

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2)1650/04-05  
(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/HS/2/04

**Subcommittee to Study Issues Relating to the Provision of  
Boarding Places, Senior Secondary Education and Employment  
Opportunities for Children with Special Educational Needs**

**Minutes of meeting  
held on Monday, 25 April 2005 at 10:45 am  
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung (Chairman)  
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan  
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
- Member absent** : Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP
- Public Officers attending** : Item II  
Mr Chris WARDLAW  
Deputy Secretary (Education and Manpower)<sup>5</sup>,  
Education and Manpower Bureau  
Mrs Betty IP  
Principal Assistant Secretary (School Administration  
and Support), Education and Manpower Bureau  
Dr Catherine K K CHAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Curriculum Development)  
Education and Manpower Bureau

Mr Tony TANG  
Principal Education Officer (Curriculum Development),  
Education and Manpower Bureau

Mrs Mary MA LO To-wan  
Commissioner for Rehabilitation, Health, Welfare and  
Food Bureau

Ms Ophelia CHAN  
Assistant Director (Rehabilitation and Medical Social  
Services), Social Welfare Department

**Attendance by  
invitation** : Item II

Parents' Alliance on Special Education System

Mrs LEUNG KONG Wai-ying  
Secretary

Mrs AU YEUNG CHAN Cheuk-man  
Member

CCC Kei Shun Special School Parents Staff Association

Ms KAN Fung-kuen  
Chairlady

Ms Angela KWAN  
Executive Member

The Special Education Society of Hong Kong

Mr Andrew TSE  
Chairperson

Ms Maria WONG  
Vice-Chairperson

Haven of Hope Sunnyside School

Mr LAW Kai-hong  
Principal

The Parents' Association of Pre-School Handicapped Children

Mrs CHUNG NG Sui-fong  
Convenor of Mainstream Education Committee

Mrs Julie LEE LAU Chu-lai  
Chairperson

Hong Kong Association for Specific Learning Disabilities

Mrs TANG LEE Yuet-ming  
Representative

Miss CHIU Wai-ki  
Development Officer

The Hong Kong Joint Council of Parents of the Mentally Handicapped

Ms Eva MOK  
Vice-Chairperson

Ms TOU Lai-lin  
Executive Member

The Association of Parents of the Severely Mentally Handicapped

Ms CHENG Yee-man  
Vice-Chairman

Ms HO Wai-ngan  
Secretary

Hong Kong Association for Parents of Persons with Physical Disabilities

Ms CHIU Yee-ling  
Chairman

Ms SHEK Lin-tai  
Accountant

Concern Group on the Provision of Boarding/Respite  
Service in Schools for the Physically Disabled

Ms Irene TANG Oi-lin  
Representative

Mr TSUI Ping-yan  
Representative

CCC Kei Shun Special School

Mr WONG Sui-lun  
Principal

Mr TAM Tat-sing  
School Social Worker

Hong Kong Special Schools Council

Dr Simon LEUNG  
Chairman

Mrs Rita MANSUKHANI  
Hon Secretary

**Clerk in attendance** : Miss Flora TAI  
Chief Council Secretary (2)2

**Staff in attendance** : Mr Stanley MA  
Senior Council Secretary (2)6

Miss Sherman WOO  
Legislative Assistant (2)2

---

Action

**I. Confirmation of minutes and matters arising**  
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1317/04-05(01) and CB(2)1321/04-05]

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 March 2005 were confirmed.

2. Members noted the Administration's paper entitled "Education of children in special schools" which was provided in response to members' request at the last meeting on 30 March 2005 [LC Paper No.

Action

CB(2)1317/04-05(01)].

**II. Issues relating to the proposed academic structure for senior secondary education and higher education**

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1317/04-05(02) and CB(2)1381/04-05(05)]

3. The Chairman welcomed representatives of 12 deputations and the Administration to the meeting.

The Administration's responses to the issues raised at the last meeting

4. Referring to a set of press cuttings which was tabled at the meeting [LC Paper No. CB(2)1381/04-05(05)], the Chairman expressed dissatisfaction that the Administration had actively approached the media to divulge its position on the issues relating to proposed arrangements for students with special educational needs (SEN) under the new senior secondary education raised at the last meeting. He pointed out that the Subcommittee was established under the House Committee of the Legislative Council (LegCo) to study the provision of boarding places, senior secondary education and employment opportunities for children with SEN. The Administration should have briefed the Subcommittee on the Administration's position on the proposed arrangements for students with SEN under the new academic structure first. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan expressed a similar view.

