Dear ESC,

We are sure you are aware that on February 2nd People Power Guernsey organised a March in which we invited members of the public to show their concerns with regard the current plans for a 1 School on 2 site model. It has always been People Power Guernsey’s aim to act as a voice for those who feel they are not being heard or are scared to speak out as a loan voice. You will have seen that thousands turned up on a cold and wet February afternoon to have their voices heard.

Since February 2nd we have been made aware of a number of concerns regarding the proposed one school two site model and would hope that you would be able to clarify some points for the parents, carers, grandparents, students, professionals and the general public who have taken their time to write to us with their concerns. Unfortunately the list is fairly long but hopefully you will have all the answers to hand. With a debate taking place next week with regard to the future education system it is extremely important that all the facts are known and questions are answered.

We also hope you understand that the questions are coming from us because many individuals in government employment feel unable to ask them because of their roles, but they are even more important as many of them understand the education system better than us.

In the interests of transparency we have copied in all deputies and the media into this e-mail and will also post the e-mail on our social media site and likewise once we have your responses we shall post those.

May we thank you for your time in answering the concerns below:

Thank you.

People Power Guernsey

1) It is unclear how the vertical tutor groups will work in the two site model. Please could you clarify:

A) How many students there will be in each vertical tutor group?

B) Whereabouts in each site will the vertical tutor groups be able to meet as there is no designated space for the students?

2) Do you agree that the profession supported the initial two site model when it was proposed as it was better than the current committee’s three school and post 16 proposals?

3) Do you agree that there are other three school models with alternative post 16 arrangements which would not impact progress with the development the Guernsey Institute?

4) Please could you explain how the proposed enrichment programme is intended to work?

5) It is understood that there will be 60 sessions at each site, so 120 each week and you are expecting 30% of these to be provided by external providers. So you will need 36 external providers each week.

A) Are these assumptions correct?

B) How confident are you that you can provide this content and provide engaging content that the students want?

C) What is the anticipated cost of this enrichment programme?

6) Would you agree that the best schools achieve great outcomes for their students because the school day is simple and allows for innovation and creativity in the school day?

7) Would you agree that the school day in your model is complex as opposed?

8) Please could you outline the benefits to the young people from the current enrichment programme as it is difficult to identify the incremental benefit?

9) Do you agree that the majority of the enrichment programme is going to be class room based? If not please could you explain your reasoning?

10) Please could you explain in simple terms how the lunchtime sessions will work on a daily basis? Is it reasonable to assume that the students will have around 20 minutes each to eat?

11) Please could you explain the difference in facilities for sixth form independent study in the current and models?

12) The current Sixth form gives students a silent room, monitored area and sixth form area space.  The new schools have these areas as corridors and through fares. Can you explain how the two site model will improve the facilities for students?

13) Please can you describe how the Committee obtained views of the students and young people in the design of the two sites?

14) What evidence do you have that the young people support the two site model?

15) Are you able to provide a comparison of students key stage 4 options for 2020/21 compared with 2019/20?

16) Please could you show what post 16 options will be available for the students in your new model and is with any differences with the current t offering at the single sixth form?

17) How is the Committee intending to protect the mental health and well being of students and staff in the new model given the diminished space available and longer, more intense working day?

18) How much more money, do you think the States would have to spend on traffic arrangements

19) Would more space include purpose built six calm areas, both for independent study and a common area as current, and at all the islands granted colleges that do not need to be shared with lower school.

20) Why is it acceptable to allow the islands excellent provision at Key Stage 5 to be the casualty of the one school plan...?

21) How does the provision of more space address the reduced choice and provision of courses?

22) How does the provision of more space address the potential need to travel?

23) The one school model creation of these failings is certainly one way of achieving equality of opportunity for all students in States education system.  Is your Committee’s intention to give all State’ students a far poorer deal than private college students? It will simply have an adverse effect on their life chances and widen the social gap for generations.

24) What plans are in place to appoint a new Director of Education?

25) When will this post be advertised?

26) What steps are being taken to avoid further reputational damage to such senior appointments?

27) Many people do not understand why the Committee dismisses the current site at Footes Lane as an educational establishment.  The Committee has not provided any evidence to support its arguments other than wild hyperbole.  Please could you provide independent evidence to support your arguments as to why Footes Lane has been dismissed?

28) The Committee is supportive of the Children and Young People’s Plan and the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child.  Does the Committee agree that in this critical decision for education the youth voice is critical?

29) Please could the Committee provide details of all engagement with students and young people in helping to formulate the plans?

30) Please could you provide total teaching staff turnover for secondary education for the last academic years?

31) Please could you provide the number of applicants in secondary education against the number of vacancies by subject area for the past five years?

32) Please could you provide a detailed breakdown of the £4m expenditure to date?

32) If you are now suggesting a return to the States to add additional areas to the new schools, how do you propose doing this without first creating a two site master plan and cost plan which may require major revisions and delay to your current published site plans? Or are you simply deferring the decision to the States in the future, which they can do in any event which makes the Amendment to the Requete pointless and simply a wrecking tactic?

