



## **REMEMBERING ROGER KAY, AGAIN: ENDOWMENT AND CONSTITUTION IN THE PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE OF THE BURY GRAMMAR SCHOOLS**

Geoffrey Wandesforde-Smith\*  
University of California  
April, 2013

### **Introduction**

Roger Kay (1663-1731) is an iconic figure in the history of Bury Grammar School, the most iconic figure I would say. If it were not for Kay's generous endowment early in eighteenth century, and the keenness of the constitutional vision he had at that time for how his bequest should be used, there would today be no School.

In 1976, on the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Kay's creation of the endowment with which he re-founded a School that dates from the 1570s, a commemorative book was published. Kay was born in September 1663. So, 2013 is another Kay milestone, the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of his birth year and, thus, a fitting time to recall and reappraise his legacy, again.

The recent re-publication online of the 1976 book, which has long been out of print, is a convenient prompt for this. Although the reappearance of the book will not add to what we already know about the narrative history of the Schools, a subject that, save for one superb book length study by Ian Fallows, has received far too little

---

\* Emeritus Professor of Political Science, University of California, Davis, California. School Vice-Captain, 1961-62. Founder, the [Henry Dunster Society](#). The views presented are my own, although I have benefitted enormously from the comments and observations of many readers, all of whom shall remain anonymous but *all* of whom have been supportive of my raising the issues discussed, below. Some have commented on the corruptions I apparently sanction of words spelled properly only in Britain. That is not an important issue in a trans-Atlantic world and certainly not a battle I choose to fight on this turf. The re-published version of the 1976 book commemorating Roger Kay's 1726 re-founding and endowment of the School, a book of which I make good use, here, is accessible from the Henry Dunster Society website. Its Foreword makes clear that Henry Dunster and Roger Kay had a lot in common. The arms displayed are those of Henry Dunster (*in memoriam*), designed by me and registered in 2008. References are omitted in the interests of readability, although they are not many. The "literature," here, is thin.

attention, the opportunity to re-read the book does provoke fresh critical analysis of exactly why it is we are indebted to Roger Kay.

Everyone associated with Bury Grammar School knows the name of Roger Kay. He is celebrated every year on Founders' Day, on the first Friday in May in Bury Parish Church. His name attaches to the splendid central hall in the building completed in 1906 on Bridge Road in Bury, on land once belonging to the Earl of Derby, to house both the Boys' School and the Girls' School, each in its own wing. A portrait of Roger Kay hangs in the hall. And Roger Kay Scholarships have long been a mark of distinction for exceptional performance on the Schools' annual entrance examinations.

Behind these well-established associations with Kay's name, however, there lie much deeper and more profound reasons to think again about this eighteenth century man. And in this essay, which builds on the impeccable history of the life of Kay in the School history published by Fallows, as well as on the newly re-published book from 1976, I want to sketch out what these reasons are.

### **Roger Kay: Endowment and Constitution**

The original Bury Grammar School, where Kay himself was once a pupil, and from where he went up to St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1684, was founded towards the end of the sixteenth century, in or about 1570, and received its first substantial endowment from Henry Bury in 1634. Like several other grammar schools in the north-west of England, the School at Bury was an outgrowth of the education policy of the Tudor state. And as such it prospered for a time.

But the School fell on hard times in the latter part of the seventeenth century. It was the victim of protracted internal conflicts, rooted in religion, among the trustees or governors of the School, as well as extended litigation controversies stemming from disagreements among these same governors and Henry Bury's other legatees about money, family, property, and power. This early history is treated at great length and with superb sensitivity in Fallows's book, which is essentially the official school history, published in 2001.

Let us be clear. In 1726, Roger Kay, who spent most of his working life after he graduated from Cambridge as a cleric in Wiltshire, where he was the Rector of Fittleton, saved the School as it existed at the time, by endowing it with essentially all of his worldly wealth, which was very, very considerable – he was richer by far, Fallows tells us, than the richest man in Bury at the time -- and by writing at great length, more than ten thousand words, a new constitution, his indentures, for the governance of the School.

Kay was, thus, a remarkable philanthropist. But he was also a savvy constitutionalist. And looking back, it is hard to know whether Roger Kay should now be celebrated more as a financial benefactor of the School or as someone who cared greatly and thought deeply about how and by whom the School should be run, assuming

it had the money to stay in business. His real genius, it seems to me, is that he paid careful attention to both.

The critical importance of these issues, endowment and constitution, to the success of an independent school would have needed no rehearsal to Kay, or to his eighteenth century contemporaries. All schools at the time, and for much of the rest of English history, were independent. But, in the nearly three hundred years since Kay made his quite remarkably generous bequest, changes at Bury Grammar School and in the context in which it operates have tended, until very recently, to push these issues into the background, obscuring what ought to be a perpetually sharp and salient focus at any educational institution, including increasingly, these days, those still supported to a greater or lesser extent by the state, on the vital importance of endowment and constitution, and their interdependence.

The School did not grow substantially in size, for example, from the time Roger Kay made his 1726 bequest until the end of the nineteenth century, when it began to play a part in the general late Victorian expansion of education in Britain, heralded by W. E. Forster's Education Act of 1870, the first statute to demonstrate a public commitment to provision of education on a national scale, and by subsequent statutes providing also for secondary and technical education. This expansion went along with progressive extensions of the franchise, as the right to be educated came to be seen as an adjunct of the right to vote. There was pressure, too, from business and industry for a better educated workforce.

This was the context in which William Howlett became Headmaster in 1879. He stayed at the School until 1919, becoming the dominant intellectual and policy force behind a liberally expansive vision for the School – liberal enough, certainly, to bring under gubernatorial direction, as a separate Bury Grammar School for Girls, a Girls' High School established in Bury in 1884. The vision was also expensive, not least in terms of teaching staff and facilities. But the financial pressures of realizing Howlett's new and larger purposes for the School were relieved by successful negotiations with the Hulme Trust, to augment substantially the returns to the Schools from fees and from Roger Kay's increasingly inadequate endowment. The formative influence of the Hulme Trust on the Bury Grammar Schools, as well as on other grammar schools in and near Manchester, has also been explored by Ian Fallows, in a book he published in 2008.

And still later, when the governors embarked on a policy of further expansion at both Bury Schools in response to the landmark 1944 Education Act, the tensions between money and mission were again alleviated, this time by government subsidy. As direct grant grammar schools under the terms of the 1944 statute, the Schools' income from fees was substantially augmented by various local education authorities in the surrounding region. By the 1980s and 1990s, under the assisted places scheme that replaced direct grants in 1981 and lasted until 1997, subsidies were contributing enough money to pay some or all of the annual tuition fees in any given year for up to three quarters of those boys and girls who qualified in the Schools' own competitive "11-plus" entrance examinations to be members of each year's entering class.

