voted, while sending their children to the independents, to remove aspiration and scholarships from the majority of the people, and that is the last time I will ever say it but my mind will never change and I think that was where it all went horribly wrong. It really did go quite wrong indeed.

But I do take umbrage at what we have got along this side, mainly from Deputy Bury, Deputy Sasha Kazantseva-Miller, Deputy Falla, Deputy St Pier, certainly Deputy Burford, you are all effectively – and Deputy de Sausmarez, along with Deputy Roffey, you are all voting along the same lines – *all voting along the same lines* – give or take the odd stretch. And I take sincere umbrage in Deputy St Pier, who went out of his way to close La Mare de Carteret through an amendment back in 2014, as a Member of Policy and Resources who, in a previous house fed his friends and starved his enemies, and we have now got to the point where we actually have a Policy & Resources that is finally behind its Education Committee. I know some of them may be holding their noses on that to a degree, but at least we have a Policy & Resources that is behind its Education Committee, and if I agree with Deputy Meerveld on anything, this conversation needs to end and we need to move this forward.

And for those reasons, I will not be voting for this because I know darn well this will be a re-debate for some Members of the Assembly who just do not want any success by this Committee, because it is obvious by their tweets. There has been an orchestrated campaign via portions of the media, certainly people's outputs on Twitter. They do what they always do; they go for the person rather than the policy and that has to stop.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Thank you. So the reason I asked for clarification regarding the final amendment falling away if this one succeeds is because I am wanting to support that amendment, because I am in favour of a review and I will expand on that when we get to that amendment.

So I very much want that amendment to be debated. In response to my question, sir, you said it would not necessarily mean it does fall away if this one succeeds. So I am going to support this amendment, I see the value and the merit in doing so because of what Deputy Trott said in his opening speech, and what we are told in 4(d):

to direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and the Policy & Resources Committee to include within the project's scoping document, alongside the scope, goals, objectives and estimated timescale, a requirement for and

timing of a States' decision with suitable Propositions to allow the States to be sufficiently informed to provide final approvals to proceed with the project.

I am going to repeat that last part of the sentence, sir, because it is crucial.

... to be sufficiently informed to provide final approvals to proceed with the project.

And the thought that springs to my mind is, why would any Member of this Assembly not want that detail in front of them? Why wouldn't they? I do not understand why anyone would not vote in favour of this amendment. And like Deputy Trott and Parkinson, I am of the view that we do need to be sufficiently informed, and we have not been to date. When Deputy Parkinson spoke, he said much of what I intended to say so I am not going to repeat any of it. I just hope colleagues listened to his extremely valid points, but he did focus on good governance which, of course, is absolutely crucial at all times. And as much as I hope they listened to Deputy Parkinson, I hope they listen to Deputy Trott when he responds.

I would not be afraid, I do not think a colleague should ever be afraid of upsetting any of their colleagues in any way, shape or form if they change their mind, for example; you do not have to justify why you change your mind. (*Interjection*) It is obvious, surely: you have given it further thought and you have come to another conclusion. So, I would urge colleagues to not be afraid to upset any colleagues if you feel minded to support this amendment, or any amendment. Surely it is not about upsetting or pleasing colleagues. Surely it is about doing what you think is right for Guernsey. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) And I suspect I will have upset some of my colleagues by saying what I have said in this speech because I am going now the other way to what my previous support of ESC, for reasons I will expand on when we debate the next amendment.

But I am not afraid about that, because I am doing what I think is right for Guernsey. I am not here to please colleagues, I am not here to upset colleagues, I am here to do my job. I have been elected to do a job, to listen to both sides of an argument and make my judgement call come the time to vote. That is going to upset people, of course it is. It is going to upset some, and it is going to please others. I divorce myself from that. It is about doing what you think is right for the Island.

So I urge colleagues to support this amendment. Sir, thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

Deputy Falla: Thank you, sir.

I do not believe for a moment that Deputy Trott's amendment is a reckless or cynical attempt to derail ESC's Propositions. It is obvious that a significant proportion of this Assembly is uncomfortable with elements of the proposals, and it is our democratic right to address that in whatever way we can. Rather than reckless, it is an opportunity for all of us in this Chamber to do the right thing by the people who elected us. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) This was an election issue of election issues. It was in the top three, top two, might have been the top.

The amount of feedback we have had on this issue is significant, through social media, through emails to all Deputies, through other means, through meetings, invitations to hear the views of the teaching profession, etc. We need to represent the stakeholders that elected us. People in this Island definitely want the education issue sorted, but they also want us to do the best thing for pupils, teachers, parents and the economy, and the States' finances. I really disagree with Deputy Taylor. I would not behave like this in business. Decisions in business are based on evidence, detail and best possible financials available. Otherwise, there is risk. Risk of second best, or worse, failure. To vote for ESC's proposals as they stand just does not feel like good governance. We are talking about public money and a lot of it. We have to take responsibility for that, all of us have to take responsibility for that. It is what we were elected to do, and what the community expects from us, and I just do not feel that we can abdicate that weighty responsibility to get this right.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Burford.

Deputy Burford: Thank you, sir.

1645 In the immortal words, I was not going to speak but I think following Deputy Inder at least mentioning my name, I just wanted to say certainly for me I do not want to see ESC fail. In fact, I want nothing more than for them to succeed because if they succeed, then the children of this Island succeed. However, on the information available I do not personally think that this model will succeed and that is inextricably linked to the position of ESC. I mean Deputy Dudley-Owen is a very
1650 able Member of this Assembly, she has obviously put in an unbelievable amount of work on this policy letter, and I fully respect that. I just have a different opinion about whether it is right for Guernsey.

So, I will be supporting this amendment. I rarely, if ever, turn down the opportunity for more information and I think this is a very large project on which more information is absolutely vital to come to this Assembly, and at that point I will review that information and I am still open to persuasion to supporting the Committee if there is enough in that that persuades me so to do.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Moakes.

1660

Deputy Moakes: Thank you, sir.

I have enormous respect for Deputy Trott and Deputy Parkinson. I also hear what Deputy Trott and Deputy Parkinson are saying, but I think we all know what will happen if this amendment is approved. It will be hijacked. When the Education Committee comes back to the Assembly, this
1665 amendment will provide certain individuals with yet another opportunity to lay down amendment after amendment after amendment to stop a decision being reached. More time and more money wasted. So I ask Members to say no to this amendment and to vote in favour of ESC's proposal.

If they do, we will finally be able to end the debacle that is the future of education. I say debacle because it has been going on for 20 years and it has already cost taxpayers almost £11 million. Not
1670 only that, it has caused widespread uncertainty and frustration, not just for teachers but for an entire generation of students and parents. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Blin.

1675 **Deputy Blin:** Thank you, sir.

The reason I did not vote for the 26(1) to stop it was because I wanted to hear and debate, and I think that Deputies Trott and Parkinson's amendment is a very important one, it is a second layer of protection. I was particularly impressed by Deputy Queripel's comment on why on Earth wouldn't we want to check, to have the Assembly, the responsibility, of probably one of the most important
1680 decisions we have ever had to make.

But there is this other side which gets to me, and Deputy Burford, very correctly, put her trust that she knows that Deputy Dudley-Owen is a very competent, professional person, but there is this other aspect of that we may not believe exactly in the way they are delivering this model. So in effect what we are saying is those who do not support the ESC model as it stands will be advantaged
1685 by actually supporting this amendment, because it means that it is another way to say if we do not want something to happen in a certain way, they can constantly block or challenge or stop the cost of something. So I am in a very torn position here because I totally believe that it is important to have this ability to overview, to have the Assembly to agree with everything, but I am apprehensive, like Deputy Moakes, that it may be used in the wrong way.

1690 So for that reason, even though I totally believe we should have this oversight, I just cannot accept it because I fear it is going to be turned into a delay, and I truly believe that I would like to get to the point that when we do agree on the model, that we allow that to continue on with strength and force. Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Haskins.

1695

Deputy Haskins: Thank you, sir.

This reminds me of Proposition 14 of the GWP debate where, as an Assembly, we have already made this decision. Can we just reject this amendment and move on? Thank you.

1700

The Bailiff: Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley Owen: Thank you.

1705

Well, Deputy Haskins has just referenced GWP, and so will I. Deputy Parkinson asked 'Do you trust P&R? This amendment is very uncontroversial. Do you want to approve final plans or are you happy to delegate that to someone else?' Well, through you sir, I remind my colleagues that we already have. In the context of GWP, the States resolved to agree the assurance and approve all pathways for capital projects set out in paragraphs 9.5 to 9.10, in the funding and investment plan annex 5, including delegating authority to the Policy & Resources Committee, to approve the opening of capital votes for all schemes in the capital portfolio or to enter into alternative arrangements subject to the overall capital portfolio being delivered within the total of £568 million.

1710

The reorganisation of secondary and post-16 education is included in that portfolio, and Members will know that we have had a break, an unintended break between that particular debate and this that we are in today. It was never intended to be so, but that is how it has transpired because that is politics. And I would also remind Members of the rationale for that Resolution that we agreed back in July because it is really important to understand why that decision was taken and why we were asked to agree with that with Policy & Resources at the time, because they said:

1715

In addition the Committee is concerned that the States' commercial position is often compromised by the setting out of project costs in public documents ahead of competitive procurement processes. Therefore, the Policy & Resources Committee wishes to recommend that it be given delegated authority to approve funding for all schemes in the portfolio up to the maximum costed portfolio value set out in Appendix 11.9. The Committee appreciates that this is a significant additional responsibility which it takes extremely seriously. On balance, it believes that this will deliver better public value and momentum in delivery. The Policy & Resources Committee will work closely with each sponsoring committee to agree scope, take any States' directions and Resolutions and test and challenge the project business cases. Funding approval will be dependent on receiving the necessary assurances that the scheme represents best value and can deliver according to the approved business case. The Committee will develop an approach for reporting back to the States on the use of this delegated authority to insure transparency in the use of public funding.

Are we seeking here today through this amendment to undo that Resolution which is less than two months old?

1720

There have been comments made by various colleagues during the course of this particular debate and I think it was Deputy Roffey who said it is about the level of detail required for informed decision making, and he is absolutely right. Let us recall that the hospital modernisation plan, which Deputy Soulsby led, was agreed with not that much more detail than what we are looking at today because it is a high-level policy letter and that is exactly what this is. And we had, definitely, sufficient information in that policy letter to agree.

1725

And he also tried to draw an analogy between the policy letter that we have got in front of us that we put forward as a Committee and also the previous committee which he was on and the two-school model. But actually, that conflated a lot of issues and it chucked in the baby and the bathwater and all the hair shampoo bottles and everything into that particular policy letter and served to really conflate a lot of issues such as the education strategy which we have pulled out and very clearly communicated to States' Members. So no, we are not going to put in information such as proposed lunch times, the length of the school day and enrichment into a policy letter about the school model.

1730

Now, Deputy Parkinson has also talked about the length of delay and it will cause delay. It is undoubted. It is a six-week lead in time from publishing a policy letter to get to debate, if we have a fair wind. Actually we know that that can be delayed; Deputy Meerveld has been trying to put in front of us the Island-wide voting report for how many months now? So this absolutely is not a

1735

guaranteed quick-fire, 'Oh, it will only take a few weeks and they will be able to transfer the contents of the outline business case into a policy letter and before the States, and therefore there will not be any delay'. It will have a delay to it, so let us be realistic about that.

1740 Also, we know that in terms of the governance processes that the States have, Deputy Trott really knows this very well, and so does Deputy Parkinson as a former Treasury Minister, that we do have the Five Case business process which is an international practice in the Five Case business model to ensure that we have value for money. This was robustly asserted during the requête debate and I absolutely see that Deputy Trott and Deputy Parkinson want to be able to adhere to the principles
1745 of good governance and so do I, and this is what we are doing now. Actually, what I want to be able to do is go through some of the issues, which I will speak about later on, about how we need to come back and involve all the stakeholders because that is good governance in letting people know exactly what is going on. P&R have yet to determine what their reporting mechanism is around coming back, but they are quite capable of coming back to the States if they think that this particular
1750 project, which is one of many in the pipeline, needs more robust challenge and needs the support of the States going into another level. But also be very mindful of the fact that this will hold sensitive information, commercial information, which does start to muddy the waters of any procurement project.

So the amendment would have an impact on the programme timelines in terms of time, effort
1755 and cost, and potentially programme dependencies, not just on the secondary but also on the Guernsey Institute, and in consequence potentially the hospital modernisation programmes. This is dependent because the Institute of Health is looking to move out of the PEH and Members of the Committee for Health and Social Care will know this, that there is a timeline attached to that particular organisation, moving from the Hospital premises down to the Guernsey Institute. Now, it
1760 will obviously impact two significant work streams and construction pipelines that the States is trying to undertake at this time.

So that is the type of delay that we are looking for, and it is a real pity because had Deputy Parkinson and Deputy Trott come to the Committee, because we did not know this amendment was coming, if they had spoken to officers, the officers would have been able to take them through
1765 the consequences of that delay, and actually that there is a price tag attached to this. So again, the new Rule 4(d) – and I have mentioned this to Deputy Meerveld as well in his capacity as President of SACC – the spirit in which it was intended, I think, by the Policy & Resources Committee was to have a better quality of amendment coming through which had been challenged and gone through with officers of the sponsoring committee which actually had financials attached to it and some
1770 facts and figures. That spirit seems to have been ridden roughshod over, though they have complied with the letter of the Rule. So I do think that if we want to have better quality amendments, which the committees are aware of and that can be reviewed in good time and with that intellectual honesty that I was talking about yesterday, then we really should be tightening up on that Rule and recasting it if that is what we want.

1775 If the Committee's proposed model is accepted by the States, we propose to achieve best value for the States by running a single capital investment programme for the Guernsey Institute and secondary combined, so we would be looking at running them concurrently. It would make no sense to have two architectural teams, two tender processes, two business cases and two construction projects on the same site. That is not good value for money and in anybody's book would be
1780 bonkers. It would be far more cost-effective to run a single combined process for the two, and having the new Sixth Form Centre opening at the same time as the Guernsey Institute.

However, if this amendment is approved and we have to bring the secondary model back to the States, then we will either have to put the Guernsey Institute on hold while the States debate again the secondary education model, or to decouple the two construction projects, resulting in
1785 significant unnecessary duplication of effort to run the two tender processes, two construction projects on the same site at the same time. So Members who are inclined to vote for this really should be thinking very hard about which one that they would rather do.

Now, I will just talk a little about Policy & Resources and the Treasury Green Book process because I am not sure if all Members are aware of it and I would really encourage Members strongly to speak to Treasury officers who are involved in this area because we have had a lot of commentary over this debate – I would like to say over the last couple of days but it is not, it is over the last couple of months because it goes back to July – about nonsense of figures and, ‘We do not like this particular figure that has been put forward’, ‘We do not believe it’, ‘It is not true’, etc. I will say yet again, if you do not like the figures put forward by officers, you need to go back and find out where those figures came from and this Committee went through, line by line on the spreadsheets presented to us by officers whose job it is to go away and cost all these things up. We asked about the formulas they were using, we went to the Green Book ourselves, checked that formula.

If Members do not like the construction formula for capital projects relating to education, relating to hospitals, relating to any infrastructure projects, look to change those. I urge Deputy de Sausmarez who is constantly questioning the figures – and I welcome her comments now.