33) Why were dedicated areas for Sixth Formers' social and study areas not included in the Site plans, especially are they are a clear requirement in Building Bulletin 103 which you used as a source document?

34) Did the Committee "value engineer" them out?

35) Was it a conscious decision to exclude the social areas or was it just not spotted that they were missing?

36) How will you determine which sites offer which subjects at Year 11 and Sixth Form level?

37) What is the curriculum and qualification offer you are considering offering to Sixth Form students in both 11-18 schools?

38) You must have decided earlier how it would be split, otherwise you could not have finalised the specialist room requirements-or did you?

39) How many additional Food Technology and Art, Craft, Design and Technology rooms are you adding to both sites in light of increasing your school cohorts to more than double the current numbers?

40) Who were your stakeholder consultees when you were formulating the plans for the sites?

41) Who decided which classroom areas in the two schools were to be below the minimum areas specified in the English Bulletin 103?

42) Do you consider there is any risk, for example, in putting science subjects in rooms originally sized for general classroom subjects like English and Maths?

43) Have you published your curriculum models showing which subjects and year groups you intend to use setting in?

44) Have you published your range of option choices for Years 10 and 11 in each school?

45) What will be your minimum class size in order for a subject to run?

46) Do you intend to offer the same range of subjects in Year 10 and 11 in each school?

47) Have you published your minimum participation requirements for all GCSE and A Level subjects and the IB?

48) Will minority subjects be protected?

49) Will sixth form students have a pastoral role with younger pupils in their vertical house settings?

50) Why have staff facilities been so depleted in each of the two schools from what they currently have and why do you consider it appropriate to reduce said staff facilities from those recommended in the English bulletins 103?

51) How can you justify the significant reduction in external play areas in both schools by claiming that it is compensated for by increased internal space?

52) Can you define what is available internally at break times and lunch hours which equates with the ability to get fresh air and exercise outside during the school day?

53) What steps is the Committee intending to put in place to support the emotional health and well being of the students and teachers during the transition to the new model and in light of the lengthening of the school day?

54) Please can you confirm the process and timeline for the review of the various business cases for the educational models.  Presumably, the previous committee’s proposals went through a business case process, and would have been reviewed when they were debated in 2018?

55) If so was this an Outline Business Case or Strategic Business Case?

56) How were there proposals approved if they were technically undeliverable – i.e. what was the point of the Review?

57) The current Committee’s initial plans were approved by the Assembly in 2018 presumably with neither a Strategic nor Outline Business Case?

58) Does this represent good governance?

59) If you think that this does represent good governance what is the point of P&R’s Capital Prioritisation and five case models?

60) Presumably once the States approved the one school model there was a Business Case prepared but there would have been no proper option appraisal to confirm that the one school two site model was appropriate and indeed the optimal solution? The answer had already been dictated by the States and again questions the States own governance arrangements.  Would you agree that this whole process was a fait au complete?

61) Who did the Committee commission to review the business case?  Did they have any educational knowledge and experience or was it simply a value for money assessment?

62) Why did the Project Assurance Review not raise any of the issues raised by the public, parents and teachers.

63) Please could you publish all the Project Assurance Reviews that have been completed for the one school two site model?

64) Would you agree that this whole exercise has made a complete mockery of the state, and capital prioritization process.  The states have been able to wholly disregard it in order to engineer the outcome that the Committee and Policy and Resources want to achieve.

65) There appears to be confusion about the key impetus for the transformation; improving educational outcomes, improving educational experience, or saving money? This seems to be a constantly moving boundary.  Please could you state unequivocally which it is?

66)  Some staff are questioning why has any money been spent on this before every student in every school has a fully qualified subject specialist teacher in every core subject?

67) Why is it not a measure of success for either Head Teachers, or the ESC, or for HR that this is attained?

68) Why does HR appoint teachers who are not subject qualified?

69) Is it true that teachers who have falsified their application data have been retained?

70) If ESC is  "listening to teachers", why is the employer giving formal warnings and employing other bullying / pressuring tactics to stop teachers from giving their views to deputies or sharing concerns with each other?

71) Does ESC believe its team has the requisite skills and experience to deliver this project?  Do you have the right people in the right roles?

72) What is the cost of IB per student qualification relative to A level? Why does the 6th form offer mixed qualifications without reliable and extensive initial information as to the acceptability of these to Universities / specific courses? Why does it not facilitate the BMAT or the UKCAT, particularly when the IB /A level combination of qualifications appears to be less acceptable to universities in Europe than those in the UK?

73) How will splitting the sixth form improve the  breadth of what is offered, especially considering that the argument for a larger school is that combination will bring increased offer for 11-16?

74)  What is the current student spend at each of the High Schools and Grammar School?

75) Please could you create a facility for all questions raised by staff to be shared with all answers provided in a full and transparent manner?