



OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

STATES OF GUERNSEY

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT

COMMITTEE

Committee *for* Education, Sport & Culture
Public Hearing

HANSARD

Guernsey, Tuesday, 25th January 2022

No. 2/2022

*Further information relating to the Scrutiny Management Committee
can be found on the official States of Guernsey website at www.gov.gg/scrutiny*

Members Present:

Panel Chair: Deputy Yvonne Burford – President

Deputy Simon Fairclough – Vice-President

Deputy de Sausmarez – States Member

Ms Grace Ruddy – Non-States Member, Scrutiny Management Committee

Mr Mark Huntington – Principal Scrutiny Officer

Business transacted

Procedural – Remit of the Committee	3
EVIDENCE OF Deputy Andrea Dudley-Owen, President, and Deputy Bob Murray, Vice-President, Committee for Education, Sport & Culture; Mr Nick Hynes, Director of Education; Mrs Natasha Keys, Director of Sport & Culture; Ms Sophie Roughsedge, Head of Education Operations and Mrs Esther Ingrouille, Committee Secretary	3
<i>The Committee adjourned at 10.28 a.m. and resumed its hearing at 10.32 a.m.</i>	11
<i>The Committee adjourned at 11.02 a.m. and resumed its hearing at 11.10 a.m.</i>	20
<i>The Committee adjourned at 12.05 a.m.</i>	33

Scrutiny Management Committee

Committee for Education, Sport & Culture Public Hearing

*The Committee met at 10 a.m.
in the Castel Douzaine Room*

[DEPUTY BURFORD *in the Chair*]

Procedural – Remit of the Committee

The Chair (Deputy Burford): Welcome, everybody, to this Scrutiny Management Committee hearing with the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture; that is to those present and to those watching on the livestream. Today we are going to be focusing primarily on the work in the Government Work Plan as pertains to the Committee.

5 I am Deputy Yvonne Burford and with me on the panel today are the Vice-President of the Scrutiny Management Committee, Deputy Simon Fairclough, Ms Grace Ruddy who is a non-States' member of the Committee, Deputy Lindsay de Sausmarez and the Principal Officer of the Committee, Mr Mark Huntington.

10 We will break at around 11 o'clock for a comfort break and we plan to finish at around about midday. Following this session, the Scrutiny Management Committee will decide if any further review activity will be undertaken, and a *Hansard* transcript of the hearing will be published on the Scrutiny website. I ask that everyone kindly ensure that their mobile phones and computers are switched to silent.

EVIDENCE OF

**Deputy Andrea Dudley-Owen, President, and Deputy Bob Murray, Vice-President,
Committee for Education, Sport & Culture;
Mr Nick Hynes, Director of Education;
Mrs Natasha Keys, Director of Sport & Culture; Ms Sophie Roughsedge, Head of Education
Operations and Mrs Esther Ingrouille, Committee Secretary.**

15 **The Chair:** I will now turn to our witnesses today. If you would like to introduce yourself, please, starting with Mr Hynes.

Mr Hynes: Hi, I am Nick Hynes and I am the Director of Education.

20 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Good morning everyone, Deputy Andrea Dudley-Owen, President of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture.

Deputy Murray: Morning. Bob Murray, Vice-President, Education, Sport & Culture.

Ms Roughsedge: Morning. Sophie Roughsedge, Head of Education Operations.

25 **The Chair:** Ladies at the back.

Mrs Keys: Natasha Keys, Director of Sport & Culture.

30 **Ms Ingrouille:** Esther Ingrouille, Committee Secretary.

The Chair: Thank you.

Kicking right off on the GWP, in the Scrutiny Management Committee's recent hearing with Policy & Resources, we were told that some of the educational priority areas in the GWP were under pressure. Further, in the recently released GWP Monitoring Report, it states that the reorganisation of secondary and post-16 education is under some stress. Could you tell us which part of the projects are under stress?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you very much, Deputy Burford, for your question.

40 It is a well-known fact that the effects of COVID have put an unbearable strain on many parts of our economy and also many plans that have been well-laid in many areas, not just public service but also private business as well. Our education work has not avoided those stresses and pressures.

We are looking at timelines for construction supply lines and those are the type of pressures which are outside of the States' control, extraneous to our influence are the pressures that we have been alluding to. Clearly there have been things around how we work internally as the States, which have been long contested around the amount of time that it takes us to do certain bits of administration in order to get approval for business plans etc, which we have looked at as well. But the pressures have really come externally from the ability of construction to be able to deliver.

45 Do they have the right amount of labour on-Island, the right skills, the right know-how, to deliver a major infrastructure project? Do we have supply lines that we can rely on to deliver materials in the time, quantity and also price that we want them to? Those are the type of pressures that have been alluded to but I think that Deputy Murray will also be able to helpfully contribute to the response here.

Deputy Murray: I think Deputy Dudley-Owen has explained the external pressures. The internal pressures which have been around for a considerable period of time, even preceding this current Committee, are being able to fill the relevant programme team jobs with the relevant skills and the availability of them. That has been a major difficulty. It still presents major difficulties for us. So we have had, on several occasions, and still do, external consultants doing various parts of those very specialised jobs. We are doing our very best to recruit so that we have got that continuity.

60 Plus, obviously it would be cheaper if we could do it internally but, unfortunately, in order to meet the deadlines – as I say, going way back, actually – some of those gaps just have not been filled. They have been identified and prioritised and obviously we are reorganising the best way that we possibly can to maximise the resources we can have access to at this point in time. It is a challenge, but it is an Island-wide challenge and I think it has probably been exacerbated by COVID as well.

The Chair: Do you think that a lot of those pressures were apparent when the policy letter was approved just four months ago?

70 **Deputy Murray:** Not the external pressures to the extent that they have effectively become known. Certainly internal pressures, they were always there. They were there from the last Committee onwards. But we have managed to achieve despite that. But we are aware it feels like it is putting a lot of staff under a lot of pressure and that is the concern in terms of the well-being and so forth of individuals who are involved with the project.

75 **The Chair:** You say that it would have been cheaper if you could have done it internally, but you are going to have to go externally. Does that mean that the budget is going to run over?

80 **Deputy Murray:** Not necessarily. Obviously, we have budgeted for the skill base that we know we can source at this point. We are still trying to recruit, and we are trying to also augment from within the States as well. Project managers are very scarce in the Island and if we can actually move people from other areas who have those particular skills or potential skills into the programme, that would be really helpful. So it is a combination of several things that we are trying to do to deal with what is, essentially, a Guernsey problem at this stage. But very exacerbated by external pressures like supply lines and so forth.

85 **The Chair:** Okay. I am just being advised by the sound crew here – could you possibly remove your face masks when talking?

90 **Deputy Murray:** Gladly.

The Chair: Thank you.

95 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** May I add that this is not exclusive to Education, that there are many projects going on – transformation projects, change projects – amongst the States. In fact the Committee for Employment & Social Security, I think, is looking for a project manager at the moment. And we know that Health & Social Care also require project management for their construction project and their transformation project as well with the Partnership of Purpose. Clearly it would be really useful if the States had a core centralised body of project management, because project management is going to outlast this term and the next.

100 I think a helpful investment in resourcing of relevant skills would be a core project management team which can be so-called 'centralised' and 'bought in' by Committees in the way that we are used to buying in IT services and finance and HR support from our central body. It is not an Education-specific issue, it is States wide and we do, as a Committee, speak to Policy & Resources about these issues and also HR.

105 **The Chair:** Okay, and you are getting full support from Policy & Resources in this?

Deputy Murray: Absolutely.

110 **The Chair:** The Scrutiny Management Committee recently learnt from its hearing with P&R that Deputy Mahoney sits as a P&R representative on your Portfolio Oversight Board in respect of secondary and post-16 education. (**Deputy Murray:** Yes.) Can you provide the panel with just a brief explanation of how this board works and comment on whether you think the system is helpful in progressing the secondary education project at the speed required?

115 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Deputy Murray sits on that board, so I will hand it over.

120 **Deputy Murray:** Yes, if you may, if you will. Essentially, we recognised from an early stage as a Committee that involving P&R as much as possible in the development of our plans was really important so that everybody was on the same page when we finally were able to finalise those. Both Deputy Mahoney and Deputy Soulsby were involved at various points during the evolution of those plans. Because of Deputy Mahoney's particular role within P&R, it certainly seemed appropriate to maintain that as we get from the design stage to the implementation stage. And the TEP Board, which essentially is the main board that has the responsibility for managing the project – the Transforming Education Project – it certainly requires keeping ... I mean we have got a number of people who are representative of P&R in terms of at officer level but at a political level we felt that

it was really important to have them on board. So Deputy Mahoney is actually involved every step of the way. We have those meetings at least monthly but, depending on circumstances, when they have to be before or beyond that. It is a key role for us because it means that, essentially, P&R are being kept up to speed with the development of the project.

The Chair: Deputy Murray, in a response to a supplementary question posed to you in the States' Assembly in November, when asked about the completion date of the Les Ozouets Campus, you said we are still working to 2024. (*Deputy Murray:* Yes.) Is that date still realistic?

Deputy Murray: That is the date that we are aiming for. We will not be in a position to determine whether that is possible until results come back from the tenders that we have already got in play at the moment and then we will see what the availability of staff and labour and so forth is, external, to be able to deliver that.

The Chair: So tenders have gone out?

Deputy Murray: Yes, they went out before the end of December.

The Chair: And are you still considering a modular build?

Deputy Murray: Not at this time.

The Chair: Right, so you have moved back from that idea?

Deputy Murray: It is a question of ... because of the pressures that we alluded to before externally, there are pressures within that industry off-Island as well at this point. Also the fact that, for example, the Princess Theatre, which is going to remain about the only remaining building on the site, the extensions to that for the TGI for its various component parts is very much a traditional type of approach. So a modular build would not really suit that, unfortunately. It remains a backup opportunity if we find that we really cannot achieve. But at this stage we are certainly going down the traditional route.

The Chair: Okay, thanks. I think Deputy de Sausmarez has a question.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you.

The transformation of secondary education was of course originally intended to deliver better financial efficiency and improve the quality of education. As the Committee anticipates its new model will not deliver significant revenue savings, in what specific ways will the quality of education be improved? For example, in terms of curriculum breadth, the standard of and access to facilities, or pupil-teacher ratios, or any other way that you think is relevant.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Yes, thank you for your question, Deputy de Sausmarez.