For one reason or another, then, for the last three hundred years or so, the Bury Grammar Schools, as they now are, separate Boys' and Girls' Schools under a single governing body, have managed to change and grow, and to prosper in many respects, without ever having to confront in a very basic or profound way the governance or constitutional issues that Roger Kay thought were inseparable from the question of endowment and financial viability.

Money has been found, one way or another, if you will, to pour oil on the potentially troubled waters created by accommodating the Schools to their times and keeping them viable in a rapidly changing world.

Or, to put it differently and somewhat more pointedly, since the late sixteenth century, when Henry Bury gave the School at Bury its start, two profound transformations have occurred at the Bury Grammar Schools, first under the influence of Roger Kay in 1726 and then under William Howlett, with the help of the Hulme Trust and reaching out to include a Girls' school, at the end of the nineteenth century. And at each turn the Schools have found a way to remain financially viable, whether from deep private or public pockets, without ever having to call into serious question the constitutional settlement Roger Kay so assiduously engineered.

What was the essence of Roger Kay's constitutional arrangement?

### **The Legacy of Educational Localism**

In the sixteenth century, Henry Bury wanted to root the governance of the School firmly in the local community. Anyone seeking to found a school at the time would have had exactly the same thought. And, while in some ways Henry Bury did this quite successfully, he did not sufficiently insulate the School either from the shortcomings of the language in his will or from the religious turmoil unleashed in England by the Reformation, as well as by the efforts of the Tudor and Stuart states to come to terms with that Reformation. It was, we should recall, a turmoil that led one Headmaster of the School, Henry Dunster, a dour, troubled and deeply committed Puritan, to leave Bury and England, with his brother, in the summer of 1640 and find a new life in Massachusetts, where Henry Dunster promptly became the first President of Harvard.

Later on, Roger Kay also believed that the School should take pride in being locally rooted. He took much greater pains than Henry Bury to spell out in his indentures or constitution for the School the principles by which the governance of the School should be conducted and the education of its pupils should be pursued, not least, of course, because he could draw from the history of Henry Bury's foundation for guidance. But even though he lived most of his life far from Bury, as the Rector of Fittleton for thirty-five years and a Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral, Kay saw no essential problem with having local people run the School, as long as they abided by the elaborate precepts he put in place.

And, indeed, for the last three hundred years or so the ideology of educational localism to which Henry Bury and Roger Kay and William Howlett all happily

subscribed at different times has come to be a defining characteristic of both Schools. They have striven hard to keep themselves affordable to a local clientele of parents and their promising children, within a catchment area still centered on Bury but reaching out to surrounding districts in the industrial north-west of England where the prosperity needed to pay school fees has, for most people, been hard to come by. Fees at Bury are still lower than at many other private schools, in part to keep costs affordable in a region of the country that is still industrial, though not now as industrial as it used to be.

And even in 1976, as the direct grant scheme came to an end and the Schools decided to try to make their way as independent private institutions, albeit this time without any deep pockets in prospect beyond the politically controversial and, thus, uncertain assisted places scheme, the then Headmaster, John Robson, could still write with equanimity about the great tasks that had been and could be accomplished in a favorable educational climate and with the loyalty and contributions of the Schools' many *local* friends.

“The study of Bury Grammar School at any time in its history,” Robson asserted, “must begin with its links in the local community. ...The School grew up to meet the needs of its district and [its] growth was fostered over the years by many gentlemen notable in the area. In modern times a striking change has occurred [corresponding to broader changes] in the distribution of wealth and income. Nowadays [voluntary activities in support of the School] are no longer the preserve of a leisured or moneyed class, nor even dependent on such a class for leadership as they certainly were even a quarter century ago. The effort of public support which has enabled the School to achieve so much in recent years has, in the main, been the work of men and women already fully occupied with their own jobs. Nor are these people in possession of wealth: they may receive, in some cases, good incomes, but these incomes have to be earned, often by the combined efforts of both parents.”

Robson then reviewed the returns from seven appeals for support made to the local friends and parents of the Schools between 1957 and 1975 and argued that against the background of social and economic change he had sketched the returns were both remarkable and generous. The policy of making appeals locally to meet the needs of the Schools, especially for building projects, had been resisted and even resented, he observed.

But the faint-hearted were proven “resoundingly” wrong when the returns from the appeals materialized, in part, Robson thought, because “Bury patriotism” made local people want to keep the School “as an ornament of their Town,” in part because successful Old Clavians saw the School as “the soil from which [they] had sprung” and wanted to give something back, and in part because of the web of local family relations linking together people in the two Schools, often “over several generations.” And there was also the fact, Robson could not resist adding, “that the character of the School itself is capable of engendering...enthusiasm, just as it casts an unflinching spell upon the diverse men and women who come to teach in it.”

Derek Hodgkiss sounds a similar theme in the only piece of writing that attempted a long range analysis of the history of the Schools until Fallows published his book-length study in 2001. Hodgkiss notes, for example, that when Henry Boutflower was Headmaster in the mid-1800s a register was kept of the social class and occupations of the parents whose sons attended the School. An 1828 report on the School by the Charity Commissioners records, for example, that thirteen boys entered the Upper School, which was the route to university, and twenty-four the Lower School, which provided a more “commercial education.” The boys in the Upper School were “the sons of surgeons, printers, a cotton merchant, a clogger, a schoolmaster, an innkeeper and a minister.” In the Lower School, parents included “three book-keepers, three butchers, two tailors, two chandlers, two innkeepers, a farmer, a printer, a cotton spinner, a foundryman, a dyer, a joiner, a tanner, a druggist, a woollen manufacturer,” and a son of the usher, or deputy headmaster, at the School.

Those boys in the Upper School, who were likely headed for university, were sometimes boarders and might come from far afield: the sons, for example, of Dr. Cassels from Lancaster; of John Bourne, a Liverpool gentleman; of the Chaplain to the Honorable East India Company of Madras; of a planter from St. Kitts in the West Indies; and of Viscount Strathallan of Strathallan Castle in Scotland. But they rubbed shoulders, Hodgkiss writes, with the sons of the prosperous manufacturing and professional families of the local community, “the Walkers, Openshaws, Hamers, Grundys, Hampsons, Calrows and Nuttalls, and also the sons of weavers, wool sorters, coach drivers and gardeners.” This was in keeping, Hodgkiss argued, with Roger Kay’s intent that his “free schole” in the parish of Bury should depend on the wish of parents that their children be educated there and that the School in turn should depend on local public good will and support.