Deputy de Sausmarez: My questioning is not so much on the figures that Deputy Dudley-Owen is talking about, but the figures that people who engaged with officers in developing amendments were given because the assumptions were not common and there were several aspects of the methodology which were not logical. For example, there was a figure of, I believe, about £10 million or a range of £7 million to £10 million for Les Varendes which even if you moved it directly into another amendment, a higher optimism bias was added even though the figures and the work would have been identical.

So there were several aspects which I criticised from that methodology, but the figures I am referring to are not the figures that Deputy Dudley-Owen is referring to, but indeed the figures that were given because they were based on a completely different set of assumptions in terms of the space standards, in terms of the tipping points, in terms of aspects like that. So I think Deputy Dudley-Owen is a little bit mistaken in what I was criticising but it was not the figures that Deputy Dudley-Owen is referring to now.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: And actually, I am quite pleased that I gave way because Deputy de Sausmarez has proved again, when we are talking about this optimism bias, go back to the Green Book, to the Five Step business case. If you do not like the formula of the optimism bias and how we apply it, challenge it at the root. Do not come into the Assembly, Members, and start to complain about the figures that were given by officers when those figures are taken from a formula-led approach. Challenge it at the root. Do not come into the Assembly and criticise.

Under the Government Work Plan, the States has delegated authority to Policy & Resources to approve, subject to appropriate business cases, all of the capital programme, not just education. The capital approval process is rigorous in itself and requires a committee to demonstrate to Policy & Resources the strategic, economic, commercial, financial and management cases for the investment. This includes demonstrating, and this is a process that is for all the committees, includes demonstrating how the proposed investment would deliver the benefits within the agreed cost envelope to the agreed timescales, that the plans and resources are in place to deliver, and that there is a commercially viable proposal from the external partners required to deliver it.

It will, I am sure, I am comforted, be subject to rigorous review. It must be, not just from the officers of P&RC, but also from the independent programme assurance professionals to ensure the promises made can be met and are deliverable. It is estimated that it will take nine months in order to work up the necessary business case, building designs, staffing structures, student transition plans, planning and cost estimating. The key to delivering large programmes such as this is maintaining momentum, and that is a word that you heard from the GWP extract that I read out. This States needs to move quickly if we are going to have any opportunity to salvage something out of the economic doldrums that we are looking at finding ourselves in.

Once you have assembled a team with all the wide range of skills required from educational specialists, HR, coms, finance, project and change management, building design, organisation

1840 design, the running cost is high. If we have to put the whole team on hold during this period where
we publish our policy letter and wait for it to get into the States, that would be very expensive, or
worse, you might have to stand them all down and then try, as you might, to reassemble the whole
team again three months later, as I say, on a fair wind of our political whim as to whether we can
finish debates or not in time. And that is once the States have made a decision; how do we get them
1845 all back together again?

So quite apart from the internal team, we must also consider the commercial sensitivity,
something that we have been very alive to in this Chamber for many terms, and also something
that GWP sought to address. And I ask when does Deputy Trott suggest we bring this back to the
States? Is it just before we go out to tender, which will mean publishing all the details of our cost
1850 estimates in this stage would result in revealing our negotiating hand to prospective contractors?
Or should we wait until we have completed the tender process? This will be unlikely to secure a
good deal, as the bidders will not know whether this project will be rejected by the States until after
they have invested significant funds in their proposals. This was exactly the issue that we came
across with one significant contractor during the pause and review, which I was part of and I hold
1855 my hand up to the Assembly, I absolutely was part of that, and I believe it is still the right thing to
do.

We acknowledge that the States are one of our key stakeholder groups and we are absolutely
committed to keeping all stakeholders briefed on progress. Why wouldn't we be? We want to be
held to account by this Assembly. We have been willing, absolutely, participants in this debate,
1860 welcoming this debate as a once-and-for-all final debate on this particular issue; but please, we
welcome challenge, we welcome debate, we welcome scrutiny, and invite people to come and
challenge us all the time. But once we have this programme under way, we cannot continue with
this stop-start, stop-start approach.

Just looking at the last 'to note' point in Deputy Trott's amendment. I think it is worth just going
1865 into a little bit of detail here, and I mentioned this yesterday in regard to Deputy St Pier's similarly
worded statements in his amendment because I have been absolutely consistent and stated in the
context of this debate just this morning that this Committee is absolutely focused on change
management and the delivery of an effective business change strategy to ensure that staff are
supported on the journey of change. None of this work can commence until a decision here has
1870 been made. It is not possible to take people on a journey of change until they understand what the
change is, and can therefore be supported in adjusting to that change over time.

Change management is not an overnight process. It involves understanding people,
understanding their concerns, working with people to find the best solutions to their concerns and
providing structured opportunities to hear those concerns to work through solutions. It is also about
1875 providing training and ongoing support via coaching and mentoring, things which people think are
soft and fluffy but absolutely essential if you are going to take people on the journey with you. It is
a complex work stream, please do not underestimate that. The hard work starts when we make a
decision, which I hope very much is going to be in the Committee's favour. But it is absolutely critical
to the implementation of successful change in any change or organisation.

1880 There is no single blanket approach for a group of teachers or support staff, but it is far more
nuanced than a people-centric approach, which involves working alongside school leaders to
support their staff through change, and I am going to beg the patience of my colleagues on this
afternoon because it is worth looking at this area in some detail to give some comfort and
reassurance because this is the type of accountability and the reassurance that this Assembly needs
1885 that we will be constantly communicating where we are at with our school leaders, with our
stakeholders such as Deputies in the Chamber.

So working with our school leaders, the Business Change team will ensure that best practice for
change management is in place through a wide range of activities to support staff during the course
of the programme. Staff will require different aspects of support depending on how they are
1890 adjusting to change and the stage at which the programme is at. The Change team will be working
with school leaders, staff and union colleagues to determine the best and most appropriate support

strategies. There will be a robust stakeholder engagement and a robust stakeholder management strategy to ensure that key stakeholders understand what is happening, and when and how they can contribute to the change.

1895 Deputies, Members in this room, sir, already form an integral part of the stakeholder engagement strategy and will already be aware that the Committee very much values the thoughts and views of States' Members. We have already evidenced this through the numerous webinars which we have run for Members this year, alongside the opportunity to attend presentations and ask questions. It is really important to the Committee that this approach continues post-debate so
1900 that we are able to work with transparency and openness as the plans develop.

There will be regular opportunity for States' Members to be appraised of the work of the programme which will cover the scope, goals, objectives, time scales as well as ongoing staff engagement activities and progress to date. These sessions will provide opportunities to States' Members to ask questions and to challenge the Committee on its work, and we will publish details
1905 of these sessions post-debate once the final outcome is known and the programme team has had time to finalise the detailed plans. And if P&R have not already started to develop their reporting mechanism as a result of that Resolution that we all made in GWP, then perhaps this might serve as a template for the P&R Committee to use for their reporting mechanism back to the States if they feel that this is a robust way, but certainly we will be engaging with people along the way to
1910 ensure that they are satisfied with this approach.

Let us keep the momentum going colleagues, through you, sir. Let us just get on and make this decision today. I understand the thrust of what Deputy Trott is trying to do here in terms of good governance, but the good governance principles have already been met, and I pledge to keep this Assembly and all stakeholders appraised of the process and involved all the way through. Thank
1915 you.

The Bailiff: The proposer of this amendment, Deputy Trott, to reply to the debate please.

Deputy Trott: Is it me, sir?

1920 Sir, Deputy Ferbrache kicked us off, and he does make me laugh, I do like Deputy Ferbrache. We both support Tottenham Hotspur, as you know, but I am delighted that Deputy Ferbrache is a supporter and not a player because my goodness me, doesn't he score some spectacular own goals? *(Laughter)*.

I mean, he started by, I would argue, almost misleading the Assembly by describing this as a
1925 delaying tactic. I went to great lengths in my opening remarks, and I shall do as this speech develops, to make the point that Deputy Parkinson and I are not seeking to defeat the Committee's proposed model or replace it. This amendment allows the Committee to continue developing its preferred model, but it adds the necessary rigour and discipline to the States' decision-making process by allowing the States to provide its final approval.

1930 He then quoted, and I may not have this precisely right, but he said 'Into the valley of the compliance officers we ride', which of course was a plagiarism of the famous Charge of the Light Brigade poem. Now the problem with that particular event was that not only did the Light Brigade jump the gun, but the result was a spectacular defeat of a size of magnitude rarely seen before or since by the British Army. But I thought it was particularly relevant for him to use that because that,
1935 of course, is precisely what Deputy Parkinson and I are trying to avoid.

Now, I do not believe everything I read in the paper, but I do and I trust Deputy Ferbrache's view of his own abilities when it comes to governance, but I do recall a headline on the front page of the *Press* a few years ago and I have no idea whether it is true, sir, but I do remember reading it, that
1940 apparently Deputy Ferbrache had been fleeced for, I don't know, more than half a million quid, and I remember thinking at the time this is a spectacular failure of basic corporate governance. But I have no idea whether that is true or not, but certainly if that had happened, it would be as I have described.

Deputy Ferbrache: Point of correction.

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: It was not half a million, it was one and a half! (*Laughter*)

The Bailiff: Deputy Trott to continue, please.

Deputy Trott: It is fantastic, isn't it really? (*Laughter*).

Like I say, I am delighted you are a supporter of Spurs and not a player! (*Laughter*). I mean sometimes I feel I am in a parallel universe. But anyway. Deputy Gollop is going to support, for which I am grateful to him. Deputy Dyke said that he believes we have enough information. Well, if he believes that, there is absolutely nothing I can say or do other than to repeat some of the remarks I made in my opening speech; and that is that in my 21 years I have never seen a policy letter of this magnitude with so little detail. Now that is a fact, please put your scrutiny committee hat on and research that if you wish, but it is absolutely the fact. But you believe that there is enough information. Okay. I do not, and I do not think very many people in the private sector would either.

Deputy Taylor does not like the 'to note' part of the amendment. I do not usually, but they were there, of course, to remind us of the journey. And part of the journey is to emphasise the spectacular volte-face that we have seen in terms of some people's views and opinions. I think Deputy de Sausmarez exposed graphically that of Deputy Meerveld. A little later on I may attempt to do the same with regard to Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Now Deputy Roffey, he does not have anywhere near enough detail to sign this off. The detail is far too scant. And of course he is absolutely right. He has not. And yet, some believe they do. Deputy Parkinson made a point that is certainly worthy of repetition, and that is that it is a significant abrogation of our responsibility as an Assembly to proceed without the comfort of what the amendment provides. It is politically unwise to reject this amendment.

Now, Deputy Parkinson is a very capable man with a very long list of professional qualifications and a successful track record in business. He is also a former Treasury Minister, he knows what he is talking about. Please do not assume that just because one has been here, in his case a dozen or so years and in my case 20 or more, that there is a malevolent approach to the drafting of these amendments. It is designed to help. It is designed to ensure that we are collectively moving forward and not to expose some of our colleagues to unnecessary problems.

Now, Deputy Meerveld gave, by his own admission, a cynical assessment of the amendment. Sir, in my view Deputy Meerveld sees political machinations where none exist, and I suspect that is because he spent much of the last term undergoing political machinations. It has never been my style or approach, and it is only an opinion, sir, I am not saying he did that, it is just that is how it appears to me. So it was a somewhat predictable response. Now, I do not know whether I am allowed to say this or not, sir. This is alleged, I know that, but it is alleged that Deputy Meerveld has a somewhat chequered history with regard to corporate governance. (*Interjection*) Well, it is alleged; not by me, but it is alleged nonetheless. And a classic example –

Deputy Ferbrache: Point of order, sir.

The Bailiff: Point of order, Deputy Ferbrache.

Deputy Ferbrache: Point of order, Deputy Trott knows that that is outrageous. I have had things alleged against me by his close political compatriot recently. I have had things alleged against my daughter by his close political compatriot recently. Let facts be proven. Deputy Trott knows exactly what he is doing. That is a disgrace and he should withdraw that.

The Bailiff: Just a minute.

Deputy Trott: I find it very difficult to – I beg your pardon, sir.

The Bailiff: Just a minute, Deputy Trott.

A point of order involves a breach of a Rule of Procedure. (**Deputy Ferbrache:** Yes.) Which Rule of Procedure are you saying that Deputy Trott has broken, Deputy Ferbrache?

Deputy Ferbrache: I am saying, sir, that he has broken the Rule that we should treat each other with respect, that we should presume good faith, that we should only make allegations if they are sadly proven. And if that is not in the Rules, sir, it jolly well should be.

The Bailiff: It is possible that it should be, but I am not sure that the Rules of Procedure as such extend to incorporate the Code of Conduct where that is an issue. It could become a Code issue in my view.

I am not saying it will be, but I am just saying that if there are concerns about a Member's conduct within the context of this Assembly, it can still be a Code of Conduct issue. What it cannot be is a litigation issue because of the absolute privilege to which all Members are entitled. Now, privilege should not be abused but in terms of whether that would be capable of being litigated, I do not think it would be in any event, but if it were then Deputy Trott would benefit from the absolute privilege which is conferred upon all Members for these proceedings and other matters under the Reform Law.

So I am not going to invite Deputy Trott to withdraw his comment at all, he approached it in a fashion that I think is just about acceptable, which he recognised by saying he was coming close to the line, but I do not believe he has transgressed it, and therefore I will allow him to continue without doing that. But that does not mean to say that Members should take that ruling as *carte blanche* to start saying things that, frankly, they would be better off not saying, and this debate does not need to descend to those levels.

Deputy Trott, continue.

Deputy Trott: Thank you, sir.

I agree entirely with that, and I would also say that whilst it is absolutely right that Deputy Meerveld does have an alleged chequered history with regard to corporate governance, I have no evidence to suggest that he has and as a result of that, sir, I am very happy to withdraw that comment.

What I am not prepared to let go is what followed from Deputy Meerveld immediately afterwards. In a not unusual act of factual inaccuracy, he said 'We have 5,500 civil servants.' We do not have 5,500 civil servants. We have something approaching that number in terms of public sector workers but I believe we have about 1,800 civil servants or less. So it is an example, I think, and a pretty graphic one where Deputy Meerveld is not always in possession of the facts that I would like him to be in possession of, sir.

Now sir, Deputy Matthews, like me, he did not recognise the corporate world that Deputy Meerveld believes is best practice. And of course he is quite right because it does not. And then Deputy de Sausmarez went on to highlight the ludicrous behaviours of some Members in terms of the manner in which they yo-yo with opinions and advice that they give this Assembly.

Deputy Inder, once again, sir, he talks of personality politics. Well I am not, I would be as happy to have a beer with Deputy Inder or Deputy Ferbrache, or Deputy Meerveld for that matter. It is not personality politics. What we are talking about is best practice governance, and what we are seeing is – and it is over and over again – we are seeing personality politics coming in to genuine debate when it should not be there. It should be about the facts, it should be about best practice, it should be about what is commonly accepted outside this Assembly as the norm, not a set of rules dependent upon which day of the week it is. Now I have always espoused these views, the views that the Assembly is sovereign, the Assembly should make the final decision because, as I said in my opening remarks, we are the executive. We are unusual in that regard, the buck stops with all

39 of us currently, and in my view we owe a duty of care to the Education, Sport & Culture Committee and the Policy & Resources Committee not to abrogate our responsibilities and create a focal point for them in that way.