5. In response, Deputy Secretary (Education and Manpower)5 (DS(EM)5) said that the Administration would maintain a continuous dialogue with the Subcommittee before coming up with a definite view. He then briefed members on the major considerations and the proposed arrangements for students with SEN under the new senior secondary education as detailed in the paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)1317/04-05(02)]. He highlighted that the Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB) was consolidating the views and suggestions on the provision of integrated and special education for students with SEN, and would continue to consult the stakeholders with the aim of working out the best proposals to meet the needs of children with SEN in different circumstances.

Meeting with deputations

6. At the invitation of the Chairman, representatives presented their views as summarised in paragraphs 7 to 18 below.

*Parents' Alliance on Special Education System*  
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1364/04-05(01) (revised)]

7. Mrs AU YEUNG CHAN Cheuk-man presented the views of the Parents' Alliance on Special Education System as detailed in its submission which was

Action

tabled at the meeting. She highlighted that the Alliance was disappointed that the Administration did not value and respect the views and suggestions of deputations on the provision of a three-year junior secondary and a three-year senior secondary education (the “3+3” secondary education) for children with SEN. The Alliance held a strong view that excluding mentally handicapped (MH) children from the provision of a “3+3” secondary education was in conflict with the right of MH children to education. The Alliance requested that EMB should set up a regular consultation mechanism to consult the views of the stakeholders in the special education sector.

*CCC Kei Shun Special School Parents Staff Association*

8. Ms KAN Fung-kuen said that CCC Kei Shun Special School Parents Staff Association requested the Administration to provide MH children with the “3+3” secondary education to facilitate development of their potentials and abilities to lead a normal adult life.

*The Special Education Society of Hong Kong  
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1366/04-05(02)]*

9. Mr Andrew TSE presented the views of the Special Education Society of Hong Kong as detailed in its submission. He highlighted that the Society opposed the provision of a non-mainstream curriculum for MH children, and considered that EMB should provide sufficient support to schools and parents in the design of individualised education programmes for MH children. The Society anticipated that EMB would set up a joint working group on provision of special education under the new academic structure and consult the views of the stakeholders in a sincere and pragmatic manner.

*Haven of Hope Sunnyside School  
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1366/04-05(01)]*

10. Mr LAW Kai-hong presented the views of the Haven of Hope Sunnyside School as detailed in its submission. He highlighted that children with SEN should enjoy an equal right to education as other students in mainstream schools. He stressed that children with SEN should be provided with the “3+3” secondary education, and appropriate curriculum, teaching pedagogies and assessment mechanisms under the new academic structure.

*The Parents’ Association of Pre-School Handicapped Children*

11. Mrs Julie LEE LAU Chu-lai said that EMB should continue to consult parents and other stakeholders on the provision of special education to children with SEN. Mrs CHUNG NG Sui-fong said that some children with SEN were not learning happily in mainstream schools and the support to these children were insufficient. She anticipated that EMB would provide appropriate staffing

Action

support and sufficient resources for implementing the “3+3” secondary education for children with SEN in mainstream schools. She also requested that EMB should set up a regular consultation mechanism involving representatives of the stakeholders to monitor the implementation of integrated education in mainstream schools.

*Hong Kong Association for Specific Learning Disabilities  
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1381/04-05(04)]*

12. Miss CHIU Wai-ki and Mrs TANG LEE Yuet-ming presented the views of the Hong Kong Association for Specific Learning Disabilities as detailed in its submission. They pointed out that EMB should collaborate with schools to provide timely and appropriate support to children with SEN in mainstream schools. The Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority should also provide appropriate arrangements for children with SEN to sit for public examinations and be assessed in a fair and consistent manner. The Association also suggested that the Administration should formulate a set of comprehensive policies and funding schemes for provision of education to children with SEN.