So, whether one looked back in 1976 across the broad sweep of School history, as Derek Hodgkiss did, or forward to the uncertain independent school future that was very much on John Robson’s mind, both Roger Kay’s constitutionalism and the ideology of educational localism looked remarkably robust, provided one accepted Robson’s assertion that endowment had now become a task for everyman, rather than a select few, and could be successfully pursued on that basis.

### **Governance by Oligarchy: The Self-Regulating Corporation**

The time-honored governance model relied upon by the Schools at Bury was one in which, in Robson’s words, those who run the School are drawn largely from “local business and professional men, many of them Old Boys of the School.” In 1726, Roger Kay wanted the trustees of his legacy to be substantial people, “drawn from the Rectors or Vicars of churches within ten miles of Bury and from lay inhabitants of the parish ‘having good Estates of at least fifty pounds a year’.” And when vacancies arose they were to be filled at the nomination of the remaining trustees.

Over time, the governing body of the Schools has not tightly fitted, perhaps, the definition of a self-perpetuating oligarchy, because at various points in School history the composition of the governing body has been altered to accommodate new

circumstances and ambitions. When ways were being found, for example, to fulfill the vision William Howlett had for the School towards the end of the nineteenth century a new and expanded governing body of twenty-five members was instituted, to include “five representatives each of the Kay Estate and the Hulme Trust, and representatives of Bury and other local councils and of the Victoria University and Owens College in Manchester.”

In the 1976 book commemorating Roger Kay’s legacy the governors of the Schools and of the remnants of the Kay estate are listed as of 1975 and it is clear that further alterations had been made to the governance of the School since Howlett’s day. One can still clearly see in 1975, on the eve of independence, the representational imprint, through local councils and councilors, of the direct grant grammar school policy instituted in 1944. After independence, of course, the nine representatives of local councils lost their seats, and with them, as Ian Fallows notes, went a substantial body of local skills and experience in educational management. At present, the governing body can include “up to twenty local men and women who possess a broad span of experience and skills,” although School web sites currently list the names of only thirteen.

So, while changes have occurred, educational localism is still very much alive at Bury. Is this on balance a good thing?

On the one hand, there is surely a need for the Bury Schools, like any schools, to have strong governance connections to the local community. It is reasonable to assume, for example, that there continues to be value in having the Rector of Bury as a governor, although now chiefly to honor the strong historical ties between the Schools and the community parish church, rather than to privilege the Church of England in admissions or curriculum. The case for having at least some ongoing representation of local business and professional interests is a strong one, too.

On the other hand, it is puzzling, I think, that the Schools’ governing body has been reticent to associate itself in an open, vigorous and continuing way with the multiple constituencies to which governance must nowadays be seen to be attentive and responsive, if it is also to be seen to be legitimate. Constituency management is now crucial not just to the success of the Bury Grammar Schools but also to the success of any independent school hoping to survive and prosper in the turbulence swirling around both secondary and college and university education in twenty-first century Britain.

The need to pay careful and systematic attention to constituencies, or what might otherwise simply be called legitimate interests, stems from major changes since Roger Kay’s day in the structural variables that shape School success. As an eighteenth century school maker, Kay was exceptionally good at his craft. But it is also true that School constitution making in Kay’s time was politically primitive. It was essentially about individuals; about finding the right *men* with a good mix of *Christian* values and *propertied* substance, and about putting in place some very basic (or, as people might say in Lancashire, “common sense”) constraints on their behavior.

Once in place, a good system pretty much ran itself and was literally, as we have seen in the governance terms of Kay's bequest, self-perpetuating, *provided* there were no major external shocks (or internal scandals). The story told in Ian Fallows's book about Bury Grammar School between 1726 and 1879 is essentially the story of exactly such an internally directed and self-regulating system. It is for all intents and purposes the story of the workings of a closed corporation, about which Fallows and, earlier, Hodgkiss are the only persons ever to have inquired or thought deeply. And needless to say, perhaps, what the story shows is that a school that started out in 1726 as a bold new experiment in institutional and educational design had by the last quarter of the nineteenth century become somewhat stale and even stagnant.

### **Breaking the Mould: William Howlett**

The genius of William Howlett, rightly described by Derek Hodgkiss as the third founder of the School, after Henry Bury and Roger Kay, was that he introduced the School to new ideas and new influences. In 1869 a commissioner from the Schools Inquiry Commission had put his finger on the limitations of educational localism. His report on the School concluded that "The difficulties under which it labours...are difficulties incident to its local position among a population whose sons it receives...[They are] ill-prepared, at nine, ten, or eleven years of age, and [the School] is forced, by the pressure of business, to send [most of them] into the world at fourteen."

Howlett wanted to tackle this problem with a new matching of endowment and constitution, a fresh equation for success that would take teaching at the School to a higher level. He wanted to send more local students to the universities, which were then also increasing in number, and he put their coats of arms along with those of Oxford, Cambridge and London on the stained glass windows of Roger Kay Hall, presumably to encourage aspiration. Howlett saw that, if he was to increase the School's value to Bury, reforms would need to be ambitious. He instituted a demanding annual entrance exam, a broader curriculum, a greater emphasis on university preparation, a house system, a cadet corps, a school magazine, school societies, an annual school sports competition, an adjunct girls' school – above all, higher and broader expectations that would put the sons and now the daughters of Bury on the same plane as those they would increasingly have to work with or compete against, across the country.

Howlett, who was only twenty-nine when he was appointed Headmaster, clearly grasped that he needed to lead a School in tune with the social, economic and political changes that were transforming late Victorian Britain. And with the notable help of the Hulme Trust, which gave money and ideas and fresh institutional connections, and the Earl of Derby, who gave both money and land and whose family had long been friends of the School, Howlett persuaded Bury to adopt and adapt the sorts of responses other private secondary schools, the English "public schools," were also making to the new environment they faced in the middle and towards the end of the nineteenth century.

### **The Advent of Constituency Management**



Today, by contrast, it is difficult if not impossible to rely for success on limited sources of support; a few deep pockets and a few close friends would still be nice, but they will not suffice. The networks of sustenance and support essential to the successful business of running large and independent private schools are now necessarily extensive, reaching far beyond a local community, and their key elements are corporate and organizational, rather than individual.