Best practice today, sir, was best practice when Deputy Meerveld was rightly calling for it a few months ago, and it was best practice when Deputy Dudley-Owen was calling for it a few months ago. It was best practice then and it is now. Now Deputy Falla said, 'Voting for ESC's proposals do not look like good governance'. Well he is right. What is that old expression? 'If it looks like something and it smells like something, it probably is something'. Well, it is not good governance and it really is as simple as that.

Deputy Burford is our Scrutiny Chair. She has a very analytical mind and a very important role within this Assembly, and she says, quite rightly, 'More information is absolutely vital'. Now Deputy Moakes – and I share a neutral admiration, I think he is a very capable chap – believes this amendment allows for a future hijack. Well, I would not have any part of that. But what I say back to him is I think it shows a spectacular lack of confidence in these proposals. If you think what is going to come back before the States will come back in a way that will allow such a hijack. I do not. I think it will come back in a form that will enable us to all get behind it and move forward together collectively and collaboratively because I am not a cynic. I am not the 'red under the bed'. I am not the machinator that some Members in this Assembly have a reputation for being.

Now Deputy Dudley-Owen tells us that we could see a four-week delay. (*Interjection by Deputy Dudley-Owen*) (A Member: Yes, you said that.) Yes, you did. Four to six weeks. Yes. I was giving the benefit of the doubt, because I think –

Deputy Haskins: Point of correction, sir?

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: I believe the President said three months.

Deputy Trott: Well, I wrote it down and it was quite clearly four to six weeks. But Deputy Dudley-Owen then went on to make the point that we postpone debate on this matter in July. Here we are now approaching the middle of September. That period alone is longer than that period, but we are quite happy to do that.

The truth is that in the big scheme of things, four weeks is not material for two reasons. The first is the construction industry is so hot at the moment that it could well be that a project of this size would not be delayed in weeks, but delayed by quarters because it is simply that committee. And I asked a close friend of mine, who so happens to be a proprietor of one of Guernsey's largest construction companies, if he would kindly build me a little extension. It is only a little extension, I do not have Deputy Ferbrache's resources so I certainly could not afford to lose £1.5 million and be so flippant about it (*Laughter*) but there we are.

But he said to me, 'You are a good customer, Lyndon, however we probably cannot get to you until the third quarter of next year'. The industry is busy and therefore a delay of a few weeks is in the present environment immaterial. But why not call a Special Meeting? If ESC and P&R are worried about an extra four weeks, call a Special Meeting. We have had six weeks with our feet up apparently. We can get back into this Assembly at the drop of a hat to consider these proposals. Now it need not be delayed.

Now sir, I am going to finish with another quote from Deputy Dudley-Owen, who is a friend of mine and I have to say, I thought she did extremely well at arguing both sides of the argument, but I think she did an even better job arguing for pause and review, which is why I supported it, because she said 'It is better to get it right than get it rushed'. She is of course quite right. I do hope Members will support this amendment, and as I said earlier, sir, I would like a recorded vote.

2100 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, it is now time to vote on amendment 8, proposed by Deputy Trott, seconded by Deputy Parkinson, and there has been a request for a recorded vote so over to you, Greffier, please.

There was a recorded vote.

2105

Carried – Pour 16, Contre 20, Ne vote pas 1, Absent 2

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy St Pier	Deputy Soulsby	Deputy Kazantseva-	Deputy Le Tocq
Deputy Trott	Deputy Taylor	Miller	Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Brouard	Deputy Vermeulen		
Deputy Burford	Deputy Aldwell		
Deputy Bury	Deputy Blin		
Deputy Cameron	Deputy Dudley-Owen		
Deputy de Lisle	Deputy Dyke		
Deputy de Sausmarez	Deputy Ferbrache		
Deputy Fairclough	Deputy Haskins		
Deputy Falla	Deputy Helyar		
Deputy Gabriel	Deputy Inder		
Deputy Gollop	Deputy Mahoney		
Deputy Matthews	Deputy McKenna		
Deputy Parkinson	Deputy Meerveld		
Deputy Queripel	Deputy Moakes		
Deputy Roffey	Deputy Murray		
	Deputy Oliver		
	Deputy Prow		
	Alderney Rep. Roberts		
	Alderney Rep. Snowdon		

The Bailiff: Members of the States, in respect of amendment 8, proposed by Deputy Trott and seconded by Deputy Parkinson, there voted Pour 16, Contre 20, one abstention, two Members were absent at the vote and therefore I declare amendment 8 lost.

2110 Can I just take this opportunity, Members of the State, to remind all Members of the Rule about not addressing another Member directly which is starting to creep in a little bit once again during the course of debate on the previous amendments. The whole idea under Rule 17(1) is that whenever speaking in a debate, Members always address me as the Presiding Officer.

2115 We have one more amendment, now I turn the page, and that is amendment 4, proposed by Deputy Le Tocq. Is it still your wish to lay that amendment, Deputy Le Tocq?

Deputy Le Tocq: It is, sir.

The Bailiff: Thank you very much. Do you want it read?

2120

[Amendment 4](#)

To delete the Propositions and substitute therefor:

"1.

1.1 To agree that: from the earliest date practicable, States' maintained secondary education should be delivered through an 11-18 learning partnership across three 11-16 schools and a Sixth Form Centre located on a site separate to those schools, and Le Murier and Les Voies Schools and St Anne's School in Alderney;

the three 11-16 schools will be located on the existing school sites at Les Beaucamps, Les Varendes and St Sampson's and the Sixth Form Centre in a new building at Les Ozouets Campus co-located with The Guernsey Institute, the development and implementation of which is estimated to have: 'Secondary & Post-16 Education Reorganisation' shall be approved as a project in the capital portfolio, subject to ratification by the States as part of the Government Work Plan debate

a) A capital cost of £43.5m as set out in table 8 in paragraph 9.4; and

b) An ongoing revenue cost which will not, in the medium term, exceed the current revenue costs associated with these phases of education; and

1.2 To delegate authority to the Policy & Resources Committee, following approval of the necessary business cases, to open capital votes of up to £54m, (which includes an allowance for optimism bias as described in section 9.8) to fund the model for the reorganisation of the secondary and post 16 education infrastructure agreed by the Assembly, subject to ratification by the States as part of the Government Work Plan debate.

And if Proposition 1.1 has been approved,

Or, if the Propositions in 1 have been defeated:

2. To agree that:

i) from the earliest date practicable, in addition to Le Murier and Les Voies Schools and St Anne's School in Alderney, States'-maintained secondary education shall be delivered through an 11-18 learning partnership across three 11-16 schools at La Mare de Carteret, Les Beaucamps and St Sampson's and a sixth form centre at Les Varendes; and

ii) before the end of 2021 the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture shall submit a policy letter which allows the States to make the resolutions necessary to put this model into effect, including the estimated capital and revenue costs and the appropriate delegations of authority to the Policy & Resources Committee. 3.1 To agree that sixth form education, in the States'-maintained secondary sector, should continue to be provided within an 11-18 setting, rather than in a stand-alone sixth form college and to direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to design the optimal model for providing secondary education in Guernsey which retains an 11-18 educational offer inside the States'-maintained secondary sector, based as equitably as possible, on the following:

Or, if the Propositions in 1 and 2 have been defeated:

3.

- three 11-18 schools based at existing educational sites;

- ensuring that the intake is such that the 11-16 section of the schools are of roughly the same size;

- including at one school site the main sixth form centre;

- facilitating sixth form 'satellites' at the other two school sites working together in partnership with the main centre; and

- maximising vocational and academic option mix between the sixth form centre and The Guernsey Institute. 3.2 To agree that sixth form education, in the States'-maintained secondary sector, should continue to be provided within an 11-18 setting, rather than in a stand-alone sixth form college, and to direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to design the optimal model for providing secondary education in Guernsey which retains an 11-18 educational offer inside the States'-maintained secondary sector, based as equitably as possible, on the following:

3.3 To approve 'Secondary & Post-16 Education Reorganisation' as a project in the capital portfolio, subject to the States approving the relevant Propositions in the Government Work Plan policy letter which is being considered by the States later in July 2021.

3.4 To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to work in conjunction with the Policy & Resources Committee to deliver the proposals outlined in Propositions 3.1 or 3.2 above within the delegated capital budget and ongoing revenue costs as proposed in the policy letter.

3.5 To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to work in conjunction with the Policy & Resources Committee to return to the States as soon as practicable with proposals to deliver the proposals outlined in Propositions 3.1 or 3.2 above

Or if Proposition 3.1 has been defeated:

- three 11-16 schools based at existing educational sites;

- ensuring that the intake is such that these schools are of roughly the same size;

- including at one of the 11-16 school sites a sixth form centre;

- seeking to investigate, develop and facilitate opportunities to continue post-16 studies, including A levels, where practicable, at the other two school sites through partnership with the sixth form centre; and
- maximising vocational and academic option mix between the sixth form centre and The Guernsey Institute.

And if the Propositions in either 3.1 or 3.2 have been approved:

Or, if Proposition 3.4 has been defeated:

within the delegated capital budget and ongoing revenue costs as proposed in the policy letter.

4.1 To agree that from the earliest date practicable, alongside Le Murier, Les Voies and St. Anne's in Alderney, States' maintained secondary education should be delivered through an 11-18 learning partnership across three 11-16 schools at Les Beaucamps, St. Sampson's and Les Varendes and a Sixth Form Centre co-located at Les Varendes, maximising the use of the existing estate and optimising equitable educational outcomes, taking into account equitable curriculum choice, access to subject specialist teachers, pupil teacher ratios and class sizes.

Or, if the Propositions in 1, 2 and 3 have been defeated:

4.

And if Proposition 4.1 has been approved,

4.2 To note that:

- a) The capital cost of reorganising secondary and post 16 education is anticipated to be substantially lower than those set out in the Policy Letter in table 8 in paragraph 9.4; and
 - b) The ongoing revenue cost is anticipated to be lower, in the medium term, than both the current revenue costs associated with these phases of education and the cost of the option set out in this Policy Letter;
- 4.3 To direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, having consulted with school staff, to return to the States with the propositions necessary to put the model described in the preceding propositions into effect and to include in its proposals measures to upgrade facilities at each of the school sites to make better and more efficient use of the existing estate, including mitigation for existing constrictions due to the design or layout, plus any other measures considered practicable to improve the student and staff experience and support improved educational outcomes.

and to agree that revenue savings should be reinvested in improving the educational offer and student experience.

4.4 To note the interdependencies between the 11-18 learning partnership and Le Murier, Les Voies and St. Anne's in Alderney, and to agree the principle that the reorganisation of secondary and post 16 education within that learning partnership does not negatively impact – and wherever possible aligns or indeed positively impacts – the provision of education in these other settings.

4.5 To agree that Les Ozouets should be developed solely as the site of The Guernsey Institute, and to direct the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to progress the development of The Guernsey Institute at Les Ozouets, as agreed in Proposition 2, 'Transforming Education Programme & Putting Into Effect The Policy Decisions Made By The States In 2018', Billet XVI 2019, as a priority.

4.6 To approve 'Secondary & Post 16 Education Reorganisation' as a project in the capital portfolio, subject to ratification by the States as part of the Government Work Plan debate.

Or, if the Propositions in 1, 2, 3 and 4 have been defeated:

5. To agree that:

- i) from the earliest date practicable, alongside Le Murier, Les Voies and St. Anne's in Alderney, States' maintained secondary education should be delivered through an 11-18 learning partnership, including sixth form studies, in a genuine 'three-school model', i.e. from three locations, with sixth form studies being delivered at one or more of those locations; and
- ii) before the end of 2021 the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture shall submit a policy letter which allows the States to make the resolutions necessary to put this model into effect, including the estimated capital and revenue costs and to give the appropriate delegations of authority to the Policy & Resources Committee.

Or, if the Propositions in 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been defeated:

6. To agree that the Review called for in the policy letter entitled 'Review of the Structure of Secondary & Further Education: Next Steps' in Billet d'Etat VIII of 2020, shall be resumed and completed in accordance with the terms of reference laid out in that policy letter, save that such Review will be completed by an independent panel, the chair of which panel shall be appointed by the Committee for Education, Sport and Culture's Independent Overseer and that the appointed Chair will be responsible for appointing a further six members with relevant and appropriate skills to the panel and that the panel will submit its report to the Committee for Education, Sport and Culture by December 2021."

Deputy Le Tocq: No, sir (*Laughter*), it will take far too long, I think.

If I may, sir, I now will try to be as brief as possible. Sir, of course this amendment was written and lodged at a time when at least I anticipated that it would provide this Assembly with an opportunity to debate all the options that were currently available at one go which I think would have saved us a lot of time.

However, we are not in that position now and many of the Propositions have been debated here and many of them have lost, obviously. But there is one that remains, and there is one that remains that, again, I am probably likely to be criticised by certain Members for not being passionately in favour of this one because the one that remains is Proposition 6. That is largely to reinstate a full review of the options available, to do it in such a way that it would be independently moderated, and to therefore return to this Assembly with that report but ensuring that the public, and perhaps more importantly the stakeholders, all stakeholders involved here, would have an opportunity to see these comparisons. So why I think that is important is whilst I did not support pause and review, I know that many in this Assembly, and indeed outside of this Assembly, did at that time and in conversations with teachers particularly, overwhelmingly they said this would be their first option. Deputy Cameron's amendment, and Deputy Cameron is very kindly seconding this amendment, but Deputy Cameron's original amendment was their second choice, the sort of semi-*status quo* option. This was their first choice.

Now, I do not think in doing that, whilst I stand by what I have said before that I do not think we will please all the teaching profession or educationalists, I tried to hear them in this and I believe that what they were saying is, 'We want to be persuaded. We want to see evidence. We are not certain enough that any particular model will work well, but before we go in any direction we want to see evidence'. Now, my fear, sir, is if we end up today and accept for this one last hoorah, we probably will end up voting for the Propositions as laid by the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture. If we end up in that direction, my fear is, sir, that in implementing those, they will not have the support or at least not have the full support, certainly not have the heartfelt support, of the majority of the teaching profession. And that would be a very difficult and potentially expensive position for this Assembly to be in.

I hope, and I would be very willing to be proven wrong on that, but I have seen this happen before because in the end it is those stakeholders, including parents as well and there are certainly a number of parents who feel similarly, who need the buy-in in order to be able to make any model work. And so this amendment, sir, enables the Assembly, if it is passed, they will have the joy of voting against, Contre, to all Propositions 1 to 5, or if they want to can vote for them again but obviously that is unlikely to change.

But when it comes to Proposition 6 to step back and take an honest view of how, bearing in mind all that we currently know, how effective and how dangerous it might be to go along the path knowing that the majority of those who will be tasked to implement it will not have their full support, their heart will not be in it. And in that case, delivering the ambitious, and I accept that they are ambitious, proposals from Education, will be severely affected by that.

So I think it is worth, sir, this Assembly, before we plough ahead, taking this opportunity seriously and I encourage Members to express their views and I will certainly listen to them as well before I respond to debate. Thank you, sir.

2165 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Cameron, do you formally second this amendment?

Deputy Cameron: Yes, please.

2170 **The Bailiff:** Thank you very much. Deputy Dudley-Owen.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Sir, I would like to have a ruling on 24(6) from Members' Rulebook because it goes further than the original Proposition, seeking to knock out all the Propositions and replace them. Thank you.

2175 **The Bailiff:** Well I am satisfied, Members of the States, that the whole context of amendment number 4 does fall foul of Rule 24(6) because it goes further than the original Propositions by introducing another different option, just as any of those that wanted to delete the Propositions and substitute other Propositions therefore would have done and, therefore, Deputy Dudley-Owen, are you invoking Rule 24(6) and asking me to put it to the Members?