That question actually formed a core of the debate, didn't it? Back at the two debates that we actually had in July and then again in September, as well as the subject of a myriad of questions, I think from yourself, Deputy Bury, and others who were looking specifically at educational outcomes. At the time, and previous to that as well, we have stated clearly that the delivery of the model itself, which is the arrangement of children in various age groups and various sites, is not what will, in of itself, deliver those excellent educational outcomes. And that separate to the model, but worked up in conjunction at the same time, we have worked an Education Strategy.

We have published that as an Education Strategy on a page and the underlying plans are being worked up by staff because those are the people who will be delivering those plans. It is those plans

and that strategy that is going to be the fundamental keystone of building those excellent educational outcomes. I will just take a moment to read the pillars of those about achieving:

We will achieve equity, safety and inclusivity. We will meet the needs of our community. We will deliver high quality learning and excellent outcomes. And we will provide outstanding leadership and governance.

Each of those commitments are underpinned by a whole set – which I do not think that you'll want me to read out, but they are accessible on our Government website – of underlying plans. Four or five plans for each of those principles. It is really important that we start to separate out the buildings and the organisation of children in our schools from an education strategy, which are the underlying plans which actually set out to achieve cultural change, support for our staff, the breadth of curriculum – because obviously the curriculum is a separate matter as well – and from the model.

But too long we have mashed the two together and said the model will determine the outcomes for the children. And that is just not correct at all. This Committee has seen that, advised by our professional educationalists and staff in our school settings, this is the way to push forward to get those excellent education outcomes that we strive to achieve for our children.

The Chair: Can I just ask a supplementary though? Are you saying, in that case, that the model has no bearing on outcomes?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I am saying that it has far less bearing than, politically, we have been led to believe in the past.

The Chair: But it does have some?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: There will be barriers put in the way of children's educational outcomes by configuration that is awkward or not particularly well thought through. I think that at this stage it will be helpful for our Director of Education to step in as one of the professional educationalists in the room.

Mr Hynes: Thank you.

As Deputy Dudley-Owen said, our strategy is the underpinning route map of how we want to ensure we deliver better education outcomes for all our learners and the Transforming Education Programme and the building work that has been front and centre over many years is actually part of the strategy and not the other way around. I think, by making sure that we are aligning everything we do in education against the four outcomes and the commitments that we are putting underneath them, we are really making sure that we are driving alongside all our colleagues within schools to make sure that the outcomes always remain front and centre, rather than what the infrastructure might look like that sits beneath it.

That is not to say that the infrastructure is not important. It is not to say that the infrastructure does not enable education to be delivered better and more efficiently, but actually the delivery and how we deliver it and abiding by our vision, values and aims within the strategy is the core area which is going to drive forward and improve the education system.

The Chair: So the outcomes could have been delivered in any reasonable model, you think, with the strategy?

Mr Hynes: I think any outcomes of improvement can be delivered within any model that you have but, where you have opportunities to improve that infrastructure, you have an ability to look and ensure that those outcomes can be improved. I think we could have delivered any education system with any model we are given and that is our role as educationists across the whole piste. But having the additional scaffolding and ability to look at what that infrastructure looks like, to look at what the structures within that infrastructure look like, have helped us to think about how curriculum

might be delivered better and more efficiently across a secondary phase. How those pathways across those secondary schools might be more aligned to enable a smoother pathway into post-16, including the TGI, has been a benefit when we have been looking at the Transforming Education Programme from a secondary and post-16 point of view.

The Chair: Thank you. Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you.

I am obviously familiar with the Education Strategy and one of the things that I find perhaps a little bit unusual about it is it does not really seem to reference educational, in the respect of academic outcomes, at all really. So my question still stands. Are you able to identify any specific ways that the quality of education will be improved? Mr Hynes obviously talked about how – and Deputy Dudley-Owen talked about how – the model is not necessarily what will deliver that. But of course it can impact things like curriculum breadth. We know that it is much more difficult to deliver a broad curriculum in smaller schools like we have got and that we are transitioning to. So, I am just wondering how the Committee is approaching this particular challenge. Are we going to see an enhanced curriculum offer compared to what there is now? Are we going to see improvements in any of those key metrics?

Mr Hynes: I think the model we are moving to, and which we are working on at the moment, really enables, through that secondary school partnership, to firm up some of the things that you are talking about, Deputy de Sausmarez. I do not think previously, although there has been a looser federation across the secondary school partnership, that there has been an arrangement and organisation across secondary education which really enables those secondary leaders, led by the executive principle, to really think about what is going on within each school from a curriculum and learning point of view.

I think the Secondary School Partnership, as the umbrella organisation of each of those secondary schools, is really enabling some of those questions – around curriculum, the delivery of the curriculum and a consistent delivery across each of those schools – to be addressed. They are working really closely already and looking at making sure that, although curriculum breadth is also important, there is some replication which is not efficient and which we are enabling to be addressed through that partnership. So, it might be around different subjects being delivered through different exam bodies, which we are now moving to with single exam bodies, which then enables teachers to be able to work more collectively across the Secondary School Partnership on the same frameworks and also to enable teachers to be able to plan and assess across that as well.

You talked about the actual outcomes within the Strategy. I appreciate it does not specifically list that, but those outcomes will sit underneath each of those commitments and they will be key performance indicators against those commitments, which we will report back to the Committee on as part of our continual drive for continuous improvement across education. So it becomes the overarching route map with the operational plan that sits underneath that we will be able to be held to account against.

Deputy de Sausmarez: So there either are at the moment, or there will be, some KPIs around educational attainment and improvement and things like that?

My Hynes: There already are quite a significant group of KPIs that we report on, on an annual basis. Some of those are more useful than others and, as part of delivering the strategy, we need to look at which KPIs are useful to really demonstrate that we are having a strong set of outcomes for our children and young people. At the moment we have got a full range of different KPIs, some are more or less useful, and I think we need to be clearer by looking at the commitments within the Education Strategy that what we are reporting on makes sense to the Committee and to the

community, and really demonstrate that we are having an impact to improve the lives and the outcomes of children and young people.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you.

It sounds as though we are not yet in a position for you to articulate any specific expectations around improvement, so I will move on.

On the gov.gg website your Committee states that birth rates are declining in Guernsey, and in turn, the number of students is dropping. We know that 'student numbers will increase briefly in the next couple of years before dropping off quite sharply.' This could of course fundamentally affect the financial and academic modelling and the new Sixth Form Centre is being built to accommodate, I think it is 450 people or up to 450 people, for example. But current projections show significantly fewer than that. I think around 320 sixth formers, for example, are projected for 2036.

So the question is, if States' population management policy does not neutralise this steep decline in student numbers, will it be economically and educationally feasible to maintain such small schools in the medium term? Or do you anticipate having to reduce the number of schools in order to maintain an adequate breadth of curriculum and access to subject-specialist teachers, for example?

Deputy Murray: Just in relation to the other point that you were making, I think what gets overlooked is the fact that we have very different sizes of schools currently under our mandate. That makes for inefficiency in terms of delivery on a pupil-pupil basis. I am not talking just necessarily about financial here. It is actually the opportunity to deliver the breadth of curriculum in an equitable way across the whole piste. What we have managed to do by taking the sixth form to some extent out of the mix, is that we have now got three secondary schools that are about the same sort of size, instead of a wide variation between them that we currently have.

That makes curriculum delivery and development much more efficient in that regard. Yes, we do not know obviously with any certainty what the future may hold. The fact that we have actually co-located and are sharing facilities on the site at LOC with the TGI means that we can maximise, in both directions, the opportunities of space that we have available. Should it go the other way, for example, if we had an influx, then probably we would start to expand into the car park area. There is room for growth there for either of those entities should that be the case, but at the moment it certainly is the indication we have got that it is actually going to contract.

We have already managed considerable savings and efficiencies by having to organise the sports facilities, for example. We did not need to duplicate or use it anywhere else. They were actually maximised because we actually had sufficient people on the campus to make that work. It is not a very simple answer. There is no simple answer to it, but at the end of the day I think what we have actually ... think of it in this term. The sixth form is at this point preventing us from being able to do the rest of the activity in the secondary space that we need them to do to be able to maximise our opportunity with them and obviously there is a cost saving there in that regard.

What it also does of course is it aligns the sixth form within an area, which is the next stage of their education depending on which direction they want to go in. We believe that probably is the right way for the Island, most economically but also in terms of delivery.

Ms Roughsedge: Could I add something, please?

Deputy Murray: Yes, please do.

Ms Roughsedge: Just to add about the curriculum breadth. What we have been doing with the principals and within the project team is looking at when we see that decline, which is from 2029 onwards, and really looking across the 11 to 16 and there is a definite maintenance of that curriculum breadth with a mixture of vocational-academic options at GCSE for students that will be

equitable across those three 11 to 16 schools. We are not envisaging any reduction or reduced offering in that respect. That is work that has been ongoing, so we are looking ahead.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I think Deputy Murray referred to the current system as inefficient, but I do not believe we are anticipating any particularly significant revenue savings, are we? Unless I have got that wrong.

Deputy Murray: I think, unfortunately, the actual work that will – obviously we will be able to identify the extent of that – can only happen when we know how many employees in which areas are going to go where and so forth, those who may perhaps be retiring during the period of doing this. It was the difficulty we were faced with before, when we took the Proposition to the States. We could only make an estimate without, actually, the negotiations having taken place. Obviously, they are still, at this point in time, at a very early stage at this point. Those would be some of the main efficiencies but then, of course, not running that additional school, which is in some disrepair at the moment in itself, which would require continual upkeep, is going to be something that from a capital perspective we probably would make savings on.

Deputy de Sausmarez: But in terms of the revenue savings, it is possible that the new model will be no more efficient than the current model?

Deputy Murray: I suspect it probably will be but we cannot give you figures, unfortunately, at this point. It is too early in the negotiation at this stage to say that.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Just going back in your first response to my question on this subject, you talked about the discrepancy between the different schools. We have got very unequal sized schools and of course that creates inequity, but that does not negate the fact that our schools are currently very small by comparative standards and that does produce challenges in terms of delivery of curriculum. That was why I was asking the question if schools get even smaller ... and in fact removing the sixth form actually removes a bit of potential flexibility as well, in terms of delivery of curriculum, because you do not have the full range across 11 to 18 in quite the same way as you would if it was in a –

Deputy Murray: I think that is actually true, to be perfectly honest. I think there is an assumption – and I did try to make this point during the debate, both the debates in fact. At the moment, of course, because of the combined sixth form situation, what we actually have is a sharing of space which means there is competition for particular rooms. Technology space, art space, that sort of thing. That limits the opportunity that we actually have. For example, were other schools to be participating in a sixth form that was not combined, it would be driven by the space available at particular times of the day in the timetable for the competition with the 11 to 16.