Success now comes in large part from representing and balancing legitimate organized interests: the teaching and support staff and the students and the parents, for example, who are critical internal constituencies; and external groups such as the university examining boards, the independent schools inspectorate, with its ties to central government, the business interests, who can be sources of both financial support and key learning opportunities for students, and the organizations of *alumni/ae* -- the Old Boys and Old Girls or, better perhaps, the Old Clavians -- many of whom still live and work locally but very substantial numbers of whom are now also well-distributed and well-organized, increasingly through the internet, in London, across the rest of Britain and, indeed, in every major region of the world.

Beyond the representation and balancing of these multiple, legitimate interests, the successful governance of a modern independent school is also about persuasion. By contrast, again, the School governors Roger Kay saw fit to appoint, and the successors they chose for themselves, were principally local men, Christians, and the owners of property. They were to be guided by the terms of Kay's constitution and by a moral compass most of them actually shared. And, assuming that that continued to be the case, their judgments about any and all matters pertaining to the running of the School were, for all practical purposes, private and beyond challenge. It has been said that then, and even now, they basically functioned as a secretive cabal.\*

Today, however, those who run the Schools work in a much more public and uncertain arena than that which confronted Kay or even Howlett. Politically speaking, the success of the Bury Grammar Schools as modern independent institutions, far from being constitutionally determined, in effect, by the brilliance of Roger Kay's eighteenth century indentures, or whatever vestiges of them remain, is something that must be negotiated, and continuously re-negotiated, among a variety of internal and external constituencies, none of which the governors of the Schools effectively controls and some of which, one might venture to suggest, they do not engage with or understand very well. A recent schools inspectorate report observes, for example, that the governors are more

---

\* The annual reports filed with the Charity Commission for England and Wales note that currently governors are co-opted on to the governing body by those already seated and there are no nominating bodies as in the past. Since independence, then, the governance of the Schools has reverted to the self-perpetuating oligarchic principle in which Roger Kay so firmly believed, and the leavening influence of the broader local representation achieved to implement the direct grant scheme of the 1944 Education Act has been lost. The governors of the Schools are also directors of the sole corporate trustee, The Bury Grammar Schools Trustee Limited. Initially Governors serve for a variety of specific terms. Subsequently, they may be appointed for a term of four years and can be appointed for a maximum of two further terms of four years each. This is not quite the comfortable cabalistic arrangement Roger Kay engineered, but it is most certainly cozy.

comfortable dealing with issues pertaining to the Kindergarten and junior schools than with the senior school, where, of course, the challenges are most complex and daunting.<sup>†</sup>

A modern mission statement for the future of the Schools cannot and ought not to be handed down, then, as if it were privately inscribed by the governors on a sacred tablet. It needs, first, to be broadly and openly discussed with relevant stakeholders. It needs to be clearly articulated and shared, and openly and vigorously contested and fought for, again, and defended, before it is approved and implemented.

And this political process must go forward in a contemporary context in which, accelerated by technology and exacerbated by the cultural diversity that is an inevitable concomitant of globalization, and has had a major impact on modern Britain, the lasting value and relevance over the next seventy years, for a student entering School now, of an education provided by the Bury Grammar Schools is, to say the least of it, difficult to predict. It is a value, moreover, that it is impossible for governors to imagine or to realize on their own, especially if by temperament and outlook they are reluctant to leaven their local rootedness.

Thirteen local men and women with “a broad span of experience and skills” is, perhaps, a good base on which to build a system of decision making for the Schools, but in a global environment of increasing connectivity and exchange, and a local environment of stiff competition for the best students and parental finances, it hardly seems sufficient. Here, I think, the limitations of Roger Kay’s eighteenth century constitutional vision, and of the educational localism it enshrined, begin to be palpable.

In addition to matching curriculum and staff and facilities and prospects for future success against their own standards, the governors of the Bury Grammar Schools are now caught up, whether they like it or not, in a contest of comparative advantage. There are in the wider Bury region alternative senior schools and sixth form colleges, and even kindergartens and junior schools, bidding for parents’ attention, endorsement, and budgets. Some of them are old. Some of them are new. But they are all making strenuous efforts to survive and prosper in an uncertain and rapidly changing world. And except, perhaps, at the Bury Grammar Schools, they are quite self-conscious and open and forthcoming about both the difficulties they face and the institutional strategies they are self-consciously and transparently developing to confront them.

Some of these alternatives to the Bury Grammar Schools that parents and prospective students will evaluate are good. Some are very, very good. Parental budgets for choosing among these alternatives are increasingly constrained. They are, of course, impacted by the state of the regional and national economy and by increasing outlays for other educational expenses parents now have to make, such as for university places,

---

<sup>†</sup> The list of governors in the now re-published 1976 commemorative book includes the name of Harry Barnes, the chairman at the time. I am reminded by one of my correspondents that Harry Barnes was widely admired, respected, even loved by the larger School community. This had a lot to do with the fact that Barnes kept a small office at School. He went out of his way to meet and know the teaching staff, even the younger and newer ones, and even if, as sometimes happened, he ran into them in the foyer of a London theater.

which used to be subsidized generously for those children who qualified but are now, except for the very affluent, paid for on credit against the prospect of future earnings. Robson's everyman is under more pressure than ever before, and his or her loyalty to the Bury Grammar Schools cannot be taken for granted. It must be argued for, and competed for, and earned in a world in which localism certainly still has value but also looks increasingly out of date.

### **Endowment and Constitution for an Uncertain Future**

The corporate, negotiated, uncertain, competitive, and globalized world of 2013 and beyond is not, of course, one that Roger Kay could even have begun to imagine.

The operative question going forward, then, is not whether we are remembering Roger Kay this year because recollection of the detailed mechanics of what he did in 1726 can help us chart a detailed course for the future of the Bury Grammar Schools, today. It is whether the governors of the Schools and, indeed, all of the other stakeholders in the future of the Schools, understand just the one very simple but enduring lesson that the life and legacy of Roger Kay taught, namely that to make any vision for the Schools successful very serious and sustained attention must be given, simultaneously and in the context of the times, both to constitution and to endowment.

Success in the early twenty-first century takes, moreover, an outward-looking rather than an inner-directed vision, one that is broadly based, widely and repeatedly discussed, skillfully sold, and demonstrably sustainable for the long term.<sup>\*</sup> The days when the Bury Grammar Schools could rely, as John Robson put it nearly forty years ago, as independence was declared, on "local business and professional men, many of them Old Boys of the School" are gone. No more cabals, even if, as is now in fact the case, women are part of the gubernatorial mix.