2180 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, sir, I am. Thank you.

The Bailiff: In that case, Members of the States, there will be a vote on whether you want to debate this amendment or whether you want to approve the motion of Deputy Dudley-Owen that the amendment be not debated.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Can we have a recorded on that please?

2190 **The Bailiff:** And there will be a recorded vote requested, please, so Greffier.

Deputy Soulsby: Sir, can I confirm that if we do not want it debated we vote Pour?

2195 **The Bailiff:** If you do not want to debate amendment number 4, which is the last of the amendments, then Members should vote Pour. If you want the amendment to be debated and a vote taken thereon then you vote Contre, because it is the motion that it be not debated.

There was a recorded vote.

Carried – Pour 20, Contre 15, Ne vote pas 0, Absent 4

POUR	CONTRE	NE VOTE PAS	ABSENT
Deputy Soulsby	Deputy St Pier	None	Deputy Leadbeater
Deputy Taylor	Deputy Trott		Deputy Matthews
Deputy Vermeulen	Deputy Brouard		Deputy Oliver
Deputy Aldwell	Deputy Burford		Alderney Rep. Snowdon
Deputy Blin	Deputy Bury		
Deputy de Lisle	Deputy Cameron		
Deputy Dudley-Owen	Deputy de Sausmarez		
Deputy Dyke	Deputy Fairclough		
Deputy Ferbrache	Deputy Falla		
Deputy Haskins	Deputy Gabriel		
Deputy Helyar	Deputy Gollop		
Deputy Inder	Deputy Kazantseva-Miller		
Deputy Mahoney	Deputy Le Tocq		
Deputy McKenna	Deputy Queripel		
Deputy Meerveld	Deputy Roffey		
Deputy Moakes			
Deputy Murray			
Deputy Parkinson			
Deputy Prow			
Alderney Rep. Roberts			

2200 **The Bailiff:** Members of the States, the voting on the motion pursuant to Rule 24, paragraph 6, proposed by Deputy Dudley-Owen, that the amendment numbered 4 should not be debated is there voted Pour 20, Contre 15, four Members were absent and therefore the motion succeeds and amendment number 4 therefore is not to be debated and no vote is taken on it, and believe it or not, we are now ready to resume general debate.

Deputy Gollop.

2205 **Deputy Gollop:** Blatantly, nobody wants the general debate, or maybe we have had it all.

It is a challenging debate, even more so that it has been extended over almost two months, but as I say there has been very mixed views on education. Another article that took my interest recently was one *[inaudible]* schools, not only a rather rye history of grammar schools and why in the UK for different reasons the two main political parties of government did not support them as much as they could have done which has led to surviving grammar schools doing very well but in more affluent postcode areas.

But there was another article on the so-called 'Oxbridge files', and here it is a very narrow, very elitist mindset perhaps, but they nevertheless come up with one of these league tables of 80 schools in England of the numbers they get into Oxford and Cambridge universities. And what is interesting about the table is 35 are independent schools, or what we might call public schools, 22 are grammar, 15 sixth form colleges, seven are comprehensives or academies and one is a further education college.

The point I am making is not only are they geographically spread, but there is no certainty that any one model of school is automatically better than another, and as I said yesterday, a point Deputy St Pier picked up on, you can make any system work with the right leadership, management, financial resources, building resources and will. The snag, of course, with the so-called Oxbridge files is it is reflective of a particular kind of mindset, and in this world, success, the Olympic or gold medal or silver medal, is defined as that of going to the people who go to the best universities, the Russel Group universities, and especially perhaps Oxbridge.

Who was it that said earlier that Oxbridge has a marvellous reputation although it is very much in elderly buildings. But that is only one definition of success. If you go back into the history of Elizabeth College, for example, you will see that in the 1920s and 1930s, many students went into the armed forces, others got scholarships to Jesus College and other Oxbridge colleges and they did well, some of them of course became teachers. But that was in a different era, and we have seen perhaps in the era of Sir John Major and Tony Blair and others, a move to get a higher proportion of people into university. I think that philosophy has perhaps led in Guernsey to a certain amount of emulation, and some of the criticism Education, Support & Culture have received has undeniably come from very successful teachers and tutors in schools of an 11-18 nature, in particular the survivors from the Grammar School.

But that is only one definition of success. It is like we use a lot of words, 'care' being one of them, 'carers', and 'skills' being another, which are not very precise because they mean different things to different people. Skills for some people would be academic skills, whereby they get the best prizes at the best universities, for others it would be vocational skills and practical skills. Sometimes when I hear various pundits saying 'We need a skills revolution in Guernsey', I think, 'What are you talking about, really?' Are you meaning entrepreneurial skills to power the next wave of Specsavers or do you mean artisan skills, hospitality skills, people skills?

And I would say, looking back at the past 30 years of Guernsey's education, we have actually seen significant improvement in our academic performance. We see the results improving in terms of the schools for GCSEs from the bad period of 10, 12 years ago, we almost certainly have more people going to university, we have seen incredible success of the Sixth Form College, but we have not necessarily seen that in other areas of our economy or society.

What was the justification for the change of the 11-plus? There are a number of factors – I will not go into all of them – but one was that although Guernsey was doing extremely well with the top quarter, the upper quarter of our society, or even the upper half, it appeared on the

evidence to be failing even compared to English counties, possibly some UK inner city areas, the less fortunate parts of our society. That is really one of the major reasons why change is needed.

Now, I have a certain attachment to the view that the 11-18 school is a very good model for instilling discipline, I was not a prefect, but leadership and improved academic performance, and I would say that a lot of people would like to see that as an option for people who are non-paying. Maybe one day the States may even go down the route of supporting bursaries to 11-18 schools that still exist. That is controversial, but I will argue that the 11-plus failed because it was no longer offering a level of social mobility it needed to and had become possibly tainted by relative privilege, people getting the 11-plus who came from affluent backgrounds, tutors. But that debate is over now and we have moved on.

So where do we go from here? What we want is the best possible education within our resources. I am frustrated there is not really a debate about choice, there is not really a debate about freeing up catchment areas, about difference, about specialisation, but that has not quite come from the community. We still have not really have local management in schools or that kind of independent leadership that it needs, and as Deputy Le Tocq and many other Members have said, 'If you have a quarter or a third of the Island where the children go to excellent independent schools, that takes out a proportion from the community in pushing for that'.

I do applaud the independent schools for their get up and go. I noticed Elizabeth College has gone co-educational this week, and they have even put a label on the traditional toilets like 'Ladies' now. They have done that. It would probably take a lot longer in some branches of our public sector. And another school that I am quite impressed with in a way is Blanchelande College. It has less than 400 pupils, its fees, at last, looking around the £11,000-£12,000 mark which appears to be our per capita cost of educating people in the States' secondary, and it has reintroduced a sixth form curriculum.

Now I know all of the theories we get told from educationalists and UK consultants and all kinds of people. It is far too small to have excellence; it should not do ... and yet nearly a third of the pupils according to our own figures have special needs and it is quite a diverse school in its way. So it is small, it is value for money, and it has reintroduced a sixth form and got 100% pass rate A-C at GCSE. Of course it is not totally representative of society, it is a different demographic, as Deputy Aldwell would remind us to a point, and it has a religious foundation, but my argument is there is room for diversity and for thinking differently.

So where am I with this? I said 20 years ago the current proposals are not a million miles away from them. I was a Member briefly, and pleased to be, of the Committee Constable Paul Le Pelly headed and it was interesting that many of the Members from that committee who came out of it have actually survived into this Assembly: Deputy Dudley-Owen as the President of the new Education, Sport & Culture, Deputy Queripel, Deputy Inder and Deputy Leadbeater, and so on – and Deputy de Lisle – are still very much around.

They put across their vision. I was impressed by elements of it. I knew we had to continue with the music side of it. The Sixth Form Centre is a hard judgement call because, yes, there are advantages to 11-18 schools but the Sixth Form Centre is like a jewel in our crown and is certainly worth supporting as a concept regardless of its location and one may say that the last time I did in fact stay with the Committee, because I thought that if we went down the two-school model despite its diversity of curriculum and marginal cost-savings in terms of executive teacher roles, it would not be popular with the community, it would have numerous problems and so it did.

Now I have given a degree of support to many of these amendments. We have thrashed out a big debate. We have listened to the arguments, everybody has had a fair opportunity to listen and to contribute. But I think the worst outcome of today would be to go home with nothing, to not actually have anything to work forward with. And therefore, although I would argue that there are disadvantages ranging from the closure of the Mare de Carteret to the loss, at least for the moment, of an 11-18 school on the same complex, I will support the Education, Sport & Culture policies and get them onto the next stage.

Although I have a question as to why we have to move the Sixth Form Centre to Les Ozouets, at least its infrastructural investment and its investment in education will create parity of esteem. And going back to my earlier point, I think Guernsey has virtually nailed it in terms of high-level academic performance and we have seen, again, really commendable results from the Sixth Form Centre and the schools recently in the examination season in very difficult times. But we are not quite getting there with supporting all of our local population and the schools. I mean we have a situation where we are not training local people in hospitality, we have to import building workers, we are not perhaps, despite the good efforts of the Digital Greenhouse, quite there with digital skills, we definitely need more people in nursing and caring. Therefore, to be controversial, much as I support the zeitgeist of coming generations and know we need more people in sports and arts and that is where younger people want to go, and there is an argument younger people are not being represented in this Assembly.

To a certain extent, a lot of younger people just love to be musicians, or actors, or artists, or sportsmen, or coaches or life coaches, and I think they should be given every support to do that, but our economy and our society need other people as well. If we are sending hundreds of people each year to universities to do subjects which might take them out of the Island for some time, yes, I think we should contribute to the world but we need to balance that with a stronger face for on-Island vocational schools-based education. That is not to save money, but it is just to give people a better choice of career and a better chance, maybe, of affording house prices.

And so if Deputy Dudley-Owen and her committee continue with the work that we need to really strengthen the skills side of the Guernsey Institute and have an equality and maybe a mix and match, not necessarily at one institution, but so that any student of whatever age can mix academic Baccalaureate and vocational skills, I think that that is a vision worth following. And so as all the other options really have not gone anywhere, I think we should now get behind the Education, Support & Culture's vision and not continue to open up this debate for another term or two.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Lisle.

Deputy de Lisle: Thank you, sir.

Following up from Deputy Gollop there on the vocational side, I think this is where our secondary schools have performed quite well in the past. They have given that opportunity both to push individuals forward academically but also they have been able to provide for that important area of trade and expertise that we desperately need in our community locally.

The problems with the option presented though by the current Committee of Education, Sport & Culture are the closure of the Mare de Carteret and relocation of the Sixth Form Centre to an already restricted site intended to accommodate the Guernsey Institute on the former St Peter Port Secondary School site. The proposals will require larger classes in the 11-16 schools and at sixth form level the pupil-teacher ratio will rise and that is an overall concern of the teaching community.

Aspirations for new sporting and art facilities will be reduced, and that is another concern within really the whole programme presented by Education, Sports & Culture that there is really not sufficient drive, I think, in that particular area to meet a number of the desires of our young people. So I believe that the great majority of stakeholders desire a three-school model with a separate Sixth Form Centre and retention of the Guernsey Institute, and there is no need to build another Sixth Form Centre when we already have a successful centre at Les Varendes, the Grammar School, with room for expansion there.

As a former teacher and lecturer in schools and universities, I have argued against closure of local schools consistently over my 17 years as a Deputy and the current new vision for secondary education would, I believe, threaten teachers, pupils and parents at the Mare de Carteret with closure, a successful Guernsey secondary school that has raised its standards and has had an

impact on the community as a whole in education and serves as a guideline, if you like, in terms of what is possible in future in upgrading education on the Island.

2355 I question also, sir, the whole problem of stability within the education system as we go forward. In fact, I am concerned within stability with the Education, Sport & Culture's option and the effect on investment and confidence in the economy of the Island. Together with competition, which with the private schools with far higher class sizes, I think these are major issues.

2360 I question also whether the support for a pause and review that so many people welcomed meant the closure of the Mare de Carteret secondary school, meant larger class sizes in the future and also relocation of the Sixth Form Centre onto the former congested St Peter Port's secondary school site with the institute being relocated there.

2365 I do not think that was seen by the public, and as a result the public are going to continually feel that they have been misguided, and that is unfortunate. Better, sir, to support a three-school model with three 11-16 schools with La Mare de Carteret rebuilt, as repeatedly promised over 20 years by former education committees, a single Sixth Form Centre at Les Varendes, the current Grammar School site with plenty of room for expansion. Could take some of the technical courses as well from an overflowing site at the former St Peter Port School, and of course retention of the Guernsey Institute as proposed in February 2020 at the time of the pause and review requête.

2370 I have concerns, then, that we are going through or going to go through instability in education and not stability, and it is stability really that we require at the current time in order to move through this period of uncertainty economically and this period of uncertainty with the current pandemic. So I think that we have to look very closely particularly at the public system and see to it that it is actually competitive with the private schools, and certainly from what I can see, it is going in the wrong direction with higher class sizes and also the impact on investment and confidence generally might be thwarted with this particular movement and the cost of its development.

2380 Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Aldwell.

Deputy Aldwell: Thank you, sir.

2385 I do not believe any Member of this Education, Sport & Culture Committee could have envisaged the journey we would have taken over the past 11 months when we were elected into the post on 21st October. It has been an incredible journey into a complex world of education from the first 1,001 days to infants, primary, secondary, post-16 all the way through to life-long learning, threading through all of these areas are the special educational needs which affect 25% of our learners. Reading many hours of the *Hansard* reports and education debates over the past

2390 20 years, we needed to understand the past to be able to move forward into a non-selective era. Coming out of the challenges of COVID, we needed to find the best solution to future-proof our education system for our small community of Guernsey and Alderney, giving our young people the skills to achieve a fulfilling career and in so doing, boosting our economy. Our strategy certainly was not designed by the Committee sat around the table alone, but with a whole team of educational specialists under our Educational Strategic Advisor, Laurie Baker, over many months.

2395 We took on-board all the information we received from the surveys, from staff in 2020, and we visited all the sites for three hours each to understand the estate. We learnt to challenge on what was and what was not possible using the information we had gained from the staff surveys. From 40 possible permutations, we challenged and concluded that we could not stay in the past, but we needed to look into the future, for what this Island would need to take us into the future: three 11-16 secondary schools – St Sampsons, Les Beaucamps and Les Varendes, with a sixth

2400

form co-located at Les Ozouets campus with the Institute bringing all post-16 students together, including Alderney.

Whether they were studying A-level, IB or vocational or professional, they are, as young adults, all equal studying on the same campus together, building self-esteem in whatever pathways they chose, promoting inclusion and stopping segregation. With possible 20 engagements presentations under our belt, we have not shied away from meeting with the stakeholders. We knew it was going to be extremely difficult for the schools most affected, La Mare de Carteret and Les Varendes, and it was quite understandable that they would have concerns with La Mare de Carteret's proposed closure and the Sixth Form moving to a different site alongside the campus of Les Ozouets.

Our model has been worked up for proof of concept. Three schools with roughly the same amount of students, space with room to grow without building extensions, feeder primary schools fitted comfortably, timetabling across the estate possible, space for the Youth Commission, music service and SHARE. Alderney students could all study together at Les Ozouets campus.