By moving them out and giving them their own actual space, which to a very small extent is shared with the TGI, they actually have full scope in terms of the timetable to deliver as and when is necessary, depending on the need and the development of the curriculum. I think the other thing you have to bear in mind, of course, is that when we have got the sort of inefficiencies of one school saying ... Sampson, for example, maybe 700 students and then in La Mare de Carteret you might have 400 students. You cannot deliver the same curriculum breadth as efficiently, or at least there will be a premium for attempting to do so. So, getting all three 11 to 16 onto an equal footing does give you that equality and it does give you the maximum opportunity to deliver curriculum to the best that we can.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: May I ask –

380 **The Chair:** Deputy Dudley-Owen, I am sorry to interrupt you. We have got a slight problem with the sound, so I think we are just going to hold for two minutes to see if we can –

Mr Huntington: If we can take five minutes, we are just struggling to pick up the audio from the Panel. Is it possible to just take five minutes?

385 **The Chair:** Okay.

*The Committee adjourned at 10.28 a.m.
and resumed its hearing at 10.32 a.m.*

The Chair: Are we up and running again? Okay. First of all apologies to people who have been trying to listen in on the livestream. There will be a transcript of the meeting, but I realise that does not take the place of being able to watch it and listen live. Deputy Fairclough, over to you. I think you have some questions.

Deputy Fairclough: I think Deputy Dudley-Owen just wanted to make a point just before –

The Chair: Oh yes, I beg your pardon.

395 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes. First of all I think that we are actually in danger of rehashing the States' debate, Deputy de Sausmarez, with some of this conversation. However, I do think it would be really useful for Sophie to be able to contribute in terms of the Secondary School Partnership and the operating model thereof, and to talk about some specialist teachers and how that overcomes some of the problems that you have identified.

405 **Ms Roughsedge:** The Secondary School Partnership, which is led by the Executive Principal and has the current four Principals of each of the schools already collaborate on curriculum. They are already looking ahead to next academic year, what the curriculum will look like, how they can think about staffing it. But also, as part of the transformation work, they are looking well ahead thinking about the decline and how that can be managed from a population perspective and how you then run schools that are still of a good size. In terms of running a school, there will be at least five form to sixth form entry and the key focus there, as I have already said, is around maintaining curriculum breadth but also ensuring subject specialists.

410 So, one of the key priorities for that team is ensuring that every teacher has a specialist teacher in front of them, which is not the case at the moment at some of our schools because of their small size and the restriction of staffing. You can often end up with non-specialists, which is not great from a curriculum experience. That is a key priority and what we are seeing from that early modelling work is that it is possible to deliver the curriculum through specialist staff. Other aspects that they are already looking at – and this comes back to your question, I think, earlier about quality – is around the quality of leadership, not just at senior leadership but also looking at middle leadership development.

415 They are thinking more broadly around offset preparation, which actually will be where we will see – in terms of quality of schools – refining where, then, schools need to improve. And really looking across the piece at where they are best to align some of the work that they do around particular policies, whilst also maintaining the unique character of each school. This is a lot of work that is taking place now. They meet weekly looking at current issues facing the schools but also planning ahead. And I think, from that leadership team, that is where you are going to see the focus on quality and school improvement moving forward. I hope that is helpful in answering a couple of those points.

425 **The Chair:** Thank you. Deputy Fairclough.

Deputy Fairclough: Thank you.

We have touched on the capital programme. I would just like to return to it for a couple of questions if I may. The programme for the approved three-school model and post-16 campus has capital costs approved of £43.5 million, including construction of £29 million and programme costs of £10 million. In her statement of December 2021, Deputy Soulsby mentioned that £6.25 million had been approved to fast-track initial work on the programme. Could you give the Committee details of what that £6.25 million was actually being used for?

Deputy Murray: I think you need to be quite careful in terms of taking bits and pieces out at this stage. Obviously, nothing has been essentially built just now. A great deal is the programme costs of maintaining the pace with the programme rollout. It might help, perhaps, to give you a breakdown of the budget for the entire project, which includes LOC, the whole of the LOC Campus. Because we have two projects here which do work back towards particular Resolutions of the States and capital allocations. But as we get to this point we are running them together to save costs where we can because of resources and so forth.

For example, at the moment – and I think it is something unfortunately that was banded around a little bit during the discussions on this – the secondary request, if you like, for the actual sixth form element of it is actually about £19 million. What was, I think, overlooked was that actually, as part of that allocation that we requested, we are going to be spending about £9.3 million on Les Varendes, on necessary maintenance, and we are also spending a much smaller amount – £320,000 odd – on St Sampson's for necessary maintenance. But there was a £3 million requirement for the decant. And the decant costs were not included in the last allocation for the TGI, so we had to actually add that to the secondary requirement at this stage.

We also have to repurpose – and again this was not really allowed for in the original budgeting – the music centre, for example, which has to move out of the TGI premises and also share. And the youth service, they are going to be accommodated in the Les Varendes, which means that we have to repurpose the swimming pool. That alone, for example, has actually got about a £2 million price tag at this point in time. Then, of course, you have the digital, which is currently at £6.8 million. It is made up of a considerable amount of transport, £1.5 million. These are all very necessary costs. What we are obviously having to draw down just now are, to assist the programme and also the design phase with architects and the various specialists that we have to employ there.

That goes through a very specific series of stages, so by the end of January we will be at RIBA Stage 3 with both projects and then, obviously, we move into the RIBA Stage 4. The RIBA Stage 3 essentially has established the layout, the rooms and the facilities. RIBA Stage 4 will then enlarge on that in terms of power points, furnishings and so on and so forth. But it is a rolling programme and unfortunately as the debates – or the two debates – dragged on, we got behind in terms of the allocation that we required to keep the programme team on track.

Whilst the work did not stop, we had to make sure that we got a draw down to cover historic as well as going forward. It is quite difficult just to pull out specific parts and some of that has been kit. We have spent quite a lot of money on refurbishing laptops or new laptops and so forth. Data loggers which, frankly, I did not understand what they were until we were asked to supply the cost for. So it is a rolling programme, but it is primary ... it is not really a build situation other than the design and the programme management at this stage, that those costs have been brought down for.

Deputy Fairclough: I understand that and thanks for that explanation. By drawing down that £6.25 million then, are you ensuring that the programme remains on track?

Deputy Murray: Absolutely.

The Chair: Can I just ask a supplementary there? Do you have an overall figure? Because I think a lot of people listening will be slightly, understandably, bamboozled by all the numbers that are

480 coming out. Do you have an overall figure for the entire project, which includes the TGI, the whole
of the Les Ozouets Campus, everything you want to do to the existing secondary schools and all
the ancillary items and indeed the optimism bias? A grand figure of the cost of this project.

485 **Deputy Murray:** At the moment, this would include the primary review which is also part of the
allocations that have been made – previous allocations in that regard – and transport, everything
else that I have mentioned thus far. There is a grand total of £101 million, just under. But that does
not include a £10.5 million optimism bias at this point.

The Chair: And which you would reasonably expect to spend?

490 **Deputy Murray:** It depends actually on ... and that the reason for the optimism bias, of course,
is to have that in the background as a flexible amount depending on whether or not our estimates
have been true to what we anticipated or not, as the case may be. And that actually reduces as we
get more of the finality of the costs for each part of the project.

495 **The Chair:** Yes, but you have a contingency in addition to that within the other figures. But one
might say then, in that case, that given all the issues that we have heard of with supply chains etc.
and difficulties recruiting staff, it would be optimistic to say that we will not spend the optimism
bias.

500 **Deputy Murray:** I do not think we can say for sure, at this stage. We will certainly know during
February when we get the tenders back and we have got then clarity of what we might be looking
at. But until we have got that ... and again for the delivery as well and the decant is a very important
part of the project because, once you start the decant you have got to know when you can get them
505 back in, basically, and also where they are going to go. That is under considerable pressure at the
moment.

The Chair: But in summary, between £101 million and £110 million?

510 **Deputy Murray:** It is certainly going to be ... on the current figures that we have got, it is
£101 million, essentially, or £100,945,000, and £10.5 million is actually in there at this point in time
for that optimism bias.

515 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Can I just ask a point of clarification on that? You said that that total
includes the cost of the primary review. Does it also include the cost of redeveloping La Mare de
Carteret Primary School, or not?

Deputy Murray: It is not down here as a cost at this point in time. That would possibly be outside
of that at this stage, that is the current figures I have got for the LOC Campus at this point.

520 **The Chair:** Thank you. Deputy Fairclough.

Deputy Fairclough: Thank you.

525 Just to be clear then, has the work – and you have already alluded to some of the problems with
the construction industry and also the lack of availability of project managers in particular – been
delayed by the availability of resources in those two areas?

530 **Deputy Murray:** It has not been delayed but it has put existing staff or consultants under
considerable pressure to maintain the deadline that we are looking for at this point. But that was
something that was actually always a problem, but clearly, we are very much aware – and particularly
in the sense of the TGI who have been waiting effectively 25 years to have premises suitable – we

have tried to maintain that. In fact, it did not stop during the secondary side of things at all. That maintained its course, basically. Then we were able with the sixth form, once we had got the approval of the States to catch up, which was something that we had hoped and have in fact done.

535

Deputy Fairclough: We were told at the recent Scrutiny hearing with Policy & Resources that there had been a change, and I quote, a change of programme managers. What was the reason for that?

540

Deputy Murray: It was at the end of a contract and, unfortunately, we are unable to find a solution that, in terms of the timeframe that we required the individuals for, and it has not necessarily been a negative because obviously bringing a fresh face in and reviewing the processes that we are actually undertaking at this point in time is actually a very good risk aspect and that has actually been very helpful for us to try and identify and prioritise. And bearing in mind that we have moved, and we are moving, from a two-project situation to one central undertaking with individual projects sitting under it, it effectively required a fresh look at how we were managing that and the resources that we have available to deliver it.

545

Deputy Fairclough: Okay, and you mentioned previously the Portfolio Oversight Board. Could you tell us who else is on that Board and what the reporting structure is to you as a political Committee?

550

Deputy Murray: Well, I am the political representative on there at this point. Education Director, Nick, is actually the senior Responsible Officer on the project and we have on there as well representation at the moment from both the sixth form and also from the TGI. Both Executive Heads are sort of links back to the individual parts of the project in that regard. We obviously have access to other specialists in there ... and we also have external people like Peter Marsh consulting, who we draw on and who have been involved from a very early stage and have quite a history with Guernsey in terms of external management and advice going forward. But I do not know if Nick would want to expand on that at all, particularly.