I am not a close student of the governing body of the Bury Grammar Schools. No one is, because the raw materials a person would need to make a full analysis of what they think and do, and why they do it, and whether by some reasonably objective standard what they do makes sense, all things considered, are not readily available to a broad public, beyond the anodyne contents of the reports the Schools must submit every year to the Charities Commission. The last person to attempt such an analysis at great length and with serious scholarship was Ian Fallows, and he was, I think, both gentlemanly and generous, as is his nature, in his assessments. His analysis was, moreover, historical and ended in 1976.

---

<sup>\*</sup> Much can be and has been made of the extent to which the Schools could greatly improve both their near term situation and their longer term prospects by doing a better job of "marketing" what they have to offer. This is sensible advice and it is long past time, in my view, that the Schools put much more thought and effort into heralding their history, their scholastic accomplishments, and their worldwide reach. That is why, for example, I have encouraged and underwritten the Henry Dunster Society's support for republication of the 1976 commemorative book. So, more and smarter marketing would unquestionably be a good thing. But a reliance on marketing will not come to grips with the structural problems of constitution and endowment that Roger Kay understood so keenly and which remain today, I am arguing here, the keys to sustaining his legacy.

I have followed the affairs of the School reasonably closely since I left School in 1962, and very intently during the last decade. But not once in all that time have I seen at Bury the organization and conduct under gubernatorial auspices and leadership of what in my adopted country we would call a broadly based, long term, strategic planning process.

Most secondary and tertiary educational institutions in the United States, and these days even many in Britain, conduct such exercises periodically, drawing energy and ideas from a very wide net of constituency advisory bodies. In some cases this occurs routinely and in other cases at intervals of perhaps five years or a decade. But it occurs at every place worth its salt and is a leading indicator of whether or not the leadership of the institution thinks hard, all the time, about endowment and constitution.

### **Money and Buildings: Endowment Priorities**

There have been, as I noted earlier, multiple appeals for local friends of the Schools and for parents to support improvement schemes at Bury. The teaching staff, many of whom are not local but fall, perhaps, under the spell that Robson said the Schools cast, have also made financial contributions. Most of this money has gone into building projects, to keep up in the race for comparative advantage in facilities with other schools in the region and to try to gain an edge over competitors, whether at Kindergarten or in the Junior School or in the Sixth Form, for example.

Sometimes money has had to be raised, or borrowed, to deal with unexpected contingencies, as when demolition of parts of the Schools' extended 1906 premises for a bold, new Sixth Form project showed that a large hole would have to be created in the middle of the Girls' School before it could be filled, again, with new facilities, which now feature a quite magnificent Arts Centre, library, and assorted replacement classrooms.

John Robson thought that the responses of the local community and of a broader cross-section of "friends" of the Schools to these various appeals for support, mostly for material improvements, displayed a remarkable generosity, particularly given the pressures on everyman to contribute. And he was right. And in more recent years, since the governors, with the strong external prodding and support of Sir Peter Ogden and the Ogden Trust established a Development Office and began to approach fund-raising with some degree of enthusiasm and sustained, professional effort, the amount raised to support the Schools has just about reached the five million pound level over a period of about a dozen years. That, too, is remarkable. It is, I would say, both quite remarkable and not very widely understood or appreciated.

But – and here's the rub -- most of this money has gone to assorted building and facility improvement projects. New buildings and improved facilities are, on the one hand, essential both to the proper functioning of the School and to maintaining a competitive edge vis-à-vis other schools. On the other hand, pouring money into building and facility improvements is akin to pouring it into a black hole. There is *always* something else that could benefit from still more capital investment. Recently,

it was the Junior School and the Kindergarten. Currently, it is the Arts Centre and the Joint Sixth Form Centre. And soon, perhaps, it will be truly decent facilities for inter-scholastic competitive sports on campus and on the fields at Buckley Wells?

There is from the perspective of potential donors never any really satisfactory way to tie investments in bricks and mortar to clearly observable improvements in the way students achieve and benefit from the core academic mission of the Schools. It is true that along the way, as appeals have been made to build and improve the physical infrastructure of the Schools, some modest support has also been found for bursaries, but only at a level sufficient to provide assistance in any given year for less than ten per cent of the incoming class in both senior Schools. At nearby Manchester Grammar School, with which Bury Grammar School is often compared, usually to the latter's chagrin, bursaries can be offered to a third of the entering class. At Bolton School, also not far away and with very large numbers of students, a fifth of new admits to the senior schools receive bursary assistance and one twelfth are offered full bursaries.

There has not been, moreover, and much more importantly, any substantial augmentation of the Bury Schools' long-term endowment. The money that comes in from fees, and from various donations, and from whatever remains of the interest income from earlier and mostly modest bequests is essentially expended every year. The annual accounts remain more or less in balance from year to year. It could hardly be otherwise, given the auditing oversight of the Charities Commission, but a close reading of the annual reports will reveal that there has to be some skillful but quite legitimate juggling involved to show that all is well and will remain so.

Overall, then, there is little or no accumulating surplus to invest and, therefore, no substantial continuing interest income from a sizeable, ongoing, invested endowment to help secure a bright and prosperous and competitive and innovative future for the Schools. It might be an exaggeration to say that the Schools are essentially living from hand to mouth, and have been doing so since they declared independence in 1976 and certainly since the assisted places scheme disappeared in 1997, but it is not, I think, much of one.

On the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Roger Kay's birth I think it is worth raising the question of what if anything might be done about this.

There are, perhaps, and in brief compass, three overarching and more specific strategic questions that ought to be asked. I will not attempt to do more, here, than state them and will do so roughly in the order in which it seems to me they bear on the issue of whether and how the Bury Grammar Schools are going to survive and prosper much longer if their present mix of endowment and constitution remains unexamined and unaltered. Do two separate Schools still make sense? How can Old Clavians become a more valuable resource? And what is the twenty-first century value of a BGS education?

### **Reassessing the Two School Strategy**

The first question to address is whether and, if so, on what basis, save for tradition, which does not seem to me to be a compelling reason for doing anything in present circumstances, there is justification any longer for having separate senior Schools, one for boys and one for girls. This issue is fraught, not just at Bury or in Britain but in many parts of the world, including the United States, where there are established and by many measures successful schools and colleges still providing single sex education, albeit in dwindling numbers.

This might seem to be a silly or awkward question to ask at a point in time at which the governors of the Schools have just spent large amounts of time and energy, and money, to search exhaustively for and appoint a new Headmaster. They have settled on a young man of considerable achievement and have for the first time in the history of the School appointed from within. They have made a choice that is according to most initial accounts both popular and promising.