*The Hong Kong Joint Council of Parents of the Mentally Handicapped  
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1364/04-05(02)]*

13. Ms TOU Lai-lin presented the views of the Hong Kong Joint Council of Parents of the Mentally Handicapped as detailed in its submission. She pointed out that EMB should formulate the arrangements for the new secondary education structure for children with SEN as early as practicable. The Joint Council also suggested that EMB should consult the stakeholders and make reference to overseas experiences in the establishment of a systemic framework and curriculum for provision of higher education and continuing education to children with SEN.

*The Association of Parents of the Severely Mentally Handicapped*

14. Ms CHENG Yee-man said that the Association of Parents of the Severely Mentally Handicapped said that children with SEN should enjoy equal opportunities in education, and should be provided with the “3+3” secondary education. She pointed out that a six-year secondary education was not equivalent to the “3+3” secondary education under the new secondary education structure. She requested EMB to work out policies to assist MH children with different learning and medical needs to pursue continuing and lifelong education.

*Hong Kong Association for Parents of Persons with Physical Disabilities  
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1381/04-05(01)]*

15. Ms CHIU Yee-ling presented the views of the Hong Kong Association

Action

for Parents of Persons with Physical Disabilities as detailed in its submission. She said that the Association held a strong view that all children with SEN should enjoy an equal right to education and should be provided with the “3+3” secondary education as other students in mainstream schools. The Association also requested that physically disabled (PD) children should be allowed to receive senior secondary education in the same school under the new academic structure given their difficulties in movement.

*Concern Group on the Provision of Boarding/Respite Service in Schools for the Physically Disabled*

*[LC Paper No. CB(2)1381/04-05(02)]*

16. Ms Irene TANG Oi-lin and Mr TSUI Ping-yan presented the views of the Concern Group on the Provision of Boarding/Respite Service in Schools for the Physically Disabled as detailed in its submission. They pointed out that PD children should be able to receive senior secondary education in one of the existing seven special schools for the physically disabled (PD schools). Mr TSUI explained that the health conditions of PD children would be adversely affected if they were required to travel a long distance to go to schools, and some PD children had in fact given up their senior secondary studies simply because of the long distance between their residence and the PD schools concerned.

*CCC Kei Shun Special School*

*[LC Paper No. CB(2)1367/04-05(01)]*

17. Mr WONG Sui-lun presented the views of the CCC Kei Shun Special School as detailed in its submission. He said that children with SEN should enjoy the same right to education as other students in mainstream schools, and should be provided with the “3+3” secondary education. He also pointed out that in Los Angeles of the United States, children with SEN enjoyed the same junior secondary and senior secondary education as their counterparts in mainstream schools, and were allowed to complete secondary education up to the age of 22.

*Hong Kong Special Schools Council*

*[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1171/04-05(01) and CB(2)1381/04-05(03)]*

18. Mrs Rita MANSUKHANI and Dr Simon LEUNG presented the views of the Hong Kong Special Schools Council as detailed in its submission. Mrs MANSUKHANI said that the Council estimated that the difference in staff cost between the provision of a six-year secondary education and the “3+3” secondary education was around \$20,000 per school per month. The Special Schools Council considered that the new senior secondary curriculum for special education should follow that of the mainstream education, the existing teacher-to-class ratio of 1.5:1 for special schools should be reviewed, and benchmarking assessment for children with SEN taking the non-mainstream



Action

curriculum should be established as soon as practicable. Dr LEUNG supplemented that EMB should review the class sizes for children with different types of SEN, the enrolment and capacity of schools for social development and the supply and demand of boarding places in these schools.

Discussion with the Administration

*Provision of the “3+3” secondary education*

19. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan expressed disappointment that EMB so far had not committed to provide three years of junior secondary education and three years of senior secondary education for all students with SEN under the new academic structure. He asked how the Administration would provide a six-year secondary education for some 5 700 MH students.