555

560

Mr Hynes: As Deputy Murray said, at the moment I am the senior Responsible Officer and then we have the political representation through Deputy Murray and Deputy Mahoney. We have the quality assurance through colleagues within P&R, as I said, and also some external quality assurance and risk management to make sure that everything that we are doing is going through the proper channels and being challenged back so that we are thinking really clearly about the decisions that are being made within that Programme Board.

565

What has been really helpful with the new Programme Director coming on board, as Deputy Murray said, is actually having a look at the total Programme, doing a review of where the Programme is, seeing where the risks are, being able to take action against those risks and mitigate to make sure that we are, as far as possible, able to stay on track with regard to costs and also the timeframe.

570

Deputy Fairclough: We need to move on, but I would just like to pick up on that issue of risk. What do you see the biggest risks being?

575

Mr Hynes: I think Deputy Murray and the President have already said that there are various risks with regard to the timeframe. We are working towards the 2024 timeframe at the moment, and we will be clear about whether we are able to achieve that in the next couple of months, once we have the tender processes back. But the Programme Board and the team have really put a lot of work into looking where the stresses and strains are across the Programme and being able to take decisions across the Programme Board about where we can mitigate to ensure that we can maintain that timeframe.

580

Also making some really difficult decisions around cost because we are obviously very aware as a Programme Board that we are spending taxpayers' money and we need to ensure that, as far as possible, we are delivering within the agreed spending that we are allowed. So we are making sure that any cost which is being spent is value for money and efficient and delivering the best service we can.

Deputy Fairclough: Thanks, Mr Hynes.

The Chair. Thank you. Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Thank you.

I know that there has been historically – there always is, isn't there, in Guernsey – some concern over the traffic impact, specifically around Les Ozouets Campus. I understand that you were undertaking some traffic impact assessments. Are you in a position to talk us through the impacts and mitigations at this stage, or not?

Deputy Murray: The Committee have not been given that report yet, but I know it has been commissioned and I know it has been completed, but we have not actually seen, as a Committee, the results from that.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: We are not in a position to be able to give any commentary because it has not been presented to the Committee at the moment.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Okay, in that case can I please move on? Deputy Murray raised the very important issue of the decant and I was wondering if you would be able to provide any more information on that. For example, the type of accommodation or learning environments, traffic impact of that. That kind of thing. What kind of numbers are we dealing with, on how many sites?

Deputy Murray: Are we talking financial numbers or pupil numbers?

Deputy de Sausmarez: Whatever you think is ... it would be good to have all of that but –

Deputy Murray: I cannot really give you a breakdown at this stage.

Deputy de Sausmarez: You have given us a ballpark of £3 million.

Deputy Murray: Yes, and that is right. I cannot break it down because it has not happened either yet at this point in time. What we have been able to do with the music centre, for example, at this point in time, it is going to be occupying a temporary space on a temporary classroom which will be erected – assuming planning agree with this – to the west of the existing sixth form, but the main one –

Deputy de Sausmarez: So, on Les Varendes?

Deputy Murray: On Les Varendes, yes. The main issue, really, is what we do with the TGI particularly, because clearly at this point in time there are quite a few people actually in there and we need to give them accommodation which is appropriate so that they do not feel ... and we also do not want to move people twice. I think it is really important that we do not do that as far as it is humanly possible. I hope, at the moment, that the recent information that we currently have is that we will be able to repurpose some of the existing Coutanchez, some of the classrooms are there to accommodate a number of the existing occupants of the LOC campus.

635 But we will require some temporary accommodation classrooms to be erected there. Well, they are pods essentially, which will be equipped. These are very ... they are not what you might see standing at the docks. They are actually proper pods which come pre-equipped so that we have got the environment. We cannot put people into even more substandard conditions than they are currently at. That would not be acceptable. But we have not yet bottomed out, and it is also a question of the timing. The timing is absolutely critical for the decant that we move on that as soon as possible in order that the rest of the building programme can actually fall into place.

640 We are going to have to make decisions on that fairly quickly, which is why we are obviously very keen to get the tenders back, to know the end point and then work backwards as to what that will actually require. We will try to maximise as far as possible holidays to get building works and so forth done on the various sites during holiday periods and so on. But it really is, at the moment, too early unfortunately to say, but it is a critical part of the whole process at this point.

Deputy de Sausmarez: So you are planning to use Coutanchez as the decant site for the Guernsey Institute for the people currently in Les Ozouets.

650 **Deputy Murray:** Primarily, yes.

Deputy de Sausmarez: There are currently people already using the Coutanchez site, I believe. (**Deputy Murray:** Yes.) Do you know how many people there are going to be, overall, using that site during the decant process?

Deputy Murray: I do not have those figures at this point in time, I am afraid.

660 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Deputy de Sausmarez you asked questions of us back in August, actually, so you have these figures already and these are in the public domain, and we gave indicative figures at that time of what we anticipated numbers were going to be using the Les Ozouets Campus once it was up and running, which obviously are not too different from what they are now, scattered around different sites. We have got, at the present time, there are approximately 300 14- to 16-year-olds who attend college for one afternoon per week. Obviously, those numbers would have to be accommodated.

665 We also have 450 students aged between 16 and 21 who are considered full-time that we have to obviously take into consideration, in addition to 350 apprentices who will attend the campus one day each per week. So clearly there is a considerable number of students that we have to take accommodation, but we have got to be very careful because, whilst we can aggregate all of those and total those up, not all of those students will be on that site at one time. And obviously staggered start and finish times are going to have to be considered for the finished campus as well as during this decant period in order to mitigate congestion and traffic usage around the site.

670 You yourself know that we have two Members shared between your Committee on Environment & Infrastructure and the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, and active travel is something that we are all keen proponents of, especially for this phase of your life where we want young people to be active. So traffic impact is very important to this Committee in making sure that we do not clog up roads in the Pitronnerie area and surrounding area around the Coutanchez to the disadvantage of businesses in the community and also the educational setting itself.

680 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you. And just very quickly, Deputy Murray talked about the timing being critical for the decant. Is there currently contingency built into the budget to cover the event of a delay in terms of the decant costs?

685 **Deputy Murray:** It is more timing than actually additional cost at that point. It is when you start the process, it depends on where that fits in the rest of the activities that actually have to be undertaken, which is why really we have to start at the end point and work backwards, so that we

get people in the right places at the right time in the project. I think what we obviously would do, if we have to and are probably going to have to order these particular pods, obviously there is a timeline to be able to get them built and delivered and so forth. So we have to build that into the timeline as well ultimately, but I think it is more a question of the sooner that we can obviously decant the sooner the building or rebuilding works can start. The demolition certainly can start and the rebuilding can continue as a consequence.

Deputy de Sausmarez: But presumably there is a scenario in which students may have to be decanted for longer than currently anticipated and –

Deputy Murray: Again, if the end point has to move then that would be the case. But if that was the case, we obviously would not want to move people unnecessarily sooner than necessary at that point. To get to the current 2024 deadline, if that is still achievable and, as we say we will know fairly shortly, we would have to start the decant very quickly. That creates some problems in a COVID environment because that gives complications in terms of what we have got to allow for in terms of use of any other facilities that we have currently got. For example, the TGI at the moment are using one-way systems to move and hopefully we are seeing a reduction in those difficulties but it is quite a complex picture to be able to achieve it ultimately, but it is a very significant part of the whole project at this point.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Okay, thank you. Just one final one from me at this stage. There was significant opposition from teaching staff at the time that the policy letter was brought forward and I understand from statements at the time, and I think soon afterwards, that you were planning to do some workshops and consult with the teaching profession to get their input into the model. So I wondered whether you could update us on how that has transpired and whether or not you believe that the profession is now fully supportive of what you are doing?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Since the model has been approved, we have had a good run into the beginning of the term and then COVID came along just after half term. But notwithstanding that, staff engagement groups have been set up and at this stage I will ask Sophie to give us her input as our business change lead here who will be able to give a lot more detail about the type of engagement that staff have been invited to participate in and consultation.

Ms Roughsedge: So there are two aspects to the staff engagement and from a Programme perspective we look at TGI and secondary because they are both as important. TGI had some well-established staff engagement groups actually dating back to 2019 and we had some staff engagement groups around the previous model and we were just about to start them after half term for secondary but we had to put everything on pause because of COVID. In consultation with the school principals and with staff it was decided that, because of the pressures that staff were under with lots of cover for absent staff and the challenges of being in schools, that we would hold off until things are in a more stable picture because people are giving up their time.

They are due to restart in the next couple of weeks but in terms of staff engagement around the build I can give you some figures. For TGI for the RIBA Stage 3, which is the design of the floor space in the plans, there have been 42 workshops involving 68 members of staff. For the Sixth Form Centre, there have been 14 workshops with 38 members of staff plus additional one-to-one sessions with architects were required and there are fewer sixth form workshops mainly because they have fewer specialist areas. A lot of their rooms are just standard teaching rooms, so there is less consultation required. That has included support staff and teaching staff and we have also had joint sessions for elements of the post-16 campus, particularly around sports and learning resource centre that are going to be shared areas.

So there has been a substantial amount of staff engagement and in addition to that, although we have not had each of the school engagement groups set up, we have been continuing to meet

740 on a monthly basis with union colleagues which include school representatives to look at the development of the Secondary School Partnership and the future potential impact on staffing and what that might look like moving forward. There has been a lot of ongoing dialogue but slightly frustrated and delayed because of COVID.

745 **The Chair:** Thank you. I think I am just going to jump forward –

Deputy Murray: Sorry if I could just add –

The Chair: Certainly.

750 **Deputy Murray:** It is probably important from Nick's perspective that we, in terms of developing the Educational Strategy, there has been a considerable involvement in there of the staff, hasn't there? There is actually a work group there where they are participating in the evolution of that and that seems to have been quite successful.

755 **Mr Hynes:** Yes, and with the development of the Education Strategy we have had a network strategy group, we have had representatives from every single school coming together to look at what that Strategy means for them and also to review those commitments, drive us forward and challenge us with regard to some of our thinking around the Strategy. As part of that Strategy work we have also undertaken a significant survey across all of our staff which we are just about getting
760 results for now. We have surveyed up to 1,200 different staff members across every single school in every single education service to start to unpick and think about what it means to work with education, where the areas might need to be developed and what is working well at the moment.

765 **Deputy Fairclough:** Could I just come in there and just ask whether any particular themes or issues have emerged as a result of that consultation?

Mr Hynes: With regard to the survey?

770 **Deputy Fairclough:** Yes.