On the one hand, this can be seen as an expression of the apparent confidence the governors have in their ability to keep two schools going. On the other hand, one may ask what systematic attention they gave before making this decision to the real, long-term benefits and efficiencies – economic and social as well as educational, for students and parents and the entire school community – that can be associated with merging the two Schools, over a period of time.

They might very well have reflected on the history of Christ's Hospital (1546) in West Sussex, a school founded in the sixteenth century only a few years before Bury and one that merged separate boys' and girls' schools and became fully co-educational in 1985, *and* did so under the inspired leadership of one of Bury Grammar School's most distinguished and admired and, at the time he was recalled to Christ's to do the merger work, retired Headmasters, John Hansford.

I am not saying, notice, that a merger is desirable. I do not know that to be a defensible and desirable proposition and, quite frankly, at this point in time no-one else does, either. I am simply saying that as a matter of both strategy and policy the case for merger, and against it, ought to be taken seriously. It ought to be studied intently and discussed openly and widely because, first, there is no constitutional bar at Bury, as there is at nearby Bolton School, for example, to entertaining such a discussion<sup>§</sup> and, second, because an adult, early twenty-first century conversation about one school rather than two at Bury would put on the table all sorts of questions now apparently considered taboo.\*\*

---

<sup>§</sup> The prohibition at Bolton School is in the terms of the endowment. In 1913 Sir William Hesketh Lever, the first Viscount Leverhulme, gave a generous joint endowment to the High School for Girls and the Bolton Grammar School for Boys on condition that the two should be separate but equal partners known as Bolton School (Boys' and Girls' Divisions). On 1 April 1915, the Bolton School Foundation formally came into existence, and the two schools have operated together but separately ever since.

\*\* I try to focus, here, on the big questions. But there are lots of little questions that need to be addressed, too. When a Development Office was recently created an Old Clavian was very sensibly chosen as Director of Development. As discussed below, Old Clavians do not hold reunion events very often in the course of a year but the men and the women have one meeting each, separately, in London where, it should be obvious there are many very attractive prospects for encouraging support for the Schools. But because the

Could, for example, the economies and efficiencies of merger, if they are real and substantial over time, be used to build an endowment that would feed into bursaries and, thus, enhance the academic achievements and competitive position of the School? As the twenty-first century unfolds, would the boys and girls at Bury be better off learning to live and work with each other, now, or waiting until they enter university or the work force?

If it makes sense, as the governors apparently believe it does, to have a joint Sixth Form Center to be used by Sixth Form students in both the Girls' School and the Boys' School, why should not the two senior schools be co-educational, as is the case already, and very happily so, in both the Kindergarten and the junior school?

Indeed, it is tempting to infer from endorsement of the joint Sixth Form Center that the governors are willing to take some steps towards co-education without necessarily endorsing it as a final destination. But, if that is the case, what is the reasoning behind this gradualist strategy and why is it not appropriate to accelerate it?

### **Realizing the Value of Global Reach**

The second issue that seems to me to cry out for serious strategic deliberation among a variety of stakeholders at the Schools is what I earlier referred to as constituency management – and I apologize to those who think this term sounds like jargon torn from the pages of a text on organizational development. But, terminology aside, the substantive issue, here, as I see it, is devastatingly simple.

Thanks chiefly to the stupendous success between about 1945 and 1976 of the direct grant scheme put in place by the 1944 Education Act, and its later transformation into assisted places, there are now many more well-educated, thoughtful and prosperous Old Clavians living and working in more, widely distributed places around Britain and around the world than ever before. But almost nothing has been done in a serious or sustained way, either by the governors of the Schools or by the Old Clavians themselves to recognize, celebrate or exploit this fact.<sup>††</sup>

(In this light, and parenthetically, it is quite strange to tour the rooms and hallways of the Schools, as I have done many times in the last decade, and see no visible manifestation of this post-War success, or of any of the Old Clavians who have contributed to it in commerce, business, law, government, or indeed any walk of life. It is as if the lives and worlds of those who are now in School and those who went before them are divorced. William Howlett, and Jane Kitchener, the first Headmistress of the

---

Director of Development is a woman she is excluded from the meeting the men have, apparently on the theory that having a woman present would spoil the occasion for the old boys. What sense does that make?

<sup>††</sup> This stands in stark contrast to the situation at Manchester Grammar School, where the use of the term Old Mancunians persists to describe old boys of the school but where all the information about, expectations for, and appeals to alumni are now lodged on the internet through a portal simply but brilliantly and quite appropriately labeled “MGS Global, a worldwide network.”

Girls' School, had a much more acute understanding of how past accomplishments can fuel future ambitions and took aspirational surroundings much more seriously.)

The two organizations representing former students at the Schools, or those former students, at least, who have elected to pay to join the Old Boys' Association and the Old Girls' Association, are stubbornly local in their governance and program. The number of events they organize each year to bring members together, save for taking part in local sports events, is limited, usually to two, and the venues are also just two, Bury and London.

Lurking in the background, here, is a legacy of the educational localism discussed earlier. Beyond this, there are other immediate and practical explanations for the predominantly local flavor of both associations. They rely, as they always have, on members who live in or close to Bury, and now London, to serve as officers, attend meetings, write and publish newsletters and magazines, maintain archives, and do most of the leg work involved in organizing events.

And while there is some real but in this day and age increasingly marginal advantage to this geographical propinquity, an imaginative *alumni/ae* association with a good working knowledge of the internet could make major strides towards interesting and involving a much broader cross-section of what is now a nationally and globally distributed membership. The notable success and vitality of the Bury Grammar Schools *alumni/ae* group at linkedin.com is, quite remarkably, entirely unattributable to the associations themselves, but speaks volumes for the commitment and entrepreneurship of Marcus Shapiro, an Old Clavian who works in the City, with money and finance and has an acute sensitivity to the value of being connected.

The much deeper structural problem with both associations, however, and one that is masked by the veneer of localism, is that they have no recognized or continuing role in the governance of the Schools. The only obligation associated with being a member of either group is to attend a meeting, usually scheduled just once a year, enjoy a meal, be entertained by a guest speaker, and reminisce. And, if one cannot do that, there is not much for an Old Clavian to do as an Old Clavian, except glance at the annual newsletter or report to see which of one's former contemporaries might have died in the last twelve months.

This is not a challenging agenda for a group that now has in it so many bright, energetic and articulate people. For many years, at least on the boys' side, it was not an especially attractive agenda, either. The days when the annual reunion dinner resembled a beer and bun fight are probably gone for good, although a public appeal for greater decorum at reunions at School had to be made quite recently by the Headmaster. Would a more challenging agenda attract more and broader and deeper interest and participation?