20. DS(EM)5 responded that the “3+3” secondary education structure was proposed under the new academic structure to replace the existing three-year junior secondary, two-year senior secondary and two-year secondary six and seven education structure (the “3+2+2” structure). The “3+3” secondary education was simply a label put forward under such historical context to signify the provision of a six-year secondary education to all students of the appropriate age groups, which was in line with the prevailing international norm. Under the new academic structure, there were two pathways for students with SEN to attend secondary education, i.e. the ordinary schools and the special schools. Students with SEN who were capable to do so would follow the ordinary academic structure, curriculum and assessment modes as other students in ordinary schools.

21. DS(EM)5 explained that MH students who were considered more suitable to attend special schools would take an adapted curriculum in MH schools. For these students, adaptations in curriculum contents, teaching methodologies and assessment would be made to help them strengthen their generic skills and appropriate learning in the key learning areas according to their individual needs. In particular, MH students with different capacities should have individualised education programmes and assessment criteria specifically tailored by teachers and specialist staff in consultation with parents. Nevertheless, students in MH schools should enjoy a six-year secondary education as their counterparts in ordinary schools.

22. DS(EM)5 pointed out that there were more common views than divided views between deputations and EMB on provision of education to students with SEN. All stakeholders supported that children with SEN should be provided with better secondary education, regardless of their learning potentials and characteristics. The Administration would continue to consider the views and suggestions of deputations in the course of finalising the proposals for further consultation with the stakeholders on the provision of education for children

Action

with SEN.

23. Principal Assistant Secretary (Curriculum Development), Education and Manpower Bureau (PAS(CD)EM) supplemented that the proposed “3+3” reflected the difference between the new secondary education structure and the existing “3+2+2” structure. She added that the new senior secondary education would provide students with all-person development opportunities and a diverse curriculum framework under which both ordinary and special schools would develop their school-based curriculum in the light of the learning needs of their students.

24. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan sought clarification as to whether all students with SEN would be provided the “3+3” secondary education.

25. DS(EM)5 explained that while the goal was to provide better education for students with or without SEN, there should be different curricula and assessment mechanisms to meet the learning needs and gauge the learning outcome of students with different types of disabilities or at different levels of intellectual developments. The Administration would aim to work out the curriculum framework for children with SEN and appropriate assessment mechanisms as models for special schools to develop their school-based curriculum and assessment methodologies, as well as individualised education programmes for their students with different types of SEN or learning disabilities.

26. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that she believed that the Administration understood the needs of parents and the concerns of members about the provision of the “3+3” secondary education for students with SEN. Subject to availability of resources, the experts in EMB should be able to make adjustments to the mainstream academic structure and work out appropriate arrangements for students with SEN, including MH students, to enjoy the “3+3” secondary education. Miss CHAN, however, stressed that making adjustment should not lead to the creation of hindrance to these students. Moreover, the Government should not be the only decision-maker in resources allocation. She hoped that the Administration would establish more channels to collect views from various stakeholders. Miss CHAN considered that the Administration should put forward necessary financial proposals on the provision of the “3+3” secondary education to students with SEN for LegCo to consider. She believed that the community would respect the equal right of the students with SEN to have access to education under the new academic structure and would support allocation of more resources to assist these students.

27. DS(EM)5 responded that EMB had set out the broad arrangements for children with different SEN in its paper and would continue to listen to the views of the stakeholders before finalising the detailed proposals for further consultation. He pointed out that the proposed arrangements in the paper such as

Action

the development of a curriculum for children with SEN and assessment arrangements would require additional resources for implementation purposes. He anticipated that deputations would provide feedback on the proposed arrangements in the paper direct to EMB for consideration.

28. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung requested the Administration to elaborate on the difference between the provision of a six-year secondary education and the “3+3” secondary education. He also asked whether the provision of the “3+3” secondary education to students with SEN were subject to resources constraints.

29. PAS(CD)EM explained the principle of “one curriculum framework for all” in the provision of basic education, and the discretion of special schools to develop school-based curriculum and learning programmes to meet the learning needs of their students with SEN. She pointed out that EMB would follow the same rationale in the development of the new senior secondary curriculum for ordinary and special schools. She added that the consultation document on the new academic structure for senior secondary education and higher education had stipulated the objectives and structure of the new senior secondary curriculum. Ordinary and special schools should make reference to the curriculum framework in design of their school-based curriculum for the all-person development of their students.