Mr Hynes: We are literally just getting the results back this week, so we are yet to look at those in detail. We will be sharing those with head teachers and network strategy leads later this week, within their particular schools and their environments, but then also looking at the substantive overview of what it looks like for the whole of education services, including all schools and anything
775 else we deliver.

Deputy Fairclough: Thank you.

780 **The Chair:** I am just going to jump forward to a couple of questions on primary before we take a short break. The States resolved in 2019 to redevelop La Mare de Carteret Primary School due to its exceedingly poor condition. That has exceeded the time span. When does the Committee propose to carry out this long overdue redevelopment which remains an extant Resolution?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Apologies, sorry I am completely tied up with my mask there.

785 The Committee has not prioritised that particular workstream in the forthcoming Government Work Plan and we know that it is a piece of work that will fit into the primary review which, again, we have had a debate about not too long ago, which was put forward actually by Deputy de Sausmarez and Deputy Roffey. We understand the arguments around that, the debates around that, but it is too soon to be able to pick that out as a priority area without having done the work on the

790 primary review to see where we are with that particular estate and where we are in terms of
delivering primary education in the Island.

The Chair. Okay. Given the current fiscal pressures which we are all well aware of and the
understandable focus on cutting unnecessary expenditure, do you think that the spare capacity in
795 the primary sector of a somewhat astonishing 650 places – the equivalent of two medium-sized
primary schools – is in any way justifiable or sustainable?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Well again, we are in danger of stepping back into debates that we have
already had which have been in the public domain which are also on *Hansard*. Again we may have
800 space in primary schools, but is it in the right places? We have got classrooms. For example, you
may have children or spare capacity in Year 5, for argument's sake, in the Forest School. But if you
have got children who are in another catchment area who are requiring spaces in Year 2, then the
spaces that you have got in Year 5 are not going to assist you, are they? We have got to be very
careful about using figures and measures to say, well there is capacity there and there are children
805 coming through there, therefore the two marry up. Because they do not. It is much more nuanced
and much more complex than I think that our political narrative sometimes allows for.

The Chair: And it can only really be resolved through the primary review?

810 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Absolutely. And looking at things like admissions, looking at things like
catchment areas which I know that some of our political colleagues are very keen on exploring, to
do away with catchment areas. But again this actually is really interesting because it demonstrates –
some of the complexities that we have to deal with around our policies in education – the need for
States' Members to have more information at their fingertips. And as Members will know, I have
815 been emailing out recently about our webinar series, which was never done before, which I was very
keen to pioneer because I just feel that successive terms of States' Members have not been well
educated enough themselves in the matter of education policy in the education system in Guernsey.

It has been really disappointing, not only have I had to cajole and chase, that we have only had
half the amount of States' Members in the Assembly actually respond to our survey. The webinar
820 series, for members of the public who are listening, we have pioneered it so that we have episodes
depending on different topics which are delivered by our educationalists, Mr Hynes and
Ms Roughsedge and others in the Education Office, so that we can start to talk about education
policy and to deep dive into complex areas for greater and enhanced understanding. And this is
open to non-States' members as well who are attached to Committees so that when those
825 individuals are making decisions that might overlap into the education sphere in their own
Committees, but also in debate, that they have a much better understanding of the complex areas
that we have to consider.

There was not a particularly great attendance at the last webinar so it is really important that – I
suppose I am using this as a platform to plea for our States' Members to come on and respond to
830 the survey – so we know what we can deliver to you, but also members of the public know that this
particular Committee is at great pains to assist and enhance the understanding and comprehension
of our education policies to States' Members, so that we can engage in better quality debate often.

The Chair: Thank you for that but coming back to the primary review, you cannot give any
835 indication at all today of when you think your Committee may be undertaking that?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Well, in terms of Government Work Plan priorities, we have put the
primary review in 2025 to 2026 because we have prioritised Education Law and other areas which
we think perhaps likely –
840

The Chair: So likely not in this political term?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Correct.

The Chair: Okay, thank you.

845 Thank you, I think we will just take a five-minute comfort break now and then reconvene. Thank you, everyone.

*The Committee adjourned at 11.02 a.m.
and resumed its hearing at 11.10 a.m.*

The Chair: Thank you, everybody. I think Deputy de Sausmarez has got a question to kick off with.

850 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Yes, a change of subject. The Committee has recently announced that it is going to be changing the way we celebrate Liberation Day with more of a focus on the parishes rather than a big central celebration. Can you please explain how that will be funded?

855 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, thank you very much for asking that question. Apologies for laughing, if anyone saw me then, I just got tangled up yet again in my mask and my glasses. The changes to Liberation Day have been well publicised, which is really helpful, by the media and in the main there has been a balanced response. We realise that there will always be different schools of thoughts about these issues, which are very dear to our Islanders' hearts. It is a shame, and I will say at this juncture, that one of our media outlets has chosen to put false statements out about the
860 future of Liberation Day, which is very upsetting, but we will put that to one side for the time being. What I will ask is for Natasha Keys, Mrs Keys, to add some detail to the funding details.

Mrs Keys: The revenue budget for Liberation Day is £90,000. It has been at that level for the past three, maybe two, years and it was increased from £70,000. That will remain the same and the
865 savings that will be made from not closing piers, having major road closures, security etc. in Town are all being passed on to the parishes. So that £25,000 saving is being divvied up into 10 lots for the parishes to support community events there. Every fifth year we then make a bid for an additional somewhere in the region of between £70,000 and £90,000 for the bigger celebrations and that covers the bigger events and the additional logistics that are needed. That funding
870 normally comes either from the budget reserve or from the lottery fund.

Deputy de Sausmarez: Sorry, just so I am clear, £25,000 is being divided among the parishes. Do we know how it is being divided? Is it being divided on a sort of per capita basis?

875 **Mrs Keys:** No, per parish, so they can apply –

Deputy de Sausmarez: So, even divisions. Obviously the more populous parishes will get per capita a very significant amount less than the more –

880 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Those parishes are able to look into their own funds as well to augment the celebrations in their own parishes and we know that some are looking at that.

The Chair: Is it reasonable though that somewhere like St Peter Port, going on those figures you have given me, would get 12 pence per person whereas Torteval gets £2.50 per person?

885 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** I think that it depends because formal celebrations are still being ... events are still continuing to take place in St Peter Port on Liberation Day –

Mrs Keys: Well even larger parishes like the Castel where we are today are going to do substantially worse on a per capita basis –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: But that is up to the parish, what they are going to do with the funding. A parish with greater amounts of population may choose not to do quite as big a celebration as one with smaller amounts of population. It is entirely up to the parish how they spend their money and equally so, some parishes may decide to do some events which effectively get more bang for their buck. So, it depends on how the parish decides to spend that money. It depends on the impact for their population that they will achieve. But one of the narratives that has come out of the reporting, which is really unfortunate and which I alluded to just before about one of the media outlets making a false statement –

The Chair: Could you tell me which outlet that is?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Bailiwick Express. They stated that the Liberation Day would never again be along the Town seafront. Now that is absolute nonsense, and I really am ... I personally feel quite aggrieved at the upset that that false statement, that false headline, has caused a lot of Guernsey people. If I had been one of those people just reading that headline, I would have been very upset if I had not have known better that it is absolutely not true to say. Because first of all, there will be events in St Peter Port this year, and every year, because we are putting formal events on. Secondly, money is going to the parish so there will be events. The parish may choose to do a sea front closure on a quinquennial, which is every fifth or tenth year, again as Mrs Keys has pointed out, we will be applying for funding to do a centralised event in Town.

There are polarised views on how Liberation Day should be celebrated and, certainly as a child, I do not recall central events going on in Town to the extent that they are these days and personally I have been involved in Liberation Day events in the background scenes probably between 10 and 15 years now. I know the sheer amount of work that goes into planning this and certainly, as a Committee Member, we have been concerned by the considerable expense that we pay for things like barriers. Just for barriers. That does not add – yes, it is safety for crowds coming in – but it does not add to the entertainment value of Liberation Day for the Islander coming into Town. But we also know that not every Islander wants to come into Town or can come into Town. And the accessibility of events, we want it to be much more inclusive so that many more Islanders can celebrate some of the more traditional things around Liberation Day, such as the Cavalcade which went down very well last year.

We also want to be able to ensure that our older residents in the Island are equally able to enjoy the experience of Liberation Day. Because of course they are the ones who have that direct experience of the Occupation and liberation and we have just a living memory of that through them. We are privileged to have that living memory from them and so we want to be able to ensure that all Islanders, not just some who can get into Town, who enjoy the more commercialised aspect of that or maybe going to the pub for a drink etc, or maybe just walking along the seafront. There are lots of benefits of having a centralised Town experience but there are also lots of benefits of having it decentralised in the individual parishes and we know that there was a spread of views, and this is what we want to try in this particular Committee. But to have stated that Liberation Day will never be along the Town sea front again was absolutely false and I deplore that type of reporting.

Deputy de Sausmarez: I think I am about to hand over actually to Deputy Fairclough.

Deputy Fairclough: Yes, thank you. Continuing the theme of focusing on other aspects of the Committee's mandate, sport and activity. There is an update on the Sports Commission's Action Plan, which shows clear strategic alignment with Active 8 – what is known as activate – and upwards into the Government Work Plan. Could this be considered to be a good example of a partnership arrangement, would you say?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Absolutely. The Sports Commission is amongst one of, I think, five or six commissioned relationships that we have, including the Youth Commission, Health Improvement Commission, Arts Commission – I am going to run out of them – (**Deputy Murray:** Language.) the Language Commission. The Sports Commission is an area that we fund the new Active 8 Plan, which is in its first year. If Mrs Keys can give us a little bit more information about the Active 8 Plan, I think that would be really helpful for listeners.

Mrs Keys: Yes, the States approved the Active 8 Plan, which included around about £1.1 million additional funding to go into sport over a three-year period. A very large percentage of that goes to the Guernsey Sports Commission to deliver specific projects. A smaller amount to the Health Improvement Commission, where the projects lay more within their skills and expertise. And then a small amount stays within Education, Sport & Culture again for some very specific projects.

Deputy Fairclough: Would you say that that is directly reaping benefits?

Mrs Keys: I would, except one of the problems that we do have, particularly around health and well-being, is measuring the success of particular programmes. It is very difficult to be able to say that that particular £30,000 spent in that area has delivered this specific health and well-being benefit. But I have to say, if you look at the Sports Commission's Plan – and they are a group of professional sports expertise and knowledge etc. that they have got along with Active 8 – and the Government Work Plan, you see the same themes throughout in terms of what it is we are trying to achieve.