The facts that we knew when we started this journey have not changed. We are not going to please everybody. We have a non-selective education; inclusion not segregation was imperative. We need to build the economy, we need to invest in our young people, we need to address skills for the future. We cannot stand still. We must be prepared to look over the mountain. Education is evolving. Will we be using A-levels from 1951 and GCSEs from 1988 in 10 years, or will we be under a different direction to go down more IB routes, as Europe do? Exams with a wider breadth, as the UK education lists are predicting. We must be prepared for change.

A quote from the editorial in *The Times on Sunday* on Sunday 4th July 2021 which is poignant:

The labour shortages are happening. It says something about our reliance on the EU workers before Brexit. We preened ourselves thinking we only needed to do after Brexit was attract those top of the talent tree, but this country is hugely dependent on foreigners to be everything from the humble fruit-picker and vegetable picker to the kitchen staff and waiters and NHS professionals. It says a lot about the bias against vocational education and training, and the failure of successive governments to tackle it. We have failed to train enough people over the many years or persuade them that not everybody has to pursue the academic route. That needs to change quickly. The pandemic has thrown up many challenges, but also a fair share of clichés. One of those is 'build back better'. It is hard to have much faith in that when a country we lack people to do the jobs that the economy needs to thrive. July 19th will be freedom day for many. It should be then when we start to think about the kind of country we want to be, and how best to educate and train our future generations of the labour force.

July 1st was freedom day in Guernsey. We are no different from the UK. We need to build back better. We need to invest in our students and it is fair to say the bias against vocational education and training and the failure of successive governments to tackle it can be said of Guernsey.

Post-war, the younger generation of the 1960s felt everything was about to change, and anything was possible. In a recent interview with Roger Daltrey, he spoke about coming out of a world of austerity and rationing. Really, they felt that there was a change on the horizon. They could make it happen, which was the inspiration for the words of the song he wrote for The Who in 1967, 'I can see for miles and miles'.

I hope, like this Education Committee –

Deputy Queripel: Sir, point of correction. (*Laughter*).

The Bailiff: Point of correction, Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Sir, Roger Daltrey did not write that song. (*Laughter*).

Deputy Aldwell: He sang it.

Deputy Queripel: Pete Townshend wrote that song.

The Bailiff: Well, there you are.
Deputy Aldwell, you stand corrected.

2450

Deputy Aldwell: I do stand corrected but he did sing it. Thank you sir, thank you.

But he also said (*Laughter*), yes he also said it was the inspiration for the words of the song that his band member wrote for The Who in 1967 'I can see for miles and miles' and I hope, like this Education Committee, this Assembly can see for miles and miles and are not going to stay locked in the past.

2455

Sir, we need to look over the mountain. We cannot stay the same. We cannot do minimum. Minimum achieves nothing, but still costs an awful lot of money. The world has changed, we must invest in our young people, give them the skills to achieve in life. Every young person needs to know that they are valued. We must build back self-esteem and no longer segregate at 16. We need to build back better for the future of our Island's economy. We need to give the Island the workforce which will allow it to thrive.

2460

We have a new Director of Education ready to take up our proposals. He is highly respected among the teaching staff. I would like you all have faith in our new leadership. Please support our policy letter. Thank you.

2465

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Bailiff: Deputy Dyke.

2470

Deputy Dyke: Thank you, sir.

I was delighted to hear from Deputy Gollop that he is a *Spectator* reader, that probably accounts for agreeing on our analysis of a number of things and it will appear that we now seem to agree on something today. I would recommend the magazine to everyone else in the assembly. You would love Rod Liddle.

2475

I came to this debate, after the Election when we first started thinking about it, very upset and depressed that we were coming into this having lost the Grammar School, and I took the view that 'Oh, well, it will just be making the best of a bad job that has been created'. But as we have gone along and as I have listened to the impressive Members of the Education Committee, Deputy Dudley-Owen and her colleagues, I have become slightly more optimistic and indeed very optimistic that part of the vision that she and they have for this current project will actually, or could actually if it is done properly, which I hope it will be, lead to actual excellence.

2480

The co-location, I think, of the Sixth Form and the Guernsey Institute is actually a very good idea. It is not the best of the bad job type of idea, and I think it could create something actually very good for the Island and our young people. We are desperately in need of good local options here and in particular, not only academic options at the sixth form, but more vocational options. I understand that there are shortages of places for various vocational schemes which hopefully will be rectified when we get the new Guernsey Institute going. More options on the Island are becoming increasingly necessary in my view as the option of going to UK universities, and I think Deputy Gollop made the point, that is not the only definition of success. It really is not.

2485

Indeed, as the years have gone by, in my view sadly, a lot of the UK university courses are actually useless and if not worse than useless. So if we can produce something here that is excellent, and I believe that that is what Deputy Dudley-Owen has in mind, then we should do so and, as I say, there seem to be shortages of places already in vocational courses, so we should press on with it as soon as we can.

2490

There was one side issue I was going to mention quickly. Over the summer again, there has been this narrative of, 'Oh, we are spending £40 million to move the sixth form college 500 metres down the road'. Well, that is not a good narrative. It is not correct. That is not what is proposed. A project is proposed for the co-location of a site, and also it is not costing £40 million.

2495

If it is not done, it would appear from the figures we have from the Committee that the costs of amending the Les Varendes and the other schools will come to roughly the same amount, and hopefully it will all be less than that, but we will see.

So voting against on cost grounds, which I would be capable of doing if I thought there was a lot of wasted money, there is not a lot of wasted money. This is a good project. So on balance I think we should all vote to allow the Education Committee to press on and we have noted Deputy Dudley-Owen has promised to keep us posted and listen to us as we go along. So I think she cannot do any better than that.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Parkinson.

Deputy Parkinson: Thank you, sir.

Well first of all, some people regard it as controversial it seems that I should express any views at all on the subject of States' education in Guernsey given that I did not go to a state school, and like the parents of 30% of the Island's children, I elected to send my children to private schools. I completely reject that insinuation, which has sometimes come from Deputy Ferbrache amongst others.

I am not simply a taxpayer and therefore on the hook for some of this expenditure. I am elected by the people of the Island to represent their interests and it is my job to ensure that they get good value for money and that their children, if they are in the state sector, get the best possible education that Guernsey can provide, so I make no apology at all for speaking on this subject. I want the States-provided education service to be as good as it possibly can be. Obviously, the Island's future and prosperity depends on a well-educated workforce and we do not educate people simply because of the economic potential that they then may have when they have passed their exams – we educate them because educating people is a good thing to do.

I share Deputy Aldwell's aspiration that the new system, whatever it turns out to be, will achieve great things, and so I want the Island to be ambitious and to aim for the highest standards. Like Roger Daltrey and Pete Townshend, she wants to be able to see for miles and miles and so do I, but unfortunately both of those gentlemen supported Brexit so I think they possibly should have gone to Specsavers. *(Laughter)*

Now, I also share her view that the Island needs to invest more in vocational training and that the esteem in which vocational courses are held should be upgraded as far as possible. On the other hand, I am concerned by some of the rhetoric we have heard over recent weeks and months that that may be achieved at the expense of academic excellence in the Sixth Form Centre, and I am not persuaded at this point that co-locating the Sixth Form Centre with the Guernsey Institute will be likely to lead to improve standards.

I remain to be persuaded that staffing the Sixth Form Centre as a standalone college is something that is practical and workable. The reality is it would be very small and it seems to me if it offers anything like a reasonable range of A-level subjects that the tutors, teachers will either be many of them working part-time or that they will be teaching outside their specialist subject areas to fill their time available. One of the reasons why I strongly support the 11-18 model of education is precisely because it enables the school management to obtain best value from their subject specialist teachers by offering the opportunity to teach at GCSE level as well as at A-level. I think clearly these proposals are going to go through, but I think this is a signal and possibly a very sad day for Guernsey because this signals the end of 11-18 education in the state sector on this Island. I have no doubt in my mind that 11-18 schools from an academic perspective as well as from a social and school community perspective provide the best learning environment. Consequently, inevitably, the move away from 11-18 schools, in my opinion, will inevitably be achieved at the detriment to academic standards.

2550 Now I am not a qualified teacher, I do not have any PhDs in education or similar knowledge. I have no specialist skills in this area. My qualifications for speaking about academic standards are simply that I have had a lot of education myself (*Laughter*) and have basically gone through the system at a high level. So I do not speak with the benefit of any expertise on the subjects of how you would go about the best possible academic standards. It is simply my belief having
2555 studied a certain amount over the many years we have been debating these topics that the 11-18 school environment would produce better results.

It follows that I will find it very hard, in fact I will have to, oppose Proposition 1 because I fundamentally disagree with the concept of three 11-16 schools and a standalone sixth form college. I just feel in my bones and all the evidence that I have seen convinces me that that will
2560 result in a deterioration in the academic standards achieved in the Guernsey state school sector. That, I think, will be a very sad day for Guernsey. Unfortunately, the die, it appears, is now cast. That is the direction of travel. I think we are heading in the wrong direction. I remain convinced that it would have been possible to structure non-selective education in the state sector around 11-18 schools and I have already rehearsed my views in the Assembly that the practical
2565 difficulties of doing that, while certainly real, are by no means insurmountable, and I think we should have had a good go at trying to devise a system that would solve those problems before we chucked out what was – what is – fundamentally the best model for secondary education.

So I am not going to be able to support Proposition 1 and the other propositions essentially just follow on from that. I will vote against Proposition 1, secure in the knowledge that it is going
2570 to win, but really as much as anything else just to signal the fact that I do not agree with the direction of travel and if, as I fear, academic standards in the Guernsey state system do decline, I will be able to say, and there will be little comfort to me, that I was not responsible for that deterioration.

So there we are, I rest my case. As I say, I think the die is cast, I do not think anybody is going
2575 to change their votes as a result of anything I might say but I have to make a stand on principle that I am absolutely convinced that this is a step in the wrong direction.

The Bailiff: Deputy Murray.

2580 **Deputy Murray:** Thank you, sir.

[Inaudible partly due to no microphone] over not just the last three months but over decades. It is the subject of education's *[inaudible]*. We cannot satisfy the stakeholders' aspirations and will never, ever *[inaudible]* without *[inaudible]* for the Island's needs. We have *[inaudible]* the
2585 concept of education. That has always been the missing link in all these events, always. We argue back and forwards about the outcomes, class sizes, teacher ratios and heaven knows what. We conveniently forget why we provide education at all in this Island, though I suggest, and my Committee, especially the President would suggest, that it is to provide young people with the skills and the abilities to participate fully in the economy in the future, to be able to feel like valued contributors and to feel as equal as everyone else. Education is part of our Island's eco-
2590 system. It does not function in isolation, and we must stop debating it as if it did. That is the approach we have adopted to deliver an education which will secure our Island's future as well as the students that pass through it, and I would ask you to please support the proposals.

The Bailiff: Deputy Ferbrache.

2595 **Deputy Ferbrache:** Sir, to carry on the musical theme that Deputy Aldwell introduced, education has had to travel a long and winding road and wouldn't it be nice if we could build a bridge over troubled waters? I think that is probably a little optimistic in relation to where we are in connection with this debate.

2600 Now Deputy Parkinson quite correctly summed up my view of, and I will come to that in due course as to his views about what I said about people who educate their children privately in

relation to matters and then take away the rights of others; and I take no apology for that at all. Now of course, he has the absolute right to express his views and he has expressed them eloquently and well, he is an intelligent person and speaks very ably. Of course, I think I may have got it wrong. I think there are four people in here who are not parents, so what? They have got the absolute right to express their views. There is no hypocrisy in that at all and whether they become fathers or whatever in due course that is a matter for them, and probably the ladies that they participate with.

But in relation to that, that is not the point of this debate. Frankly, I am angry. I am angry at the abuse that Deputy Dudley-Owen and some of her team have had to suffer over the past six or eight months. It is despicable. It is despicable. We have got a character who used to be a States' Member, who I now – I get mental images in my mind, that is the only way I can think I am afraid, and I regard that person as a tall man's John Bercow because he has moved from one end of this political spectrum to the other. I do not mind people being criticised, and I have broad shoulders and people criticise me a lot and if you punch me, I punch you back, or I try to and even if you get two punches at least I will get one in.

But in relation to that, for him in his regular three or four weekly columns to vilify the good efforts of Deputy Dudley-Owen is despicable because it goes beyond criticism, it goes beyond sardonic wit, it goes into bias and bile. She does not deserve that. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) There are other people he turned his sword on, Deputy Meerveld who Deputy Trott, in my view and in my opinion, made an injudicious and improper remark. Whether it breaches the Rules or not, I do not give a cow's fig, but it is something he should not have said. Absolute disgrace. He should actually reprimand himself because he has an ego as such that he will not reprimand himself. But in relation to that, he also turns his bile on Deputy Inder who also has broad shoulders. And Deputy Taylor has come into that sphere in the last couple of times, he is not one of the favoured few.

Even I have been criticised, what a surprise. Even I have been criticised. I do not mind being criticised. But what people with considerable political experience in – Deputy Roffey, Deputy Gollop, Deputy St Pier, Deputy Parkinson the day before – they took down an education system without any idea as to what they were going to put in its place. That has caused devastation to the lives of so many people. It has disadvantaged so many people. Instead of saying, 'We come together with a blueprint, we do not like selection, we think this is a better model, we have researched it, this is the way we will take it through, these are our ideas', they have destroyed the Walls of Jericho without any idea of how they were going to rebuild them. An absolute disgrace.

Now I fully accept – and as I said, when I took it the 11-plus, there were still gas lamps in the street, they were. There were not quite horses on the road – well not very many anyway – but it was a long time ago. And if you were a child that did not 'pass' the 11-plus and go into one of the colleges or the, then, two grammar schools, you went to a secondary school. And though there were very many able secondary school teachers, Deputy Queripel has referred in the past to a teacher who had great influence upon his life in relation to that, and there were many. There were many. You were generally almost canon fodder because there was nothing for you. There was no college for further education, there was nothing for you.

One of my very good friends is a man called Ron Le Cras, may be known to some of you. And Ron Le Cras said when he went to Beaucamps School there was one – and she happened to be a female – only one person who had one O-level. And he said, 'We thought she was a genius and we thought she was posh because she had a double-barrelled name'. Now in relation to that, that is what the kids of that generation, my generation, were cast if you did not 'pass' the 11-plus. That is what they were left with.

Now the situation moved on, because when I took the 11-plus every single child that past it was in working class. I know people do not like that phrase, but they were a working class child. They came from a humble background. That transformed over time because the posh people, the elitists, sent their children to – as they had every right so to do – they sent their children to

the state school, they tutored them, they gave them considerable advantage, and there is nothing wrong with that because we are parents. We must do the best for our children. In a parental relationship, we are the volunteers, your kids are the conscripts. They have got no option. You have got to do the best for your children. So I do not criticise them, but it distorted the system. It completely distorted the system.

When I took the 11-plus, in 1962 because I am very old, when I took the 11-plus at Amherst School with over 40 kids in a class, seven boys went to Elizabeth College, 11 girls went to Ladies College and my good friend Judy Beaugard who was a year younger than me who was also a States' Member, said the year she went there were 15 girls who went to Ladies College. Just about everybody of that 40-plus kids in the 'top class', Mr Whitmore's class, went to one of either the grammar schools or the colleges. Some from the B class, even one from the C class at Amherst in those days. By the time my sister's daughter who was brought up in a States' house at La Vrangue, by the time 30 odd years later she took the 11-plus at Amherst, she passed and went to Ladies College, she was the only one. The system had been completely distorted over that period of time. Bright girl, she went to Durham University which is actually a very good university.