30. DS(EM)5 pointed out that there might be different perceptions on the provision of senior secondary education for children with SEN between EMB and deputations. He explained that the provision of appropriate curricula and the adoption of effective class arrangements were essential considerations for achieving the expected learning outcome in different stages of basic and senior secondary education. He highlighted that the curriculum, the class arrangements and the academic structure were inter-connected and inseparable issues in education. As part of its Report on the consultation on the proposed new academic structure for senior secondary and higher education, the Administration expected to elaborate on the issues set out in the LC Paper No. CB(2)1317/04-05(02).

31. DS(EM)5 further explained that in line with the principle of “one curriculum framework for all”, EMB would work out a curriculum framework for the new senior secondary structure to meet the diverse needs, aspirations and attitudes of students. EMB would assess the resources implications of the new senior secondary curriculum when the community had reached a consensus on the new curriculum framework. He pointed out that there were separate policies on provision of public funds for special schools which required special support and equipment in the provision of special education for students with different SEN. Given the objective to provide all students with the best possible education programmes, EMB would have to ascertain the views of the community on the provision of different education programmes in different settings, and then estimate the long-term resources implications of providing

Action

these programmes in ordinary and special schools.

32. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung remarked that members and deputations understood the need to develop different curricula and individualised education programmes for students with specific learning needs. He pointed out that parents were concerned about the provision of fair and equal education opportunities for their children with SEN, and hence requested the Administration to confirm that children with SEN would be entitled to the “3+3” secondary education as their counterparts in mainstream schools. Mr LEUNG considered that the Administration should consult the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) whether the provision of a six-year secondary education in special schools and the “3+3” secondary education in mainstream schools would constitute discrimination against students with SEN in special schools. He also considered that the Subcommittee should invite EOC to give views on the matter at a future meeting.

33. Principal Assistant Secretary (School Administration and Support), Education and Manpower Bureau (PAS(SAS)EM) responded that EMB maintained close communication with EOC on matters related to the proposed new academic structure for senior secondary education and higher education. EMB would consult EOC when the arrangements for the provision of secondary education in special schools were finalised for further consultation.

34. The Chairman requested the Administration to confirm whether the “3+3” secondary education would be provided to children with SEN. DS(EM)5 reiterated that the Administration was finalising the report of the consultation on the proposed new academic structure for senior secondary education and higher education. The report would incorporate the proposals on how special education should be enhanced and implemented under the new senior secondary structure.

35. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong considered that the Administration should understand the needs of parents and their children with SEN in education as well as the role of the Subcommittee and members to uphold social justice and ensure fair and equal opportunities for vulnerable groups in the community, including the provision of equal education opportunities for children with SEN. He pointed out that staff of special schools often felt disappointed and frustrated when they found themselves being unable to help children with SEN develop their potentials and lead a normal adult life.

36. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong pointed out that the Administration would have to carefully examine the long-term resources implications of providing the “3+3” secondary education to children with SEN. He agreed that the design of the secondary curriculum for special schools and the provision of individualised education programmes for students with SEN would mean the Government’s long-term financial commitment in provision of special education under the new academic structure. He considered that the Secretary for Education and

Action

Manpower should consider the issue with a view to mapping out the way forward.

37. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong suggested that EMB should explain the financial implications of the “3+3” secondary education to the stakeholders and exchange views with them on the appropriate curricula and programmes for students with SEN under the new senior secondary structure. He pointed out that the senior secondary curriculum for special schools should be designed in the light of the learning needs of students with SEN, and not whether they would sit for the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education (HKDSE). He considered it essential for EMB to explain to parents the practical considerations and obtain the trust of parents and other stakeholders in order to facilitate future consultation on provision of resources and support for implementing the “3+3” secondary education in special schools.