Deputy Murray: I think there is another dimension to that too which is appropriate, I think, to our last conversation, which is on the LOC Campus, we had extensive involvement of the Sports Commission on the development of the sports facilities that are there. What that ensured was that we actually are looking for the opportunity for further community use, which would allow us at tournament level and so forth to have the right size of facilities. Because an audit, in fact, that the Sports Commission did for us across all of our settings and across the Island did indicate that a lot of the facilities we may have built in the past did not take into account the scope that we could actually achieve from them. So it felt very important that the Sports Commission had a lot of input on that particular project.

Deputy Fairclough: It is a very interesting point, Deputy Murray, and one that I was going to pick up on actually. So I will just jump to that point if I may. Therefore the question, can we assume that it will be a priority to ensure that the significant sporting facilities within the education estate will be made fit for purpose for community use and the access and booking of such facilities promoted and coordinated? Because I think you are absolutely right. In the past we have had promises that these would be community facilities and that has not necessarily borne fruit.

Deputy Murray: I think there are two aspects there. One is certainly, again through that audit, it was established that the booking aspect across the Island is a problem, that a centralised booking opportunity would be very helpful. Obviously, it is a challenge to achieve that but it really does need to happen that we can actually maximise the facilities. The second thing that came out was that, even though we have spent quite a lot of money on some facilities, they are not actually up to national standard in terms of being able to run national type tournaments. And so they do not have enough runoff space in some cases, for example, for some of the indoor ball games and so on.

That resonated with us, which is why we made sure that the new intent at the LOC Campus was up to that capability, basically. I believe the Sports Commission are quite happy that we might ... money is not endless. We have to make some compromises. But to make sure that we could use this beyond just the schools and educational use was very important.

995 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Absolutely. And the Sports Commission have actually undertaken an audit of Island-wide sports facilities because, as per the Active 8 Plan, ensuring that facilities are accessible and used by the community as well as by the school settings, if that is where they are sited, is really important.

1000 **Deputy Fairclough:** So can we have a reassurance from the Committee that liaison is taking place with the Sports Commission and others to ensure that we get the right facilities, not just for the school populations but also for the wider population as well.

Deputy Murray: Absolutely.

1005 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** It is happening now, so yes, you have our commitment that it has started and will be ongoing.

Deputy Fairclough: Okay, thank you.

1010 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Can I just come in off the back of that? Obviously, we are delighted to be hosting the Island Games. Is that a vehicle in itself for improving our, as Deputy Murray described them, sometimes substandard sporting facilities? Are we going to see specific improvements as a result, or working towards that?

1015 **Deputy Murray:** I think there is also private investment already going in in many respects as well, which obviously I think the Sports Commission have a better handle on than we do at this point. But they are obviously very aware of that as an event that we obviously have to try to drive towards. We are limited, to some extent, in what we already have. Beaucamps School, for example, has got a super pool there at this point and the difficulty there is not actually the size of the pool, it is actually the availability of lifeguards – or the equivalent whatever they are called these days –
1020 that we cannot maximise because we do not have, necessarily, the trained individuals to be able to make the best use of that. So it is not purely just the size of the premises, you have to have the skill. That is where the Sports Commission's ability to step in and help us is really beneficial.

1025 **Mrs Keys:** I think it is possibly worth mentioning as well that, on top of the funding that the States put into the Island Games, that funding was matched by private sponsorship. But I would also say and then some because we had additional sponsors come forward after the main sponsorship had closed. And some of those we have put into partnership with particular sports and said, well you cannot join as a main sponsor now but what you can do is go and assist this sport with a particular piece of equipment that they need or a particular refurb that they need. Unlike the
1030 2003 Island Games, there will not be one big sporting facility that we look back on and say that is a legacy but there will be improvements across a number of facilities.

1035 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Thank you. And what major sporting policy initiative does the Committee hope to introduce this political term?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: The Active 8 is the major sporting policy initiative. Obviously, we feed into other Committee mandates and Economic Development is undertaking a Tourism Plan and there is obviously an awful lot more that needs to be done with sports tourism. Whilst directly we need to ensure that we are supporting the Active 8 overarching policy before we start to try and
1040 introduce new which may not fit into that. So I would suggest that anything other than the Active 8 and feeding into the Tourism Strategy for the sports tourism will be the extent of the policy initiatives for this term. To support those, make sure that they are embedded and that they are very strong because they are long-lasting and overarching policies, both of those.

1045 **Deputy Murray:** I think another aspect that is quite important too is the TGI will be introducing a sports degree so that we can (**Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Thank you.) train individuals locally. And that is really quite important that we can grow our own in that regard, because they can assist much more easily than having to either import or take people across the water.

1050 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Did I misunderstand your question? I am sorry.

Deputy Murray: It was just in terms of our investment –

1055 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** No, I am just thinking was there anything else that you were expecting me to say?

Deputy de Sausmarez: No, I was just asking whether you are planning to introduce any major policy initiatives on sport this political term?

1060 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** The Active 8 was only just introduced in August 2020, it was approved. So that is still pretty new and, unfortunately, we have had a nasty old COVID, which means that these initiatives are still almost bedding in. We have not been able to race ahead with those with the speed that we wanted to. But yes, there we go.

1065 **The Chair:** Ms Ruddy, I think you have got a question on arts and culture.

Ms Ruddy: Yes. In your updates to the States you have made several references to an arts policy being on the way or being developed. Can you tell us where we are with that?

1070 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** Yes, the Arts Commission is another commissioned body that sits within the mandate of the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and is headed by Stephen Ainsworth. The Arts Commission has for some time been looking at itself and its delivery of States' policy and the arts strategy, when I originally sat on the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture last term, it was something that was in the offing and was very nascent as an idea there. It has gained an awful lot of momentum and is now underway. I will ask Mrs Keys to update us on the progress of that.

1080 **Mrs Keys:** Yes, the Arts Commission would not mind me saying that they have in front of them at the moment what they are calling an exposure draft, which is a draft that they want to go back to – and they are currently talking with some of the major partners that they worked with in putting the strategy together – so not completely public at this stage. But just to confirm, and one of the things the Committee has asked them to confirm, is to ensure that they have done a gap analysis, that there is nothing missing.

1085 There is the age-old issue of the resource requirements for it and that is what the Committee are grasping with at the moment, is an understanding of what it is that the arts strategy will need in terms of resources and how we might deliver those. So we have been having some conversations with them about how we can be a bit more creative, so that when they say we need these three new roles, we are saying well, actually, could that role be done or funded through a foundation? Could that role be combined with another role that we already have? So we could try and give them a bit more flexibility. But they have got the creative six, which are the six objectives.

1090 The final one of those is securing increased and sustainable funding for the arts, so it is a bit of a chicken and an egg situation in that. Part of the idea of the strategy is to help people understand the value of the arts and the value of investment in the arts – and that includes Government, of course – in order to be able to generate more and more.

1095 **Ms Ruddy:** So they have a draft of the strategy document?

Mrs Keys: They have a draft that they are sitting on as we speak but sharing it, as I say, with a small group of people that were involved at the beginning, which was a year and a half ago – well, no, in fact given COVID, two and a half years ago now – that they began that consultation.

1100

Ms Ruddy: How do you feel about the fact that it has taken them a year and a half, or two years to come up with a strategy document? When at the same time we have got all these very exciting initiatives going on in the private sector and you mentioned about sports supporting tourism and obviously, as I am sure you are aware, they are very keen to support tourism initiatives with their work with Renoir and the new exhibition space. Do you not find it is, a little bit, throwing our Arts Commission into the shadow somewhat?

1105

Mrs Keys: I think what I would be keen to point out is that the first part of the work was rebuilding the Arts Commission. So they have got an entirely new one, nearly an entirely new set of Commissioners in place now. Directors completely reviewed all of their governance arrangements with them as well. But when you look at their strategy, it is part of their business planning as well. So they have not just been doing that, they have been getting on with other things. But you raise a good point because Art for Guernsey's relationship is key in all of that and that is one of the reasons why the Committee has asked them to go back with their draft to the likes of those organisations to say, does this cover what you would expect it to?

1110

1115

Ms Ruddy: Do you feel it is really delivering value for money, the Arts Commission, at all?

Mrs Keys: The Committee puts in about £130,000, which is not a lot. So in terms of what it delivers for the small amount of States' funding that goes into it, I think it is delivering value for money. It is very reliant on volunteers, as a lot of areas across the Committee are. Very reliant on private sponsorship as well. But in terms of what the community gets for what taxpayers are paying for it, I think it does bring good value for money.

1120

Ms Ruddy: As you say, £130,000 is not a huge amount of money in terms of the bigger scheme. But obviously if you were to give £130,000 to, say, the Guernsey Photography Festival or the Literary Festival, that would be a significant sum of money for them on an annual basis. Bearing that in mind, do you still feel we are getting value for money?

1125

Mrs Keys: Yes, and £50,000 of that funding is given out to other organisations. So the Literary Festival benefits from funding from the States separately, including from Economic Development. The Photography Festival does as well and when it works in partnership with us with our museums hats on. So that is not the only money that goes into the arts, but they also manage the programme of grants that gets fed out.

1130

1135

Ms Ruddy: Sorry, could I just ask Deputy Dudley-Owen if there is any major arts initiative you would like to introduce during your term?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: As the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and moving ... and I was just looking at my pack about commissioned services, actually, because I think this starts to raise an interesting question around how we actually commission various organisations to deliver public services for us. Do I think that as politicians we should be introducing specific initiatives delivering specific projects which are probably more operational? No, I do not. I do not think that, for example, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture should be saying, we have got a brilliant idea actually, let's bring over an artist in residence this year and install them in a States' property etc. I would much rather see other organisations doing that level.

1140

1145

If we are talking about saying we want Guernsey to have much wider, more prominent exposure to famous artists or for our young people to be able to enjoy, to get invigorated by, to be able to

1150 share learning from, networking from, then actually a solution to that could be an artist in residence.
But do I, as the President of Education, Sport & Culture, think that we as a Committee should spend
time planning that and thinking about it? No, I do not. I think we need to come up with a high-level
strategy. If we are paying money to a commissioned organisation or to a private organisation such
as a charity to deliver those, those are the type of ideas I want them to come up with in order to
1155 solve the policy dilemma of, okay how do we increase our exposure for international artists and for
our young people and our community to be able to benefit from it?

It is an interesting conversation that you have just had with Natasha around do we think that we
are getting value for money. I would argue that, if we are holding our commissioned services so
tightly that we are actually starting to deliver the plans for them, then we are not getting value for
money.