But that is why the system was distorted. It should have been remedied, it should have been rectified, it should have been amended. Instead, Deputy Roffey, Deputy Gollop, Deputy St Pier and Deputy Parkinson amongst others destroyed it. Absolutely destroyed it. A complete and absolute disgrace. So what we have had, we have gone through – and Deputy Trott and I, we actually like each other really, I know we joust but he and I came the same journey until recently, and I do not mean any criticism of him – but we came the same journey, we wanted to keep the selection, we failed. I voted for two schools, I cannot remember if he voted for two schools. I did; no, he did not, I accept that. But we then went down the pause and review.

Now, the pause and review, and I voted for and it only passed by one vote. It would not have passed if Deputy Parkinson had not abstained from that vote, I think it was 18-17 and one abstention, I cannot remember the exact votes but it was a close vote. The idea of that was on reflection to see what we could do, to see if we could pause and we could review. But the overwhelming – and we have all talked about how we represent the people – the overwhelming view of the public of Guernsey, it is not 100%, but it is probably 70% or 80%, it might even be higher, is that the two-school model did not suit this Island. We did not want two big comprehensives, however many good O-levels, A-levels or GCSEs of 1988 or whatever it was, Deputy Aldwell said. Whatever it was, we did not want that. We wanted something that was different.

Now I do not think it is perfect. I am not holding my nose when I approve it. I do not think it is perfect, but I think it is a good model that has been brought from Education. I have worked with Deputy Dudley-Owen over the last five or so years now, we were in Economic Development together and we have kept a close relationship. We are the supposed Van Party. We are actually not the only party, we are not the disintegrated party led by Deputy St Pier. I suppose it might re-emerge as the 'I am the Messiah Party', I do not know, (*Laughter*) or the 'Sour Grapes Party', or 'I am always right' party. I do not know what it will be called, we will find out in the due passage of time.

But in relation to all of that, we work closely together on that with Deputy Prow and Deputy Inder because we share common views. Not exact views, we have not voted almost as consistently as Deputy 'Kazantseva-Miller', Deputy Bury, Deputy Burford, Deputy de Sausmarez and the others that were listed by Deputy Inder. If I say something, it will be voted against. If Deputy Dudley-Owen says something, it will be voted against. They do not want us to progress as we should do.

So I am angry. I am angry as a parent, albeit all my kids are grown up. I am angry as a grandparent, albeit I have still got kids in the system. I am angry for my grandchildren. I am angry for the people of Guernsey that States' Assembly after States' Assembly has messed up. This is the time to grasp the nettle. This is the time to start. It will not be perfect because school

buildings are important, technology is important. Teachers are very important and we have got a bundle of very good teachers; I have no doubt we can get other good teachers. Deputy Aldwell hit the nail on the head really with a point about A-levels 1951 and 1952, whatever it was, GCSEs since 1988. The system will change, I would like to see it change because the English school system, the English education system which used to be probably the best in the world is crumbling. It is almost itself not fit for purpose.

Look what they did in Scotland where they had a wonderful education system. They brought the ideology (**Several Members:** Yes.) and they brought in [*inaudible*] and the system is rubbish. (**Several Members:** Yes.) Leave it to people like Deputy Dudley-Owen, you could not get a more conscientious person more interested in education, and her able team (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) to bring the matter forward.

When I read the policy letter – I have read it, as I am sure everybody has, on several occasions – the paragraph that smacked me in the face was paragraph 1.17 which said:

1.17 The Committee's proposals for future post 16 provision are to create a brand new campus for all post 16 education, providing a learning environment with bespoke, high quality facilities for both further and higher education. This will ensure that academic and vocational pathways are considered as equally valid choices for the island's young people, removing some of the existing and in some quarters, historically negative perceptions around entry into technical and vocational careers. The Post 16 Campus will act as a flagship centre of ambition and aspiration for all learners progressing from the 11-16 schools. All students will have the opportunity to graduate to the new campus, irrespective of their choices at post 16 and will join a mature, adult learning environment which will prepare them for their next steps in education or work.

Exam results are important, they always will be important. Anybody who wants to get into Chambers in England, anybody who wants to get into a good medical school, anybody who wants to get into a good teacher's training environment has to have good academic results. You can say what you like, they have got to have it.

Let us have a look at the businesses that I have got an interest in. We have not been able to open one of our businesses at all this summer because we cannot get any staff. The other businesses, we have had to work on curtailed days, curtailed hours. We cannot get staff. We need to tell people, and I have always believed it, that if you are a vocational person you are just as valuable as Deputy Dyke who is a very able lawyer, you are more valuable than Deputy Ferbrache who is not such an able lawyer, you might even be as valuable as our acrobatic pilot, Deputy Trott. Although I doubt that, certainly not in his own estimation!

But in relation to that, we need people with all abilities. We have got 30%, I think it is – if I have the percentage wrong somebody will correct me – of parents paying for their children to go into education and they are not all affluent people. I was driving up the road the other day, I am not going to say which road, and I saw from a very humble house two kids come out with their mum and dad, they were going to private schools. It must have been a massive financial sacrifice for those parents to put their kids through private school but they did that because they believed that was best for their kids.

So, we have to have a society where we value everybody. We have got a high percentage, and Deputy Aldwell talked about that, of children with special needs. They are valuable in our community. They are our citizens. They are the ones that we have got to protect. They are the ones who we have to foster. We have got to have an all-embracing education system. We cannot have more delay. Action this day – I know I have been criticised many times in relation to that and I make no apology for saying it – action this day, approve the proposals.

The Bailiff: Deputy Queripel.

Deputy Queripel: Sir, thank you.

I am afraid I cannot support these proposals. As I said in an earlier speech, I was very much in favour of a review and I am disappointed we did not get to debate amendment 4. I am now at the stage where I am wondering what our children and their parents actually want, as well as

our teachers, and I say that because the majority of them did not want, as Deputy Ferbrache just alluded to, a one-school across two-site model as was once proposed by our previous ESC Committee. They were so opposed to it, in fact, that approximately 2,500 of them marched in support of a pause and review.

2755 Now we are told that the majority of teachers do not want the three-site model with a separate sixth form, so the whole thing has become an absolute nonsense which is why I would have supported the review amendment. As regards what the children actually want, I do not recall them ever being asked, but I stand to be corrected on that one. I would like to hear a comment from one of the members of ESC on that because I was one of the seven signatories
2760 on the pause and review requête and I was, like many, extremely disappointed. The review, I was led to believe, was going to take place and be a comprehensive review to naturally take place. So we are now where we really should not be in the eyes of many, not just me.

2765 The way I understand it is 87% of our teaching profession opposed ESC's proposals and I think we really need to be concerned about that. On that note, there was an article in the *Press* on 30th July headed 'Les Beaucamps teacher hopeful of a meaningful review before States' decision'. In that article the teacher said this:

The reason ESC have given for stopping the review was that the terms of reference were not appropriate, but why not just change the terms of reference instead of stopping the review

2770 The teacher went on to say that ESC had been careful not to use the word 'consultation' during this whole process, instead they used the word 'engagement'. This is because consultation is a two-way process whereas their engagement has simply been a case of presenting their preferred model to us and trying to reassure us that it is the best model. I would like to hear a response from a member of ESC on that issue at some stage please, sir, because as we all know there are two sides at least to every issue.

On the same page of that *Press* article readers are told that a group of teachers from the Grammar School said:

Recruiting teachers to work at the sixth form exclusively will be almost impossible.

2775 And added that in their view:

... there will be no improvement and student outcomes from ESC's unproven model and there is a very high risk that outcomes could be jeopardised.

They finished by saying that they back the idea of ESC carrying out the review that was promised and that it should be over a shorter time frame with new terms of reference.

2780 Which brings me onto, sir, there was a time when I supported ESC's model. But after giving the matter considerable amount of thought, the last few months the phrase that keeps springing up to my mind is, 'Take the public and those working within the profession with you on the journey'. It does not seem to me as though ESC have done that; and I might be wrong, I stand to be corrected on that.

2785 Now, we heard talk earlier on of hypocrites. Am I being a hypocrite? In the eyes of some maybe I am, but I do not see it that way. I see it as going away, giving the matter further thought, undertaking further research, talking to more people and reviewing my approach. Combined with the fact – and this is the big one – the pause and review was nothing like I was led to believe it was going to be, which is why I signed the requête in the first place. So that is extremely disappointing and concerns me greatly, but it did not happen in the way that I was told it was going to happen.

2790 Now there are often comments made in our community, and we hear it in this Chamber from some colleagues, 'Make a decision and stick to it.' So you make a decision and stick to it, even if it is the wrong one. But where is the rationale in that? Where is the sense in that? It makes no sense, but it is the people that say that who are the first people to criticise if the decision is made is the wrong decision in their eyes. Complete nonsense. I take no notice whatsoever of such

unbalanced, nonsensical comments like that. I refuse to be bullied by anybody, either in this Chamber or outside in the community. I have been elected to look at both sides of the argument and make a judgement call. I do that to the best of my ability.

Due to the issues I have highlighted and the concerns I have expressed, I am afraid I simply cannot support the proposals. If I have upset any of my colleagues by coming to that decision, then that is unfortunate. But as I said earlier, I am not at all concerned about upsetting colleagues; I would rather not but what I am really concerned about is doing what I think is right for Guernsey. In saying that, I want to emphasise I am not criticising any of my colleagues, I have the utmost respect for every single one of them. We all do an extremely difficult job to the best of our ability, and even when I disagree with any of my colleagues I always respect their views. So in turn, sir, through the Chair, I ask them to respect mine.

Surely it is better to agree to disagree than hold a grudge against a colleague for saying something or voting in a way the other colleague really did not agree with, and in fact took issue with to such an extent that they did not even say hello to you anymore or even work with you anymore. That is totally unprofessional and is not the way we should be carrying out business in this Chamber and in the States as an Assembly. We should all be prepared to work with one another, regardless of things that have been said in the past or the way we voted in the past.

So on that note, I will leave it there and just repeat, I ask colleagues to respect my views, as they should respect everyone's views in this Assembly of course. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.)

Thank you, sir.

The Bailiff: Deputy Kazantseva-Miller.

Deputy Kazantseva-Miller: Thank you, sir, and thank you to Deputy Queripel because I actually share a lot of his feelings on this matter.

Like Deputy de Sausmarez, I actually now find it quite laughable that colleagues who are most vocal in criticising others for hypocrisy, party politics, personality politics and you name it, perhaps just need to look in the mirror at themselves. But if colleagues confuse intellectual curiosity and questioning, democratic scrutiny, value of having different points of view with some angry and grand conspiracies, to be honest that is their choice. But I will continue offering a different point of view and question when I think it is valuable and due part of our democratic process.

So what are we voting for today in summary? We are putting a nail in the coffin of an 11-18 education setting, confining this option only to those who can pay for private colleges and putting a nail in the coffin at the altar of the stated ambition of parity of esteem between academic and vocational skills. I have continuously asked for evidence to show that this is a problem on the Island, and the best I have received so far from the President of the Committee in July was 'Just trust us, it is out there. The evidence is out there'.

So let us talk more about skills. This proposal says based on the latest comparison that it aligns with the skills strategy which I am lucky to co-lead with Deputy Haskins. No skills strategy has been published and work is only in development. Skills strategy so far is agnostic to where the sixth form is located, or it is agnostic to a building we are building. But I will share with you some of the key areas that have been identified as part of this early development of this skills strategy. They include numeracy, literacy and digital inclusion, children and young people connected to the world of work, early career starters, lifelong career development, skills for longer working lives, digitisation across all sectors, expansion of remote, flexible and gig-employment, supply and demand forecasting for skills.

So could the Committee, in summing up, tell me which specific part of this developing skills strategy will be answered with co-location of the sixth form? It seems like there is confusion in this policy letter with the huge value of building a new and single campus as Les Ozouets for the Guernsey Institute that will be a seminal development for our Islands and ongoing lifelong development of skills with actually what the value of the sixth form is. And just on the subject of

the Guernsey Institute, I think the choices this Committee has been making in the past 11 months have been at the cost of delays to the Guernsey Institute. It was a project that was already approved and the capital vote opened at the last States' Assembly. So why hasn't construction of the Guernsey Institute begun? So there have been delays, there has been cost of the choices this Committee has made.

The other cost, to me, I think, the lunacy partly in this proposal are around the sixth form and removing co-location with another school. Deputy Leadbeater talked about the facts and figures and questioning that they were facts and figures, and I was looking at a couple of them and questioning them. For example, the need to provide facilities for the music centre were included at the cost of £5 million with all other proposals. However, I have looked at the policy paper on secondary education from 4th September 2019, paragraph 27.1 and that paragraph clearly says that actually, the cost of accommodating the music service centre has been taken as part of developing the Guernsey Institute. And I quote that paragraph:

In the event that it is not possible to base the Guernsey music services at Les Varendes, space will be provided for the service on the site of the Guernsey Institute. This has been taken into account in the range of capital cost provided for the development of the Guernsey Institute.

There we go, £5 million just gone, like that. That is excluding the optimism bias of 40%.

We talked about the optimism bias, and the Committee clearly said the side-by-side comparison is not a model that we can compare anything by but they have obviously gone ahead to continue and still compare all the models and use those arguments against all the other models provided. So by my estimation, the removal of co-location of the sixth form is about basically creating an additional £20 million cost that we do not need to be spending. So the basic Cameron model is about £20 million cheaper in my estimation; that is nearly half the price of the Committee's proposals.

Other small discrepancies, perhaps, in the side-by-side comparison and continual narrative on this model include staff travel. For example, the comparison says that the ESC model says that the Cameron model will include the same amount of travel as the ESC proposals. I simply cannot understand how that can be the case. If there is a sixth form centre located separately, that requires travel to three other schools with the Committee's model. With the Cameron proposal, there is one school and two other schools to which staff may travel, but perhaps those are little details in the big scheme of things nowadays.

We talked about that this is likely to be approved today. It is a transition stage to a tertiary college. Perhaps that is the way, and this is, again, this is something that has been proposed time and time again in the last 20 years so let us not talk about that this is some kind of revolutionary new thinking that is taking us away from 19th, 20th century and giving us a completely new model of education. It is not tertiary colleges and this kind of model of education is ... there is nothing innovative in that.

Having spoken to teachers in the Sixth Form Centre at the meeting in July, many of which other Deputies attended, the instinct when the tertiary college confirmation was surfaced at that meeting saying that this is something that can be happening within five years once the early transition has been completed, the immediate reaction of many teachers was, 'Well, I do not want to teach in a tertiary college'. So, this goes again to the core of problems we are likely to have with retaining and getting really good teachers to come to the Island.

So all of this, this model, ultimately comes with basic universal and sustained opposition. The percent of teachers disagreeing with the proposals was 87%. This is based on the survey that was conducted by teachers themselves and this is based on the number of teachers who have responded to the service. The Committee had jumped several times to their feet trying to correct this figure saying it was not 87% but something like 46%. I have challenged the Committee twice to provide a justification of what kind of figures they have used to arrive at this response. I never got the answer to this challenge.