38. Ms Audrey EU asked the Administration to elaborate on its proposed arrangements for provision of secondary education to MH students in special schools. PAS(SAS)EM responded that the Administration would plan the provision of manpower and support measures on the basis of the proposed arrangements for the development of school-based curriculum and education programmes for students with SEN in special schools. She pointed out that the Government would have to allocate additional resources to implement the proposed arrangements for students with SEN under the new secondary education as outlined in the Administration’s paper. She added that in terms of the average student unit cost, the Administration had already allocated adequate resources in special education.

Consultation with stakeholders

39. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan considered that EMB should establish a regular mechanism for consultation with the key stakeholders on the provision of special and integrated education for children with SEN.

40. DS(EM)5 responded that the Committee on Special Educational Needs (the SEN Committee) established under the Curriculum Development Council (CDC) to advise on curriculum development for students with SEN would continue to consult the stakeholders on the provision of appropriate curriculum for children with SEN under the new senior secondary structure. He pointed out that Principal Education Officer (Curriculum Development), Education and Manpower Bureau had discussed with the deputations the provision of a six-year secondary education for children with SEN and would further discuss with them.

41. PAS(SAS)EM said that parents of children with SEN who were enrolled in ordinary schools or different types of special schools had different areas of concerns. In view of this, EMB would organise separate meetings with groups of parents on the basis of their areas of concerns in order to facilitate focused

Action

discussions and effective exchange of views with parents.

42. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan considered that while consultation with parents might be carried out in the form of focused discussions on different areas of concerns, there should be a regular consultation mechanism to consult the stakeholders on the general policies regarding provision of senior secondary education for children with SEN. The parent representatives in the regular consultation mechanism should represent the interests of parents in specific sectors of special education instead of their personal views. He considered the operation of only one SEN Committee insufficient to encompass the views of the stakeholders on issues related to the provision of education for children with SEN.

43. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong and Ms Audrey EU shared the view that EMB should establish separate platforms for exchange of views with the stakeholders in the special education sector on an on-going basis. They considered it impractical for the Subcommittee to hold meetings for discussion with deputations and the Administration on the same issues repeatedly. Ms Audrey EU pointed out that EMB should establish consultation mechanisms which would allow the stakeholders to proactively express their views to EMB, instead of providing responses upon EMB's requests.

44. Miss CHAN Yuen-han considered that the Administration should improve its mechanisms for consultation with the stakeholders in the special education sector. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung considered that the Administration had responded to the request of the Subcommittee at the last meeting to improve the consultation process, but should demonstrate its sincerity to consult the views of deputations by improving the established consultation mechanism.

45. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong requested deputations to express their views and concerns about the provision of the "3+3" secondary education to students with SEN in their meeting with the Secretary for Education and Manpower on 26 April 2005. Ms Audrey EU suggested that the Administration and deputations to provide the Subcommittee with a summary of their discussion for follow-up discussion, as appropriate. At Mr CHEUNG's suggestion, the Chairman requested the Administration to provide the Subcommittee with the summary, in consultation with the deputations, in order to facilitate follow-up discussion.

Admin

46. PAS(SAS)EM responded that EMB would consider members' suggestions in enhancing consultation with the stakeholders. She pointed out that EMB held discussions with the Hong Kong Special School Council on a regular basis and would explore the feasibility of establishing a consultation mechanism to exchange views with parents on the reform of the academic structure of special schools on a regular basis. Meanwhile, EMB would continue to conduct focused discussions with parents on special topics in special

Action

education.

47. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong pointed out that parents were also concerned about the support and rehabilitation services for children with SEN after leaving secondary schools. He asked whether the Health, Welfare and Food Bureau and the Social Welfare Department (SWD) had similar mechanisms in place for consultation with parents and other stakeholders in the social welfare services sector. Mr CHEUNG stressed that it was important to provide welfare services to complement the implementation of the new academic structure for children with SEN.

48. Commissioner for Rehabilitation, Health, Welfare and Food Bureau responded that she would follow up closely with EMB and SWD on the provision of enhanced support and rehabilitation services arising from the implementation of the new academic structure. She also pointed out that SWD had established mechanisms in place for consultation with the stakeholders on provision of various social welfare services.