1160 **Ms Ruddy:** So do you feel it is your job as a Committee to decide the strategy and then –?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Correct.

1165 **Ms Ruddy:** But you do not have the strategy. You have been waiting for the Commission for
two years to produce the strategy.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I think that that is an indication of potentially how closely those
commissioned services have been held by political Committees in the past. And this is a political
1170 Committee that wants to start to push those commissioned services away to say, actually, we are
commissioning you to do that job, so you need to now go away and do that. The journey that the
Arts Commission has been on in terms of reforming itself having a complete change of
commissioners as it has done a refreshed and relaunched website, starting to look at a strategy of
how it is going to operate and how it is going to deliver on States' policy and strategy, the
1175 overarching vision, is absolutely the right thing to do. If we are constantly constraining these
organisations and I am giving them the plan that we are asking them to work up, then we are not
allowing them to prove value for money with taxpayers' money.

The Chair: Thank you, Deputy Dudley-Owen –

1180 **Deputy Murray:** I think we just need to remind ourselves that in the Government Work Plan
there is a new look at commissioned services across the piste, not just in ESC, to ensure that we are
getting value for money and what the service level agreements should look like. I think it is
something that is under review at this point.

1185 **The Chair:** Yes, I hear what you said on those responses about central control, and it brings to
mind a question, when does the Committee envisage that schools will be managed locally,
independent from central control?

1190 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** That is a very interesting question and one that I am not surprised has
come up. Governance, as it is commonly known, is a very interesting subject for us and one that we
are heavily involved in looking at. We need to be clear about what we are actually talking about
though. In terms of local management of schools, I wonder, Deputy Burford, would you be able to
elaborate in terms of exactly what you mean by that?

1195 **The Chair:** I am quite sure there are varying degrees of it but I would be much more interested
in hearing the Committee's plans for the future.

1200 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** As we have already stated in, I think, previous question time, actually,
for the States just before Christmas in response to Deputy St Pier's questions, the Committee is

undertaking some so-called on-the-job training in regard to governance of our schools. It is one of our responsibilities as the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture to undertake the job as of governors of our local settings. As Elizabeth College has a board of governors, as Blanchelande, as Ladies' College have a board of governors.

1205 I have difficulty in recalling – I have only been in the States for one term before this – but I do have difficulty in recalling a previous political board that undertook the job visibly as school governors. And it is quite some undertaking given the amount of schools that we have in the primary and secondary and also post-16 settings that we have. This particular Committee is looking at our role of governors at the same time as undertaking a governing role, which is holding our
1210 head teachers to account for the delivery of the services in schools, which is delivery of education. It is absolutely the right thing to do.

Until we have done that ourselves, we cannot then start to say with any accuracy or any certainty how devolved governance would work in the Guernsey context. Deputy Burford, you have used that interesting term 'local management of schools' and that is a very English term, because this is an
1215 English framework for devolution of governance to UK schools. I would argue quite strongly that that is not going to work in the Guernsey context because our education system is quite unique and it is different from the UK. We have a different way of working and I will ask our Director of Education to pop in shortly in response to this question.

We also need to look at what actually we are seeking to devolve because there are all the nuts and bolts, the hard nuts and bolts, of running a school such as facilities, human resources, budget, and also financial management, amongst other areas that we could be devolving governance for, IT. But actually the States has gone through an exercise of centralising all of those services. So we no longer have an IT service provider embedded within Education, Sport & Culture or our own Education, Sport & Culture HR team like we used to. That has all gone into P&R into a central
1220 function which we then sort of so-called 'buy back' in the Committee.

Are we thinking that we would then give that to our schools? For example, an HR specialist. Would we have one embedded within each school so that a head teacher could call upon their own HR specialist if they are dealing with maternity leave, or staff issues, or recruitment, or staff exiting? Is that what we are looking for? Do we need a bursar for every single school for financial
1230 management and budgeting purposes? Do we need embedded IT within every single school? Because if that is what we are talking about, we suddenly look at a very new level of expenditure and starting to move away from a States' policy that we have been working on for quite some time, to make services more efficient by centralising them.

That is the hard nuts and bolts of governance, and we have to argue, is that going to impact our child in the classroom in a favourable, positive and constructive way? Because if it does not, then you will have to ask yourself, why are we doing that? If it does, then we will say excellent, we will do that very quickly and we would like more of it, thank you. The other side that we have to look at is cultural governance and that actually is something that is already started. Because this Committee is very keen that head teachers are empowered. They are empowered to run their own schools, to
1240 be able to look at their own values and their ethos and the cultural identity of their school which is unique to each school.

Beaucamps is different from Sampson's which is different from La Mare de Carteret which is different from the Grammar at the Varendes site. We must appreciate that. And each of those head teachers wants to be able to run those schools and to be able to determine the culture, the values, the principles, things that are important to that particular school, and that is very important to us. Through the Secondary School Partnership we can actually facilitate that, encourage that and ensure that that grows. Devolution of cultural governance is something that the Committee is very keen on and has started already because we do not want to dictate what is important in the school setting. We think that that is not correct. But in terms of the nuts and bolts and the hard stuff that
1250 we often talk about, the everyday running and administration of the schools, we need to work very carefully to ensure that that is actually what head teachers and their senior leadership teams want.

Do they want to be running the school in that way, dealing with the budget, the financial management, the human resourcing, the IT, the facilities management, all at their level? Or do we want a hybrid? Or do we want to continue as we are? And that is the journey that we are currently on as governance. I think that I would like to hand over to Mr Hynes at this stage to bring in some of his personal experience as well in this issue.

Mr Hynes: Thank you.

I think the Education Strategy, as I said before, does highlight that one of the key areas is about outstanding leadership and governance. And one of the things we want to make sure that we are doing as an education system and also through the Committee is about, as Deputy Dudley-Owen said, empowering our leaders to lead. We want them to have the autonomy to be able to make those decisions around what needs to happen in the school with regard to improving and developing systems that can enable those children and young people to have excellent outcomes. That is against the framework of support, challenge and monitoring, which is done through the Education Office but then also through the work that the Committee have undertaken to understanding what their governance role might be with regard to the Committee.

I think when you are thinking about the delegation of funds, which is not necessarily about the delegation of autonomy and the decision making to be taken, small jurisdictions such as Guernsey need to be quite careful about to what extent they are willing and able to delegate appropriate funds to make a difference in each school without leaving some central services without the sufficient amount of money and resource to deliver services across the whole piste. As soon as you start thinking about some of that delegation from a central service point of view, it does mean that some smaller schools may not be able to access some of the services they were previously if you are looking at a pro rata delegation.

So we need to make sure that any delegated model financially in the future needs to be proportionate to maintain some of those services that schools need to access centrally, as well as thinking about what finances and what services they are able to manage from within their local environment to have an impact on the teaching, learning and outcomes of young people.

The Chair: Can I go now – sorry, Deputy de Sausmarez.

Deputy de Sausmarez: As we have brought up the Education Strategy again – I know we have touched on it before, but as you say it is a very important subject – in Deputy Dudley-Owen's general update in May last year she stressed that, in introducing actually the topic of the Education Strategy, that – and this is a quote – 'it is for this Assembly to make strategic policy decisions and then empower our public servants to deliver those policies at an operational level'. But we have also heard that there is no intention to bring the Education Strategy to the States' Assembly to agree that strategic direction. I was just interested to understand why not.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: You are absolutely correct there, Deputy de Sausmarez, the Committee do not have an intention to bring the Education Strategy to the States of Deliberation for approval and the reason for that is because not all state strategies go to the States for approval. The Digital Telecoms Strategy did not go to the States for approval and no extra funding is being sought from the States to support the Education Strategy. We are looking to ensure that this is funded through existing budget. It is interesting because I think that Deputies maybe forget that they actually did have an input into the Education Strategy.

In December 2019, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture invited Deputies, I think probably for the first together event that a Committee had hosted to the St Peter Port school site for a workshop, where we discussed the future model of education, the review that was going on, but we also elicited opinion from Deputies and their feedback from that workshop on the principles of our Education Strategy. The Committee then took that feedback and fed it into its own deliberations alongside deliberations from our senior leaders within school settings and obviously

senior officers within the Education Office. The result of that, the direct output, is the Strategy on a page which people can see and download from gov.gg and has been publicised by the Committee.

The underlying plans that come underneath each of those four commitments are being worked up by staff and Nick has already alluded to how that is being done. We are really proud that that is being done in a collaborative way and that ownership of those underlying plans has been given to school staff, which are the same people who will be delivering those plans as well. I cannot think, really, of a more unfortunate scenario where we took that Education Strategy with underlying plans into the Assembly for not just debate, because you do not just debate it and approve it or deny it, we also have the ability to change it quite considerably, but we would not have had the opportunity because there is an operational underlying plan.

So I would query whether States' Deputies are the right people to be amending, delaying or changing considerably or denying operational plans worked up by the very people who are going to be delivering them.

Deputy de Sausmarez: The operational plans are one thing. In your own words, it is for this Assembly to make strategic policy decisions. So why is something as monumentally important as surely the cornerstone of our education proposition not being brought to the States' Assembly when previous strategies always have been? I think the last one was in 2015.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I think it is interesting also that the States of Deliberation delegated function to five States' Members to sit on the Education, Sport & Culture Committee to lead that Committee and to provide strategic oversight. And that is exactly what we have done with this Education Strategy. So not all work needs to be taken to the States of Deliberation, otherwise we might really as well dispense with our Committee system and have all of the business of Committees pulled into the States on a regular basis and sit in Committee most days. I think we would have to do that.

There has to be an acceptance that delegated function ... I know that this particular Committee is under a huge amount of scrutiny and just in compiling the work for this particular Scrutiny hearing, looking at the amount of questions that we have been asked in an 18-month period, we have probably had more than the Policy & Resources Committee. You, yourself, Deputy de Sausmarez, have asked a lot of questions of us and Deputy St Pier. I actually welcome that because it gives us an opportunity to tell a story and to be able to talk about the really good work that we are doing and to be able to demonstrate the openness and transparency with which we wish to operate.

Sometimes questions do not always come at the right time because you want to be able to put the responses in context against other good work that you are doing, or it might be sensitive information, or some people might not have been told before others and you do not want to wrong foot people. But we always are quite pleased to respond to questions. But the interest, sometimes, in the Committee's mandate, I think, could be forgiven for wanting to micromanage the Committee's mandate. I would argue, if we want to start to step into Committee mandates to the extent that a strategy such as the Education Strategy, which has been worked up in consultation with States' Members, having to then come to the States for approval, amendment, sursis motivé etc. and all the other tools at our disposal for good democracy, would be actually a pretty sad day for education when we have gifted the underlying strategy to our staff members to work up in collaboration and to execute.