2895 We have received dozens and dozens of letters and have seen letters published in *The Guernsey Press* as well. Out of all of them, there has only been letter – I repeat, *one* letter – in support of this model. Deputy Ferbrache took the time to read that letter out in July. If I took the time to read each of the letters opposing the proposals, we would be here obviously until next year. So what is the result? The teachers – and I have spoken to many – feel demoralised, they feel demotivated, they feel they have not been heard and it has been a one-way highway.

2900 So in talking about the process, Assembly after Assembly did the same thing. Magic up a model and argue for what its worth for the merits of it; 20 years on, you know the results. This approach has not worked, so the previous Assembly brought it on a different approach, conducting a like-for-like, open and transparent review. People marched for it, it was an election issue, people voted for Members in this Assembly based on that promise. The new Committee with a brush of a stroke got rid of this process, but they then engaged in exactly the same process trying to provide an express and rushed side-by-side comparison of models under consideration from amendments.

2910 The models proposed so far in the amendments at their core are largely in line with the models in the pause and review, as three 11-18 model and 11-18, 11-16 model and variations of 11-16 and a sixth form co-located or not co-located. So they failed to finalise the proper review and they conducted a rushed review that cannot be used as a basis for comparison, but they have criticised amendees for not having enough operational details on their amendments which they had always renounced as non-political issues. This is not a way to design a future education system and I cannot sign up to this unfounded, untested, un-evidenced experiment

2915 on the future of our children and the future of this Island.

The Bailiff: Deputy Le Tocq.

Deputy Le Tocq: Thank you, sir.

2920 I will be brief. I think the Assembly Members are aware of the concerns that I have over these Propositions and so I am not going to rehearse them again. Sir, I tried to be as far as possible an optimist, I try to look for the positive in things, to some degree a pragmatist in a positive way, I hope, and so I want to say why I will be supporting these Propositions as they stand.

2925 Sir, I think it is incumbent upon us as an Assembly, bearing in mind the direction of travel, to make these proposals ... give them the best chance of working. I think we can only do that through the methods that we have already done. We have expressed our concerns, those of us who have concerns about this. We have pointed out where there are weaknesses. Deputy Ferbrache himself said it is not perfect. No model is perfect, I would say that. But I say it primarily because I have been in this place before. So obviously in 2001 when I was on the then Education

2930 Council, our proposals were rejected by this Assembly and a different model, a different sort of education system was brought in as a result of that, and I was both disappointed and quite angry to begin with. Angry at the way in which it was done, and angry because of what I deemed was the lack of being thought through of the process.

2935 Now I give credit to the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture. They have not done this off the back of a postcard or a fag packet or whatever proverbial thing you want to think of, they have gone away and I think they genuinely believe in this. Now, I do think there will need to be some significant further steps that are taken, and I also do think that this Assembly and probably the Assembly that follows it will need to inject some significant amount of money to make this model work. But what I see of the positives in it ... well I think I will speak to two or three of those, sir.

2940

2945 I am not at all enamoured currently by the state of the university system in the UK particularly, and the move that I think occurred during the Blair government to endeavour to call certain types of education 'degree level academic education' and to try and have a target of 50% plus of students going to university I think was a big mistake indeed. And I think coupled with that, for us as a small jurisdiction many who seek academic qualifications and degree-level academic

qualifications and degrees and those sort of things and post-grad degrees, they do not return to Guernsey for obvious reasons probably, because there is a limited number of jobs here that actually require those sorts of things. And great, credit to them. But there are in this issue of the parity of esteem, I think we need to esteem more those jobs and those people that we do need here on Island (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and therefore, I am keen to see more emphasis on the sorts of training that can be done through apprenticeships and giving greater value, and I mean that in every sense of the word, to those that undertake that type of training.

And so I am hopeful. I want to be hopeful. I am speaking to myself as much as to anybody else that we could make this work. Make it work for Guernsey. And also, sir, as many know, I admire or I love France, and it is true to say that in France there are hardly any 11-18 schools. They separate into little blocks and different sections, people move from one to the other, and there are different types of establishment; that is true post-16 certainly. There would be vocational training and academic training. But often you also see a move towards amalgamating them and working together, and I do not actually see the French education system being any worse than the UK certainly; in some areas I think it is much better. In terms of some of the smaller towns and cities, I think it works very well indeed

Now there is a problem there, because we do not recruit from France. We recruit our teachers from the UK. So that needs to be overcome, and I have already alluded to that. But I think we need to swallow hard and accept that this is a direction we are going to go in. Let us make the best we can of it, and I think we can. But as I said, sir, I think this is not the last time we will come to this issue. There will need to be changes. There will need to be injections of cash and there will need to be some serious thinking about how we can produce the best quality education and skills training for the generation that we need particularly to take on the jobs that are coming here on Island and for the Bailiwick obviously as a whole.

But on that basis, sir, I wanted to explain why I will be voting Pour.

The Bailiff: Deputy Inder.

Deputy Inder: Thank you, sir.

I would like to thank Deputy Le Tocq for that speech because what he actually did say when he brought his three 11-18 amendment, he said he was going to test it and if it did not work, he would back Education, so I think we should all be grateful for his pragmatic response to the test and the loss of the amendment.

I tend to agree but I have always been behind this education model. Just a brief look at the skills gap in the UK, the struggle seems to be, well they are all over the place, certainly in the service sector, directors, secondary teaching, software, graphic design, chefs, cooks, nurses, social workers, mechanical engineers, welding and trades, and a lot of that can be applied to Guernsey. A brief look at, from my mind, maybe Deputy Roffey can interrupt me and remind me, we had a list of the skills of the current unemployed from back in July. There were no tradesmen on there, none at all. There were no carpenters, there were no welders. If you have skills, you will get a job. The one thing a boss cannot take away from you is your skills. He can take your job away from you, but he can never take your skills. Your skills are transferrable, and I genuinely think that is the future.

Just briefly looking at the upskilling of the Channel Islands' Workforce for a Digital World, this PwC report from July 2020. Admittedly, it is an open document. I do not know who pays for it, but it is free for people to read. It was talking about digital skills but it spoke about jobs at risk because of automation, 30%; cost of upskilling now rather than later, six times. Most disrupted sector, 27,000 jobs at risk with financial services being the sector most disrupted. Now whether that is true or not I am not entirely sure because I can be fairly positive. I think Guernsey is a lot better than changing all trust offers into robots, but I think the world is just changing.

The world has changed remarkably and so I think COVID, to be honest with you, has identified that even the loneliest KP is key to every single restaurant or hotel in Guernsey. But I have said

before, there is no such thing as unskilled labour and if you think there is such a thing as unskilled labour, when you tip the chef or the waiter, or pass the kitchen and tell the KP he is unskilled, then get your mates to do it again a day later and tell him he is unskilled, see how long he lasts and see how long your hotel, your restaurant stays open. Or if you think a taxi driver is unskilled? When you phone them up for your ten past five trip to the red eye at the Airport, tell him he is unskilled, see how many times he will turn up for you.

Labour is incredibly important, and labour and those who work with their hands and their minds and their heads and their hearts, they are key to absolutely everything. And this is where I think Education has actually got it right because it reflects the future. It has seen it coming, either by accident or by design or by circumstance, the fact that we do not have a Grammar system of education ... before, then if we remove the aspiration from one part of our education system then we are obliged to put the aspiration somewhere else. We really are. And I genuinely think that what they are doing here – admittedly they are a separate organisation – but the actual feel of Les Ozouets with a Sixth Form Centre, mixed up with the institute will be better for Guernsey.

Now if some of us, and I include myself in that, I will not mention selection ever again – which I said in my last speech, that I would never mention selection again and I did but that is where I am going to stop. And if we can all, probably myself included, be a little less irritated and a lot more conciliatory, we may be in a better place.

I am obviously aware of the Skills Strategy, and it is ably led by Deputy Kazantseva-Miller and Deputy Haskins whilst, through you, sir, Deputy Dudley-Owen I was thinking in terms of our Committee, and unfortunately I have not got it because I just closed it.

But effectively – excuse me, sorry. (**A Member:** Digital skills?) (*Laughter*) My digital skills are not as good as they were, and people are paying me for it! Anyway, I was going to make a very pertinent point and made a complete fool of myself as usual.

But anyway, in short it is worth saying Deputy Kazantseva-Miller did make reference to the skills which eventually will be a policy letter, it is that important, and I will remind Members that it is me that has driven that because I do think Skills Strategy is incredibly important and it is hooked in with education. Part of that is something I have described before – it recognises in part some of the skills cap that we have in Guernsey and it talks about educating people, it talks about upskilling people, but it will not be done in just a sixth form centre, it needs to be part of an institute. And I know it is only nuanced, and I know it sounds like £40 million too much for moving something 800 yards down the road, and I think in a different life I may well have agreed with that, but I have just moved on.

We have all seen what is happening in the market. Those people that you never recognise, you are seeing them now because your restaurants are closed. You cannot get your painters and your decorators. Those no-name electricians that turned up and fixed your lights, they are not coming anymore. That is where your problem is and that genuinely is where the future is. The technicians are going to dominate the world because they can show you, they are showing you now, if they are not there quietly getting on fixing everything, you do not have a society. Your economy fails. And that is where I genuinely believe Education have it right, and I hope after this we can all genuinely get behind it, but that is about as far as I am going to get with that.

I am going to thank Education for all the hard work they have done on it (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) because I genuinely think they are heading in the right direction. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Brouard.

Deputy Brouard: Thank you, sir, I will be very brief.

I think Deputy Inder has brought me to my feet. (**Deputy Inder:** Oh dear.) I hope Deputy Inder is right. I really genuinely do. And I hope that the Island has the skills that we are going to need, and I hope we get all the academic skills that we also need and that the results after many years of debate actually start to go up and we get some real genuinely high-class results which

3050 we should have for a community of our size and our affluence which we have not been getting. We need to raise the bar and I hope this does it.

3055 So, although I will not be able to vote for this, I hope genuinely that I am wrong and I am proved wrong, but I will wait to see. I will not vote for the proposals, but I do hope – generally I like to be right, I like to secretly think I am right, a bit like people with the scores and they follow the football, they like to score that they have ticked and they were right all along. I genuinely hope I am wrong, but I will not be able to vote for it. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Falla.

3060 **Deputy Falla:** Thank you, sir.

I was optimistic for this moment. My first education debate, an opportunity to honour my manifesto pledge. Let's get education done – not really good grammar, sorry! – (*Laughter*) and to deliver on the top issue on the 2020 Election doorsteps by putting an end to the yo-yoing on this issue and giving our young people, their teachers and their parents the best, thoroughly thought through solution to secondary and post-16 education.

3065 The first chink in my optimism was when ESC rescinded Deputy Dudley-Owen's sursis pledge to pause and review, which could have resulted in a well-argued, evidence-based compelling policy letter that would provide us with a clear way forward –

3070 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Point of correction, sir.

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

3075 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** I am very sorry to do this in the middle of the debate because I do have an opportunity to round up, but I just need to point this out right now.

The pause and review was not as a result of a sursis or the requête, it was a result of the then Deputy Fallaize policy letter which was subsequent to it.

3080 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Falla to continue, please.

3085 **Deputy Falla:** There followed Deputy Bury's unsuccessful Government Work Plan amendment. The chink in my optimism became a larger crack when the policy letter was published. We already knew that it would not contain the promised style of review, throwing various models against the abandoned two-school model. So what have we got? We have got a marketing document entreating us to buy into a concept that is incredibly light on detail. It talks about ambition, bravery, boldness and aspiration, a cultural game changer, a golden thread, and a perception. There is very little in the policy letter about how excellent education or excellent outcomes will be achieved and delivered.

3090 There is no operational detail, instead an invitation to support a collective ambition, and to trust that the Committee for ESC will fulfil its mandate. Perhaps paragraph 5.14 of the policy letter explains why when it says:

Previous models have unravelled at the point at which implications of operational detail became visible.

3095 But by not including this detail, are we just delaying that unravelling process? I have not been supporting detail because I think States' Members should get involved in how schools are run operationally, but it would help me to support these proposals if I knew that the key stakeholders were on board with the detail. I do not know that because the detail is yet to be defined.

We are being asked to agree to larger class sizes and less space, and there is only a passing mention of local management and better governance of schools. Now that is what I consider to be aspirational. Sir, I found only one mention of the grant-aided colleges in this policy letter in paragraph 4.9, and this has been a long-held concern of mine. Has anybody asked them what

they think? They are experts at producing results from mixed ability school, population and they are mixed abilities, including the students with special needs or needing special educational help and support. They make small sixth forms work. Can't we please look at education more holistically? Sir, this policy letter should have been informed by a pause and review as promised, by an Ofsted review and the timely updating of the 50-year old Education Law setting out the Island's philosophy for education.

What do 21st century students need, and what does the economy need? Then we could have set a proper course on which to confidently make a decision. I really genuinely respect my political colleagues on ESC and I would very much have liked to be able to wholeheartedly support them, but in the circumstances – and to be clear I speak and vote and always have as an independent Deputy – (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) it would be inconsistent, disingenuous and against my better judgement to support these proposals. Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Gabriel.

Deputy Gabriel: Thank you, sir.

I feel like the pair of jeans that are in a Levi's logo. For those of you that do not know it, the pair of jeans are being pulled apart by a pair of horses attached to the chains at the waist and at the ankles trying to destroy the jeans. I am pulled in two different directions. Yes, of course I want to aspire to greatness for our children, our future. I believe in them. Of course I want parity of esteem. But how can the cost of moving the Sixth Form Centre approximately 500 metres down the road, and at multimillions of pounds, be sensible or right or true?

Let us face it, if you owned a large property or large house, residential house, with a large mortgage on it and a conservatory, would you choose to change where your conservatory was and spend a huge amount of money moving the conservatory from one side of the house to another? I know I certainly would not. Co-location, yes it works at the moment at the Grammar School because it shares the site and it shares the same facilities and the same teaching staff. But is it going to work as Les Ozouets campus? I am not sure that it will.

Yes, I agree with Deputy Inder that we are still going to need plumbers, we are still going to need carpenters, joiners, and these people will fire our economy, but we are also going to need academics, people to code for us, people to do all sorts of things in the future that may not be on the market place yet. And of course, I pay tribute to Deputy Dudley-Owen and the rest of her Committee for the excellent work they have done in raising this policy letter and all the information that they have given us and their officers and responded to some of our questions.

For me, there are still a couple of unanswered issues about the Les Ozouets campus certainly, the staffing of the site and how that is going to work with only approximately 70% of the teachers being full-time, and again, the lecturers at the Guernsey Institute, if there are going to be any synergies there at all or not, and how they are going to aspire to greatness. I too, like Deputy Brouard, hope that I am proved wrong, but unfortunately I cannot vote for this unamended policy letter as is. And again, I may well disappoint Deputy Inder, but I am voting for the contents of the policy letter, not for the person whose name is at the top of it.

Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy Bury.

Deputy Bury: Thank you, sir.

I will also be brief as I think it is fairly clear where I stand on this matter. The decision that is about to be made here was always, it feels, a foregone conclusion, but despite that and as tempting as it is to throw in the towel and let it just play out, some of us have to stand up and say what needs to be said on behalf of those that will be truly devastated at the decision that is about to be made. And I am not talking about the La Mare community, who of course will indeed

be devastated, very legitimately so considering their recent track records and fantastic reputation as expressed by Deputy Leadbeater and many others in the earlier amendment.

No, it is not them that I am thinking about primarily, although I certainly am personally, as the La Mare teachers have actually told us that if the model was the right thing, then they would accept their school closure easier. And I am not talking about those that will not be devastated right now but probably will be in the future as they are too young at the moment and do not even realise yet the impact this is going to have on them. But they will, and as they did not have a say at that time when they realise they will look to us, the decision-makers, for accountability.