49. Assistant Director (Rehabilitation and Medical Social Services), Social Welfare Department supplemented that SWD held regular joint meetings with parent groups and associations on matters relating to the delivery of new and existing social welfare services. The next meeting was scheduled for 5 May 2005. SWD had issued invitation letter to parents associations, some of which were among deputations attending the meeting, to discuss new initiative of welfare services in 2005-06. If necessary SWD would conduct additional meetings with parents on matters of adult rehabilitation services arising from the implementation of the new academic structure as appropriate. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong suggested the deputations to approach SWD for participation in the meeting scheduled for 5 May 2005.

Children with SEN in mainstream schools

50. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung expressed concern about the emotional disturbances encountered by students with SEN in mainstream schools. He considered that EMB should review its policies and support measures in mainstream schools for the implementation of integrated education. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong shared the same view and urged the Administration to review the provision of support measures and resources to mainstream schools which had enrolled more than 20 000 children with SEN. He considered that children with SEN were not adequately supported in mainstream schools.

51. Ms Audrey EU requested the Administration to provide a paper on its review of the implementation of integrated education for children with SEN in mainstream schools. The Chairman added that the Subcommittee would discuss the issue at a future meeting.

Action

Admin

52. PAS(SAS)EM responded that EMB had conducted an opinion survey on the implementation of integrated education for children with SEN in mainstream primary and secondary schools on a yearly basis. She undertook to provide the information available to the Subcommittee for reference at a later stage.

Provision of boarding places for PD children

53. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan expressed sympathy for PD children who could not receive senior secondary education because of a lack of sufficient boarding places in the two existing PD schools which provided senior secondary education.

54. DS(EM)5 responded that the guiding principle in the provision of special education for children with SEN was to arrange the best placement for them. Under the new secondary education structure, PD students would, wherever practicable, be arranged to attend the same PD school throughout their secondary studies.

55. PAS(SAS)EM pointed out that PD students might, depending upon whether they were also MH or not, learn under the ordinary curriculum and sit for the HKDSE, or follow the curriculum tailor-made to suit their learning needs. EMB would discuss with the existing seven PD schools the arrangements for the provision of appropriate curriculum for their PD students under the new academic structure. EMB would arrange for the PD students to receive six-year secondary education, and where practical in the same PD school.

Overseas experience

56. Miss CHAN Yuen-han suggested that the Subcommittee should request the Research and Library Services Division of the LegCo Secretariat to conduct a research study on academic structures of special education in developed overseas cities. Members agreed.

57. DS(EM)5 responded that EMB would consider the prevailing international practices in provision of special education to children with SEN such as the development of learning outcomes and individualised education programmes. He considered that compared to other developed jurisdictions, Hong Kong was not lagging behind in the provision of special education to children with SEN. Nevertheless, he agreed that there was room for improvement in special education.

58. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong pointed out that Hong Kong was lagging behind the developed countries in class sizes of special schools. He considered that EMB should review class sizes for students with SEN, in particular the class sizes of 15 and 20 students for children with visual impairment and mild mental handicap respectively.



Action

59. PAS(SAS)EM responded that the class sizes for all categories of special schools were in the range of eight to 10 students, except the schools for social development, school for children with visual impairment and schools for children with mild mental handicap. She pointed out that the basic teacher-to-class ratio of special schools at 1: 1.5 compared favourably with that at 1:1.3 for ordinary schools. Furthermore, special schools were provided with additional resource teachers on the basis of their needs, resulting in much more favourable teacher-to-student ratios in special schools, which ranged from 1: 4.5 to 1: 8.5. For example, the teacher-to-student ratios of the special schools for children with visual impairment and mild mental handicap were 1: 4.5 and 1: 8.5 respectively.

Follow-up

60. In concluding, the Chairman said that it was a unanimous view of the Subcommittee that the Administration should set up a regular mechanism for consultation with the stakeholders on the provision of special education. He requested the Administration to provide a written response to members' requests and concerns raised at the meeting for discussion at future meetings.

Admin

**III. Any other business**

61. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:16 pm.

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
26 May 2005