Ms Ruddy: Deputy Dudley-Owen, do you think your States' colleagues would be comfortable with the fact that the Education Strategy makes no reference to academic achievement or monitoring thereof?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Actually it does, Ms Ruddy. We are looking at ... if we look through our Education Strategy and we are ensuring that our education system equips learners with the right

balance of knowledge and skills so that they are able to succeed. We are looking at consistently high quality of support. We are looking at early intervention approaches. We are looking through –

Ms Ruddy: Normally an Education Strategy would have specifically academic achievement as a cornerstone with ways of monitoring that because it is not easy to monitor evidence-informed workforce. It is very surprising to me that there is no specific reference to academic achievements and monitoring thereof.

Deputy Dudley-Owen: I will hand this over to our Director of Education.

Mr Hynes: We are already duty-bound to report end of Key Stage results, examination results, as we do on an annual basis. I think we do have key reporting data, quantitative and qualitative, that we report on an annual basis. I think the Education Strategy is a way of also making sure that we are not missing out on some of those reporting workstreams. We report annually on level two GCSE results, post-16 results, A-Level, BTEC and then your level three results at that stage, end of Key Stage 2 results.

We are currently putting together a new assessment policy which will be looking at how we can make sure that we are not just reporting outcomes for reporting's sake, but that internally we are looking to see how we are using that data to challenge and think about what we need to do to move learning forwards. So we already have the same qualitative data and quantitative data that we report on an annual basis in line with other jurisdictions. I think what the Education Strategy will do will be to align very carefully those KPIs we are already reporting on against those commitments, so it is really clear about where that evidence stream is.

I think, as a result of the Educational Strategy and those commitments, it is likely that we will have other key performance indicators tied in there in addition to the ones we are already reporting on to be able to give that clarity to the Committee to demonstrate where there are other areas that we know we need to improve upon.

The Chair: I would like to hand over to Deputy Fairclough now because I think he has a few outstanding questions before we wrap up.

Deputy Fairclough: Yes, thank you.

I would like to focus for a moment on the provision for special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). Has a clear SEND strategy been developed alongside the secondary school reorganisation?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: Thank you, Deputy Fairclough.

We received, the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture, the SEND Review, which was undertaken by a commissioned body, NASEN earlier in 2021. I think it was April or May, wasn't it? We were given 18 recommendations, all of which we embraced in the Committee. We have recently received a progress update on those recommendations in terms of where we are with those in a rag rating, in terms of whether they have started or whether they have been completed etc. We are also being supported, which I am very pleased about. We have had support expressed from specific members of other Committees where those Committees touch on this particular area, such as Employment & Social Security and also Health & Social Care as well as P&R, so that we have political support for ensuring that the SEND Review is implemented to its fullest extent. If I hand over to our Director of Education who –

Deputy Fairclough: Just before you do that, Deputy Dudley-Owen, could you share with us the results of that assessment or analysis, of your progress against those 18 recommendations?

Deputy Dudley-Owen: If I can hand over because actually Nick was our Director of Inclusion, so this was actually his area. I think that, operationally, this would be more meaningful if Nick was able to respond to you there.

1410 **Mr Hynes:** Yes. Of the 18 recommendations, we started really quickly to put a plan in place about how we are going to meet each of those, and we shared the recommendations obviously with the Committee for Education, Sport & Culture and had two substantial discussions around that with colleagues from NASEN to really unpick what those recommendations meant and essentially what the outcomes and improved outcomes for children and young people would be by implementing those. Because I think it is really important when we have any review to really understand what the impact is going to be as a result of doing those.

1415 We have got a working group who look at the recommendations and lead Members, or lead officers, for each of the 18 different recommendations. We have completed some of them already within some of the timeframes and do have other substantive ones which are ongoing, but we are working against each of those recommendations at the moment. There are probably three of those which are dependent about how closely we can work with other Committee areas, and we have had commitment from those Committees, including Employment & Social Security, Health & Social Care, where our work entwines really closely with them, such as looking at the provision for children with special educational needs from 0 to 25, as opposed to 5 to 19 as we do at the moment. Looking at how we can integrate and ensure not just better value for money but better services for our children, young people and their families through a children's services type approach, and how we might be able to integrate some of those services to work closely together.

1420 Some of that work is already taking place and has taken place historically around areas such as early years, where we have some integrated teams already in place with Health & Social Care colleagues and Education colleagues working really closely from pre-school age through into primary schools.

1430 **Deputy Fairclough:** Which particular areas are still outstanding or red rated, then, using that rag rating that has been referred to?

1435 **Mr Hynes:** At the moment there are the outstanding areas we need to now focus on over the next couple of months, as we are getting a working group together to look more closely specifically at the two areas of what 0 to 25 looks like with regard to children with special educational needs and disabilities, and also how we would work closely together with those other Committees on a more formal basis to look at how some of the services that we have within Education and services included within Health & Social Care might be integrated or work together better for those children and young people.

1440 That piece of work is quite a large piece of work because it looks at breaking down some of those barriers which might be in place at the moment from a Committee point of view to break them down at an officer point of view so we can ensure that duplication is not in place, single plans can be looked at and resources can be used better.

1445 **Deputy de Sausmarez:** Can I ask a quick question on that issue of resources? I am just hoping for a little bit of clarification. In Deputy Dudley-Owen's speech during the Budget debate, she explained that the budget for secondary schools had been reduced by £2,000 and £10,000 and a very similar sum, £2,000 and £15,000, was being added to the budget for special schools and SEND support. Is that one of the funding mechanisms that is being used to implement the recommendations of the NASEN?

1455 **Mr Hynes:** At the moment the only substantive funding that we have received, which is additional, was through the Government Work Plan where we have managed to ensure that there is a full-time pro rata SENCO in each of our primary schools and that is already starting to have a

significant impact on how we can support children and young people within the primary schools. The piece of work we need to do to see whether there are any other resource implications, in particular around how we support children and young people, needs to be completed through some of the work we need to do about integration of services and how we work together.

I think the Committee would be looking at ... obviously whenever we are looking to make, or are able to make, any efficiency savings and reinvesting back into the priority areas that we have identified as part of the Government Work Plan but also as part of some of the commitments that we have got through the strategies. So we know that, for example, there are financial pressures always on supporting specific young people with additional needs within the mainstream school and I know that the full-time SENCO posts are supporting that already. But where we are able to make savings across different areas within the special education needs inclusion area and any of the other areas, we are looking to see if we can redirect some of those funds to support those areas which are under the most strain at the moment. Some are COVID related because some of our more vulnerable children have become more vulnerable and some are because we know there is an ongoing resource we need to look at.

Deputy Murray: Can I just make a general point? Because I had to pick up on something that Deputy de Sausmarez said. Unless you are involved in the education system, the nuances that actually sit under some of these headings is probably unknown to most people and one of the surprising things that I have actually found coming in with no real previous experience – as most people, I went through the system, but that was years ago – and it is very significant, I think, that the SEND proportion of children that we have or students that we have is about 25%. That is very high, but within that – and I think this is the significant point – uniform-allowance children, which is about the only measure of poverty that we actually have, are significantly represented within that.

That is an issue because that is a societal issue at this point in time. So when we are talking about allocation resources, we need to think quite carefully about where we want to invest resources as an Island because that just gets worse. As they go through the system it puts more pressure on our system, they do not fulfil their true potential. It really is something that we have to get to grips with because this is very difficult, and it is not something that we want to talk about. Poverty does exist in this Island, and we can see a direct result of it in terms of the lack of literacy and numeracy with children actually entering the system that we then have to obviously spend more time and effort trying to bring them up to speed. And they are not realising their full potential as a consequence. So I think this is something that we really do need, as an Assembly, to be thinking about in the fullness of time.

Deputy Fairclough: Sorry, just a final point on this then, Deputy Murray, because I think this has raised an interesting issue. How do you overcome that friction that Mr Hynes has talked about in terms of integrating these services across Committees, potentially? What is the answer here?

Deputy Murray: That is a – sorry –

Deputy Dudley-Owen: This is where we went out very quickly and we presented the SEND Review to other Committees where we felt our Committees had mandates which were touching each other and had those cross points. Ensuring that we had a political champion from those particular Committees who were going to work with us in order to try and not just implement these recommendations but also to understand more the complex issues surrounding this particular area when they were making decisions that would touch on our mandate as well.

Also, again going back to those webinars, that really important piece of all States' Members making sure that they are sufficiently well informed about our mandate because we are at the sharp end of delivery and making sure ... really, it is with us here, with Education, that the future success of our Island sits. Because if we cannot get it right for our children, who really only have one shot at the education game through their lives, that the success of the Island is predicated on whether

1510 those children are able to get good, excellent outcomes going forward. Actually, to speak to Ms Ruddy's point around the academic success or otherwise, academic success is important for this Committee but well-rounded citizens who have good skills acquisition is equally important as well. Confident individuals who are able to carry this Island forward. I think that that is an important point to make.

1515

The Chair: Thank you. I am afraid we are rather running out of time, if not out of questions. But just to wrap up, one question which I would imagine will have a very short answer, when will we see a new Education Law to replace the existing one which is over 50 years old?

1520

Deputy Dudley-Owen: It is stated before the end of the term to be presented to the States. Replace the Education Law project is 2023 in the Government Work Plan, replacing the Education Law Ordinances in 2024 and implementation at end of 2025.

1525 **The Chair:** Can I ask, to finally wrap up, there is a growing home education community in Guernsey. Can you confirm that the Committee and the new Law will continue to support the rights of parents and guardians to continue to educate their children at home without undue interference from the States?

1530 **Deputy Dudley-Owen:** That is certainly a direction that has been drafted already into the policies that we are looking at and certainly ... I do not think the Committee has actually looked at that particular area. Personally I am very supportive of that, and I hope that my colleagues would be too.

1535 **The Chair:** Okay. Thank you very much. I think we have to close because I think we have two Members who have to get to another important meeting. Thank you to all the witnesses for attending and increasing the public awareness and understanding of the work done by Education, Sport & Culture and thank you to the members of the media and to all of those who watched on the livestream. And again, apologies for the gremlins at the start of that. Scrutiny undertakes regular public hearings with all the Principal Committees to increase public understanding of key areas of Government and to enhance openness and transparency.

1540

Thank you again to everybody else and the meeting is now closed.

The Committee adjourned at 12.05 a.m.