But who I am actually referring to are those that will be expected to execute this, who have already told us that it will not work and it is not the best for our children, our future workers and therefore economy. I am talking about our teachers. After this passes, which it will no doubt do shortly, I cannot imagine what the next few months will look like for the Committee and their relationship with the teachers that they are going to have to work with to try and get this across the line and to implementation. After being increasingly dismissive of their opinions, I believe the Committee, bar Deputy Cameron, have quite the job on their hands to not only try to rebuild those burned bridges, but to build them up to great enough strength to ask those key stakeholders to deliver a plan that the teachers tell us they have no faith in and have had no influence over, despite voicing their concerns numerous times in various ways but all to no avail.

Whatever change would have come about would have been a difficult transition. That is natural in a big shift change, but in these circumstances it is going to be quite an extraordinary feat to work together. It is clear that this Assembly are going to sign off these plans, but I find it quite unbelievable that they are going to do so in the face of such opposition from the profession. When I led the charge on the abortion debate on behalf of HSC, while there was strong public and political opinion on both sides, for and against, I could champion the case in good faith, knowing that the profession had urged us as a committee to do so and were right behind us in a large majority. I could not have done it in the manner that ESC are doing this. It is really quite baffling. And despite suggestions to the contrary, I do hope the ESC are able to create a successful model, because their success is the success of our students, and as you all know I have real skin in the game on this one, despite Deputy Inder seeming to infer yesterday that he is the only Member of the Assembly who has.

But I am really intrigued to see how they are going to do that with the current feeling among staff, and I would be pleased to hear from Deputy Dudley-Owen in her summing up of how her Committee intends to approach this going forward with the teachers who are vehemently against the plans. What strategy is in place to heal the divisions that have been caused over the course of this debate, and can she guarantee us that this sort of roughshod being ridden over them will not lead to strike action by our teaching staff? Thank you.

The Bailiff: Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you, sir.

Like Deputy Bury, I too have a lot of skin in the game and I have come to this as objectively as I can. We can all see the writing on the wall and I, too, wish nothing more than a really successful transition to a new education model because I am going to have to look the people who will be shaped by it in the whites of the eyes for some generations, some decades to come.

It is just sad, I think it is really sad, as Deputy Bury said, that the omen is not good. Deputy Gollop said at the start of general debate that something is better than nothing. We have got to walk out of here with some decision. I could not disagree more. I think the worst of all possible outcomes is to walk out of here with the wrong decision today, and I think the omens are not looking good for this. This is not supposed to be the difficult bit.

The bumpy bit – I mean if we think back to the previous model, at this stage there was very strong support, there was very strong professional support, as the unions reminded us, there was strong political support and there was community support for the plans. It was not until the

more tangible elements, the details became known, that the wheels started to fall off. I think this education model has a long way to go, and I think if it is this bumpy now, as Deputy Bury said and especially without the support of the key stakeholders tasked with implementing it, I am concerned. I really am concerned.

I think the policy letter did a very good job of talking a good game, I think Deputy Murray's marketing skills were quite evident, but that is one of the things that has troubled me throughout. We have had an extended engagement period with this policy letter by virtue of the delay and debate, but it has perplexed me that in more than one presentation or other opportunity to engage on this subject and listening to Deputy Dudley-Owen, listening to some of the Members of the Committee talking about it, we would be forgiven for thinking that we are being asked to approve a tertiary college model because that is what is being sold. This idea that everyone is going to, I think the words were, 'study together' and this idea of co-location. But it is not. It cannot be both things. It is very specific here and the Committee have, to their credit, been honest and transparent about this. It is very explicitly not a tertiary college. So all of that vision around the parity of esteem and the studying alongside, side by side, that just does not bear out. That is not borne out with the actual plans that we are being asked to approve. The plans, the model, that is being proposed by the Committee is a vertically integrated 11-18 partnership.

The whole idea is that the sixth form is integrated with the 11-16 sector across the other three schools. Now in previous parts of this debate, we have talked about, we have teased out, some of the problems with that, most recently alluded to by one of the more recent speakers. I think it was either Deputy Falla or Deputy Gabriel, I think it was Deputy Gabriel. You can either have your sixth form teachers mostly at the sixth form centre, but in that case they are not in the 11-16 sector, are they? Or you could have them largely not ... they can be shared more equally between the sixth form and the 11-16, in which case they are not spending the majority of their time at the sixth form centre. There are problems with having a remotely located completely separate sixth form centre and as we know, no one has been able to identify an example of a working model of this. So it is completely unproven, it is untested and it does concern me. We are repeatedly told, 'Do not worry, this is all operational detail, that is not our job, it is not a politician's place to go about deciding how this is going to work, that is for the educationists on the front line', but you go and talk to the teachers and they tell us they are not confident it can be made to work, or certainly not effectively, and we know it is not looking like it is going to be in any way cost-effective. So I do think we need to be alive to these concerns.

Someone earlier described teachers as the most important asset to the school and I think that is right. Again, I think we need to be mindful of what is going to give us the best possible opportunity to attract the best teachers going forward. Again, all the indications are that we are not going to be able to do that. That is what they are telling us, the profession is telling us. They do not have confidence in this model. There is some objective evidence as well that seems to support that as well. So again, not a good omen.

What I worry about, these proposals is by building a new – well actually there are several aspects to this. First of all, the benefits of co-locating the Sixth Form Centre with the Les Ozouets – taking a look at Deputy Le Tocq for my pronunciation gets the seal of approval – it is somehow being conflated with this idea of parity of esteem whereas I think it is actually the opposite. I think it creates more problems. It actually demarks, it further divides the difference, it further underscores the difference between the two institutions. They are two very separate institutions. As I explained earlier, the model is quite clearly proposing a vertical integration between the sixth form and the 11-16 sector. It is an 11-18 partnership, however that is going to work. It is not a horizontally integrated organisation with the Guernsey Institute. So it cannot be both. It just cannot be both. You cannot integrate them both ways, and we know it is not a tertiary college. It is not designed to be horizontally integrated.

So what might the advantages be? Well I asked some questions about that, and I got no answers. We cannot identify any educational benefit from co-locating them. But I can think of

3255 quite a few disadvantages. I mean it is less space for the Guernsey Institute, and if there is one
thing that I do not think has got enough air time in this debate so far, it is the Guernsey Institute.
(**A Member:** Yes.) And I really do feel like this is the albatross around its neck. And I actually
3260 think that if we vote down the proposals, if we do not endorse the proposals today, then
according to the extant Resolutions as I understand them, the Guernsey Institute has free reign
to get the green light and push on. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think that would be the best thing
possible without the cannibalisation of its space, without the potential cultural friction between
the, 'Turn left for academic and turn right for vocational and technical', without the increased
3265 pressure and all the additional movements and the different types of learning that are going to
be on this site. I think there is enormous pressure on this site potentially if these plans progress,
and I am concerned that we have got so many details on these.

So I really do not think that any decision is better than none, quite the reverse actually. I think
certainly in terms of the Guernsey Institute it would be a lot better if these proposals were not
approved by the Assembly. And we also know that this is – and it is logical because it is moving
3270 from four sites to four sites – there are no economic economies of scales, there are not financial
economies of scale, there are going to be no economic benefits to this. It is going to be revenue
hungry. Like the existing arrangements, revenue hungry. That really matters because not only
are we under economic pressure, or fiscal pressure more generally, but as Deputy Le Tocq said,
and I agree with him, I think we need to be putting more money in to make a system like this
work. I hope I am joined by every single Member in having the aspiration to improve educational
3275 opportunities and educational outcomes of all students, and I just do not see how that can be
achieved.

I am really concerned because we have already got a very revenue inefficient model or
arrangement that we are working under at the moment and we are moving to an equally revenue
inefficient model. We are going to have to, we have been told in order to fund things like the
3280 very important SEND recommendations, we are going to need to make educational
compromises and we have seen that. Class tipping points have already gone up. So we are going
to get bigger class sizes. People teacher ratios are going to go up, which means we are going to
have proportionately fewer teachers, and we have been told there is going to be a rebalancing
between primary and secondary, in primary's favour.

3285 So money, far from going into the secondary sector, is going to be taken out at the very time
where we need to invest in our secondary sector and that really concerns me. I think actually the
debate on Deputy Leadbeater and Deputy de Lisle's amendment was very useful because it did
shine a spotlight on La Mare and what has made La Mare successful, and it has been very
successful, and we know that those are some of the key ingredients. We know that smaller class
3290 sizes, more teachers per pupil numbers and a greater financial investment clearly do reap
benefits. And yet we are here about to do the very opposite. We are about to spend significant
capital sums, moving a sixth form a few hundred yards down a road for no identifiable
educational benefit in a way where the teachers cannot explain, the Committee cannot explain
exactly how it is going to work. I mean it is really looking worrying.

3295 The other thing is we also appear to be building for the peak of student numbers, so we have
got student number projections and we are building for a short-term peak, and then we know
that those student number projections fall off a cliff, so within a decade student numbers in the
Sixth Form Centre which is going to be built for about 450 students will be down to a predicted
3300 328. That is not very many at all.

I give way to Deputy Oliver.

Deputy Oliver: Thank you, Deputy de Sausmarez, for giving way.

Won't that just mitigate what you are saying though, because if student numbers are going
to fall, then teacher student ratios are then going to go back up?

3305 **A Member:** No, they are not.

Deputy de Sausmarez: (*Laughter*) I wish I shared Deputy Oliver's optimism but that is not what the policy letter says, so unfortunately not. It just does become increasingly economically inefficient. I really do not think that has got enough to recommend it, unfortunately.

3310 I think the policy letter did do a really good job of talking about aspiration. It did a great job pitching the vision. But every time we have asked for explanations about how that vision, how that aspiration might be achieved, we have had no answers, no significant answers or no substantive answers really. It is all just more marketing speak, really. I cannot see a pathway through and I desperately want there to be, because I have got four of my own children to go
3315 through this system and I so want it to be brilliant. I really do. I do not really like the expression 'skin in the game' but I have got lots.

Deputy Aldwell talked about us approving here a proof of concept which I do find quite ironic because we have asked but we have not seen the proof. So again, I am concerned. And Deputy Ferbrache, I am ... Ah. I work with Deputy Ferbrache quite a lot and actually, he and I agree on
3320 really quite a lot and maybe we surprise ourselves in that respect; (*Laughter*) and actually I might surprise him again because I am glad, I cannot quite see how it related to the Propositions that we are being asked to vote on but I am going to mention it anyway. As we are talking about it, I actually share his concern about Scotland and the ideological shift (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I am not sure how relevant it is to the Propositions we are being asked to debate on but as
3325 it has been raised in debate I would just like to add my concern to his.

I think we do have to be very careful that while we want to develop an education system that enables students, equips students with the right skills, I do think we have to be very careful not to do that at the expense of knowledge. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I think a knowledge-rich curriculum is really important to avoid the kind of nose-dive that Deputy Ferbrache quite rightly
3330 described in other jurisdictions like Scotland, which I think was one of the best education systems in the world prior to that.

So I am a little bit alarmed by what I conceive to be an overemphasis of skills at the expense of knowledge. I am also a little concerned that for all the talk of aspiration, we are actually not very focused on academic results and I am the first person, front of the queue, to say academic
3335 results are not the be all and end all, they are not even necessarily the most important thing, but they are a really important part of that mix and I really hope we do not lose sight of them. So I would ask the Committee to please bear that in mind as their model develops. But I would like the President, when she sums up, to try to give us some assurance actually that we are not – I do not see how she can because it is in the policy letter – but I would really like, in an ideal world,
3340 some assurance that class sizes are not going to rise, that we are not going to have to increase the tipping size in the way that we have. I mean it was 24 only five minutes ago and now it is up to 28 it seems.

The pupil-teacher ratios will remain ... which way is it? I always get confused with pupil-teacher ratios. Pupil-teacher ratios will remain low and ... is that the right way around? (*Laughter*)
3345 I really do think we need to invest the money that we need to invest to make the system work, but I cannot support the proposals I am afraid because I really do think that it is baking in a system that will undermine our efforts to provide the best educational opportunities, and therefore the best educational outcomes and wellbeing outcomes for our students, and I do also worry about the effect on teachers as well.

3350 So, with regret, I cannot support the proposals but I would ask for some assurances that we do not cut any more educational corners, that we do what we can to restore class sizes, that we do what we can to restore pupil-teacher ratios and that we invest the money that we need to invest because I am seriously concerned about the erosion of standards in that way. Thank you.

3355 **The Bailiff:** Deputy Leadbeater.

Deputy Leadbeater: Thank you, sir.

I have no intention of speaking. I would just like to ask if Proposition 2 can be taken separately when we come to the vote please?

3360

The Bailiff: Very well.
Deputy Haskins.

Deputy Haskins: Thank you, sir.

3365

I am not going to comment on what various Members have said. The same comments, concerns, and often misunderstandings, are being mentioned, and I do not think it is helpful. I will, however, reply to Deputy Kazantseva-Miller with regard to the skills comment. The list that was quoted was a high level list of indicators and ideas, and I am sure that Deputy Kazantseva-Miller is aware that phase 1, which has really only just this week begun to kick off, is about gathering data and designing the strategy for implementing and those things to implement.

3370

Either way I would highlight one heading that was mentioned, 'Early career starters'. Under that there is, 'Access to high quality work experience, industry placements and entrepreneurial opportunities, reducing barriers to entry, employability skills and preparing for transition.' I would suggest that this is just one pillar where synergies can be found within education. Literacy was also mentioned. I think literacy also extends across all years of education, so I hope that allays some concerns for the role of education in the Skills Strategy.

3375

Now I said the following at one of the school visits to one of the teachers: the students are our future. Now realistically, our economic success depends on their success. I think the Committee understands that, I understand that, I truly believe that. We need to do the best that we can for all of our students. We are looking to the future. We should be striving for excellence, not for mediocracy. Excellence is what the Committee is striving for. I truly believe that the proposed model offers exactly that. I believe that. I believe we have the best vision on the table and I am excited to help it to become a reality. I appreciate some of us have a different opinion, and that is absolutely okay. It is okay to have a different opinion (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and I hope Deputy Queripel takes some solace from this.

3385

In a similar vein to Deputy Le Tocq, if this policy letter gets through I urge Members to get behind this model and help in any way you can and not be destructive. I believe the candidates of the Guernsey Partnership of Independence, and I quote, '... pledge to accept the democratic majority'. Now I understand the party has now been dissolved, but I hope their commitments still stand strong and I would aim that particularly, sir, through you, at Deputy Trott who has previously voiced his desire to hold Members to account for their manifesto promises. And perhaps now at Deputy Falla, who also spoke about his desire to adhere to his pledges.

3390

I truly believe the proposed model is the best fit for Guernsey and its future, and I urge Members to support it. Thank you.

3395

The Bailiff: Members of the States, it has just gone half past five. Normally at that point I will announce an adjournment to 9.30 in the morning.

Can I just see who else wants to speak in general debate? Deputy Dudley-Owen, you get the right to reply anyway. I will simply put to Members, is it your wish to sit to conclude this Item of business this evening? Those in favour; those against?

3400

Members voted Contre.

The Bailiff: Well I am going to declare that loss and will therefore adjourn to 9.30 tomorrow morning.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.33 p.m.