At the moment it would not, it seems to me, because there is nowhere for the energy and enthusiasm and goodwill that might be generated by more vigorous and innovative Old Clavian associations to go, even if it proved, as I suspect it would, to be



creative and productive and to involve something more than motivating an occasional individual donation to a building appeal or bursary fund. The governing body of the Schools does not want to know what the Old Clavian associations think about matters of policy and strategy that bear on the present health or future welfare of the Schools. They must know that they are not constitutionally barred from soliciting and entertaining such views. So, their inability to realize the value of these assets on a scale that is appropriate to their size and reach is hard to excuse.

This judgment might seem harsh, because some former students at the Schools have been co-opted from time to time as governors and might even think, or be encouraged to think, that when the governors discuss and debate weighty issues those co-opted to be on the oligarchical inside represent those left on the outside. But this is not, in fact, the case. It is a fallacy of misplaced concreteness. Asking co-opted individual members of *alumni/ae* associations to act behind closed doors *as if* they were association representatives is not at all the same thing as asking people *independently chosen* to represent those associations to take part by invitation in the deliberations of a body that is *formally distinct* from and not, therefore, and *ad hoc* to be conveniently conflated, at the governors' own discretion, with the associations themselves.

The governors do not routinely reach out to or engage with or take into account formally the views of the Old Clavian associations, or the vast majority of their members around the world, for the same reason they do not do similar things *vis-à-vis* the teaching and support staff or the parents or the students at the Schools. They do not see these interests as legitimate resources that can be combined with their own considerable experience and skills to yield valuable results.

This is a failure of constituency management. Or, to put it in more immediate terms, it is a failure to appreciate, in the case of the Old Clavian associations, the immensely valuable transformation that has occurred in the number and quality and distribution of Bury Grammar School *alumni/ae* since the end of the Second World War, and to use this global transformation to the Schools' advantage. It is a failure, therefore, of both leadership and imagination. And, in my view, it needs to change.

### **Connecting What Goes on Inside to the Modern World**

Thirdly, and finally, there are serious questions that need to be asked, and discussed and debated widely, about the distinctive qualities of what goes on inside the Bury Grammar Schools, about the content of the curriculum and the long term value in a very rapidly changing world of a Bury Grammar School education.

How is it different and better than what is available, say, at Manchester Grammar (1515), Bolton School (1516), Queen Elizabeth's Blackburn (1567), the King David School (1873) or the Holy Cross Sixth Form College and University Centre (1993)? Why is it different? And why is Bury a wise choice from the perspective of parents and even more so from the presumptive perspective of students, who will only fully realize the value of their education decades from now, in a future world we can barely begin to imagine?

Christ's Hospital boldly claims that it is "a school like no other." What claim might Bury make?

There is to my knowledge no publically available document or web page with the governors' imprimatur upon it that seeks to answer this question. The governors' chief claim among themselves, reflected in their annual reports to the Charities Commission, is that they are keeping their financial heads above water and the fabric of the Schools more or less intact. These are *not*, let it be said, trivial claims, given the circumstances the Schools have faced since independence, and more especially since the end of assisted places in 1997. We may take them as evidence that the governors are people with positions of responsibility and authority in their own fields of endeavor who have seen it as their duty to use their experiences and abilities to make sound decisions in the interests of the Schools.

They have achieved a measure of stability in the difficult years since independence and the end of assisted places, and could likely continue to keep things on an even keel by incrementally ratcheting up income from fees and harvesting donations for bursaries along the way. But the more fees rise, of course, the sharper become the comparisons parents and students will want to make with nearby alternatives. "Steady as you go" and "avoid the reefs" are not directives for distinctive long term success, either for the Schools or for their students.

John Robson speculated that the Schools had a character capable of engendering universal enthusiasm and casting a spell on those who encountered it. In thinking about the Bury difference, he would not dwell, he said in his contribution to the 1976 book commemorating Kay's re-founding, on academic excellence, because Bury, like all independent schools, takes it for granted that the pursuit of such excellence is a major distinguishing characteristic of the education it provides. The Bury difference might lie elsewhere, though, and was a matter, he said, rather encouragingly, to which he and his colleagues on the teaching staff did give a lot of thought. What do people look for when they think about offering someone from Bury a job or admitting them to university?

"[They want] to avoid," Robson wrote, "both the colourless personality and the confounded nuisance, [they] want a willingness to work and a range of aptitudes,...a sense of proportion and a sense of humour and the ability to get on with all sorts and conditions of men. [They] look for confidence without brashness and courtesy without formality. To the development of these characteristics in young men, games, in our view, make a contribution which is too often narrowly interpreted and so undervalued."

To sports as an essential adjunct to classroom work Robson then quickly added music, arts and crafts, design and technical drawing, the CCF, and community service, arguing that all of these activities, as well as school societies, foster partnership and a spirit of cooperation among those who participate (and in sports, he underlined, participation was mandatory). "This approach," he avowed, "is the right one to fit young men for a complex world in which problems are not solved by the erection of rigid structures of command but rather *by persuasion and the co-operation of everyone concerned* (emphasis added)."

But, much as it is appealing as a description of his School's ability to turn out good all-rounders, Robson's catechism of the Bury virtues or values is not all that distinctive. It is clearly foreshadowed in what Hodgkiss tells us was the educational philosophy William Howlett and others in the public schools propounded at the end of the nineteenth century. And it finds strong echoes still, today, in the annual messages the Headmaster and the Headmistress write for the opening pages of every issue of *The Key*, a magazine the Schools' Development Office edits and distributes, very widely, to as many of the Schools' friends and stakeholder groups it can reach. Now and then there are glimpses in these and other messages that the tried and true sturdy amalgam of "work hard, play hard" is being supplemented by an emphasis on newer attributes.

Roberta Georghiou, the current Headmistress and a deeply influential and positive force in the recent history of the Schools, has repeatedly sounded themes in *The Key*, for example, about adventure, as when her girls have traveled to far off lands, facing a "world challenge," sometimes surmounting difficult personal circumstances along the way, or when they have taken on daunting and disciplined tasks that convert exceptional personal success into giving back, as one student did when she swam the English Channel, raised nearly twenty thousand pounds from sponsors, and gave most of it back for a new joint Sixth Form Centre, becoming in the process the Schools' youngest major donor. Georghiou also often recalls Founders' Day and Roger Kay's endowment, underlining both the importance of honoring the past and the lesson that giving of oneself and one's own can yield the satisfaction of providing for the success of others. She clearly believes this is a key part of the Bury difference.

Comparable themes appear in the first letter to parents, written in April 2013 soon after he was appointed, by the new and current Headmaster, Richard Marshall. He wrote about his commitment to communicating to students a "love of learning" that had transformed his own life is surely capable of transforming other lives, too. A Bury Grammar School education would, he promised, turn students into confident and "entrepreneurial learners," people who have the capacity to turn challenges into opportunities and become calculating risk takers, seeing failure as a natural precursor to success and personal development. There would also continue to be at Bury, he said, a healthy balance between hard work in the classroom and strenuous effort outside it.

Robson would nod in approval at this, because he admired strenuous effort, too. "There is," he had written in 1976, "one feature of the Bury Grammar School approach to work to which attention should be drawn: we do like to get on with it and get it over," which is why, he said, neatly converting philosophy into practicality, the school day was relatively short. So, by choosing to impress on parents that he saw himself as "a hard-working Lancashire lad," a phrase he used twice in his recent letter and even paraphrased from Henry Dunster in Latin, Marshall may have been looking to meld a future oriented message about entrepreneurial learning and developmental risk taking with reaffirmation of the educational localism that has been such an enduring feature of School history since the middle of the sixteenth century.

Perhaps, then, the enduring key to understanding the Schools and to assuring their future is that the lessons they strive to teach are distinctive and valuable not so much because they are radically different from the lessons any independent school anywhere in Britain tries to teach – they are not – but rather and precisely because they resonate so deeply with the ethos of the region the Schools have always sought to serve. It is not hard to discern a core set of evolving values to which people in leadership positions at the Bury Grammar Schools have repeatedly paid deference: academic excellence, hard work, fair play, decency, adaptability, working well with others, co-operative problem solving, a spirit of adventure, a sense of humor and withal an abiding charity. There is certainly nothing that anyone who hails from the industrial north-west of England needs to be ashamed of, here.

But is it too generic? Is it too Lancashire lad-ish and provincial? Is it enough?

All of the other schools mentioned previously have asked themselves the same question about the distinctive qualities of what goes on inside their walls. They all subscribe, of course, to the catechism of Bury values, but at Manchester Grammar and at John Hansford's old school, Christ's Hospital, for example, they have seen at least some competitive edge in offering the international baccalaureate alongside the national curriculum. At the King David School the governors have opted for designation of the senior school as a mathematics and computing college under the terms of a national specialist schools program, and have otherwise stressed science education in the other schools they manage.

At Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School in Blackburn the declaration of independence in 1976 was accompanied by an unusually robust and assertive commitment to the universal value of co-education: "The huge benefits of co-education are quite clear, and in recent times the arguments for single sex schools have largely been lost. Co-education is undoubtedly right for society as it is now, and for the future...; the workplace is mixed and both genders need to learn with each other and accept each other's differences."

Only at Bolton School is the value of education expressed, as it is at Bury, chiefly in terms of service to a local community. But Bolton has advantages of scale that Bury does not have. Bolton has long been one of the largest independent day schools in Britain. It has huge numbers of *alumni/ae*, who have already been recognized and are clearly drawn upon as a global asset, connecting the school to the world. And Bolton has gone to extraordinary lengths to profile and market and profit from the value of its capital assets, including a magnificent thirty-two acre estate, to connect it to people living in a large surrounding region.

It is reasonably clear, then, that these other schools have been thinking for some time, now, not just about how to express the value of what goes on within their walls in the traditional terms in which education is valued for individuals but also about how to express and realize, and, to their credit, monetize the institutional connectivity they have to a larger world outside themselves, whether that takes the form of commitment to an international curriculum, or to nationally prioritized specialist schools, or to

universal educational principles. These are not, perhaps, huge distinctions to claim. But they are evidence at these other places of an ongoing consideration of connectivity that is more than just individual, and in that sense goes beyond noting in a school publication that ten girls went to Nepal, last year, or five boys to Australia, or that there was (finally) a Schools' reunion event outside Britain.

It is this institutional consideration of connectivity and of its underlying organizational constituencies that seem to me to be in need of strengthening at Bury and which, if they are not soon addressed, may well play a determinative role in the Schools' future.

There is a public policy imperative at work here, too. Independent schools in Britain go to great lengths to build their endowments because that is where they find the resources to show, under regulation by the Charities Commission, that they are providing public benefit. The biggest such benefit they can provide is to help finance the educations of students who meet their exacting academic standards and would profit from admission but are kept away by the fee structure. Bursaries connect independent schools to the expectations of a national community in which state-maintained schools are the norm and independence survives on sufferance not as of right.

Thomas Friedman, author of *The World is Flat*, an influential book about global economic transformation, recently observed that when he wrote the book, only a decade ago, "Facebook, Twitter, 4G, iPhones, iPads, high-speed broadband, ubiquitous wireless and web-enabled cellphones, the cloud, Big Data, cellphone apps and Skype" either did not exist or were in their infancy. Now, using these and other tools of connectivity and productivity and creativity, individuals can learn, retrain, start and run a business, look for or fill a job, invent, invest, and generally do more than ever before, some of it on their own, some with others, and all online. Friedman's point was not the trite one that "technology is changing the world so quickly that nothing will ever be the same again," but rather that connectivity, or even now hyper-connectivity, is removing the boundaries around the structures that used to channel the way people learned about the world, and used to help them when they struggled.

Schools are one of the most vital of those structures. They gave people the benefit of an education, variously defined and configured according to some mixture of geography, tested ability, willingness to pay, and available school alternatives. Increasingly in the future, however, people are going to be able to, and will want to, and *will* to a greater extent than they do now structure their own education, taking advantage of the opportunities hyper-connectivity affords.

Schools will not disappear, of course. But their purposes and the means they have to attain them are changing. Their value may come less, for example, from delivering a pre-defined benefit called, let's say, a "rigorous, academic stream senior school education at Bury Grammar School" than from teaching senior school students how to access, evaluate, and use on their own account the information they need to invest in themselves, more than once in a lifetime, and define the contribution they can make long after they leave school, probably and increasingly, Friedman suggests, in

ways that can be reliably and repeatedly measured with data that will likely be archived and brought up to date in real time in a data cloud.

As Friedman observes, some of the educational and personal and career development implications of this hyper-connectivity are scary. But, I would respectfully submit, they do need, nonetheless, to be acknowledged and confronted and responded to by all the various stakeholders who make up the Bury Grammar Schools community. And, if this commemoration of Roger Kay's birthday sparks that process, it will have been more than worthwhile. If it leads to governance reform and starts to generate new and various and generous contributions, it might be the beginning of a new foundation.