

立法會
Legislative Council

Ref : CB2/PL/ED

LC Paper No. CB(2)1456/05-06
(These minutes have been seen by
the Administration)

Panel on Education

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 13 February 2006 at 4:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building

Members present : Dr Hon YEUNG Sum (Chairman)
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon MA Lik, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP

Public Officers attending : Item IV

Mr Chris WARDLAW
Deputy Secretary for Education and Manpower (5)

Dr Catherine K K CHAN
Principal Assistant Secretary (Curriculum
Development), Education and Manpower Bureau

Mrs Betty IP
Principal Assistant Secretary (School Administration
and Support), Education and Manpower Bureau

Dr Francis CHEUNG
Deputy Secretary General, Hong Kong Examinations
and Assessment Authority

Mr HP SOU
Chief Curriculum Development Officer
(Career-oriented Curriculum)

Miss Sarah NGAI
Chief Curriculum Development Officer (Kindergarten
and Primary)

**Attendance by
invitation** : Item IV

Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union

Mr Don CHENG Sau-leung
Executive Committee Member

Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers

Mr CHIM Wa-kwan
Executive Committee

Mr FOONG Nim-yee
Assistant Project Supervisor

Parents' Alliance on Special Education System

Ms Panny KONG Wai-ying
Convenor

Ms Karen CHAN Cheuk-man
Vice-Convenor

Hong Kong Special Schools Council

Mrs Rita MANSUKHANI AU Hay-lui
Chairlady

Mr CHAN Kwok-kuen
Vice-Chairman

The Special Education Society of Hong Kong

Mr Andrew TSE
Chairperson

Ms Maria WONG
Vice-Chairperson

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

[LC Paper No. CB(2)1044/05-06]

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2006 were confirmed.

II. Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting

2. Members noted the following papers which had been issued since the last meeting –

- (a) school project proposal on the construction of a primary school at Sheung Shui [LC Paper No. CB(2)999/05-06(01)]; and
- (b) school project proposal on the construction of a Direct Subsidy Scheme Primary School at Nam Fung Path, Wong Chuk Hang [LC Paper No. CB(2)999/05-06(02)].

III. Items for discussion at the next meeting

[Appendices I and II to LC Paper No. CB(2)1043/05-06]

3. Members agreed to discuss “Review of Post-secondary Education Sector” at the next meeting scheduled for 27 March 2006 at 8:30 am.

IV. Consultation document entitled “Action for the Future – Further Consultation on Career-oriented Studies and the New Senior Secondary Academic Structure for Special Schools”

Briefing by the Administration

Action

4. Deputy Secretary for Education and Manpower (5) (DS(EM)5) briefed members on the main proposals in the consultation document entitled “Action for the Future - Further Consultation on Career-oriented Studies and the New Senior Secondary Academic Structure for Special Schools (the consultation document)”.

Oral presentation by deputations

Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1129/05-06(01)]

5. Mr CHENG Sau-leung presented the views of the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union as detailed in its submission tabled at the meeting. He highlighted that the Union acknowledged the importance of career-oriented studies (COS) and special education under the new academic structure, but opposed the implementation of the proposals in parallel with other reform initiatives. The Union considered that the Government should review the priorities of initiatives for progressive implementation of the education reform.

6. On implementation of COS, the Union suggested that the Administration should ensure the practicability of the curriculum, specify the maximum class size for each COS programme, plan the teaching manpower and the professional development for teachers, and monitor and review the implementation of COS programmes in different schools and institutions. As regards implementation of the new secondary curriculum for special education, the Administration should provide sufficient support to special schools, establish a consultation and coordination mechanism, review the implementation of integrated education in ordinary schools, plan the role and functions of existing special schools and their teachers and reduce the class sizes for implementation of the new academic structure.

Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1093/05-06(01)] (revised)

7. Mr CHIM Wa-kwan presented the views of the Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers as detailed in its submission. He highlighted that the Federation supported the conduct of further consultation on COS and the new senior secondary academic structure for special schools. The Federation suggested that the Administration should further elaborate on the planning and development for COS, empower the COS Committee to be established with the authority to add, delete or amend the scope of the COS curriculum, amend the relevant ordinances and regulations to allow practitioners in COS-related industries to teach COS, and to continue the operation of the Yi Jin/Secondary School Collaboration Project (the Collaboration Project) after the commencement of the new senior secondary (NSS) academic structure.

Action

*Parent's Alliance on Special Education System
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1129/05-06(02)]*

8. Ms Panny KONG and Ms Karen CHAN presented the views of the Parent's Alliance on Special Education System as detailed in its submission. Ms Panny KONG stressed that the Alliance considered it imprudent to conclude from the report of "A Study of the Effectiveness of Special Schools (the Study)" that overall special schools were not cost-effective in provision of support to students with special educational needs (SEN) in learning. The Alliance considered that the contributions of the principals and teachers in special schools over the years should be recognised.

9. Ms Karen CHAN supplemented that the Alliance was concerned about the provision of sufficient resources for implementation of integrated education and special education, the provision of 10 years of basic education for students with intellectual disability (ID students), and the increase of school fees and boarding fees under the new academic structure for special schools. The Alliance also considered that parents should be invited to participate in school management and design of individualised education programmes for their children with SEN, instead of assisting teachers in school administrative work.

*Hong Kong Special Schools Council
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1129/05-06(03)]*

10. Mrs Rita MANSUKHANI AU presented the views of the Hong Kong Special Schools Council as detailed in its submission. She pointed out that the special education sector was dissatisfied with the findings of the Study which covered only 10 special schools. She highlighted that the Council supported the provision of three-year senior secondary education for students with SEN, and was ready to participate and contribute in the design of the new senior secondary curriculum for ID students (the NSS(ID) curriculum) and the assessment framework for special education. The Council also considered it essential to increase allocation for implementation of integrated education and special education under the new academic structure.

*The Special Education Society of Hong Kong
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1129/05-06(04)revised]*

11. Mr Andrew TSE and Ms Maria WONG presented the views of the Special Education Society of Hong Kong as detailed in the revised submission. The Society suggested that the Administration should change the Chinese version of the NSS(ID) curriculum from "新高中(智障兒童學校)課程" to "新高中(智障兒童)課程", consult the stakeholders of the special education sector on the design of the NSS(ID) and COS curriculum framework for students with SEN, develop a formula for the allocation of recurrent resources to different

Action

types of special schools, and set the NSS school fees on the basis of the current senior secondary fees in special schools.

12. To sum up, the Chairman said that deputations in general supported the proposed new academic structure for special schools and the adoption of the same curriculum framework for student learning in ordinary and special schools, with adaptation to suit students of different learning characteristics. He shared the view of deputations that additional resources should be allocated for special schools to implement the new senior secondary curriculum for students with SEN.

The consultation on COS and the new academic structure for special schools

13. Ms Emily LAU asked about the justification for the Administration to conduct further consultation on COS and the new senior secondary academic structure for special schools in the same consultation exercise.

14. DS(EM)5 explained that COS and the new academic structure for special schools were incorporated in chapters 5 and 6 of the consultation document entitled “New Academic Structure for Senior Secondary Education and Higher Education – Action Plan for Investing in the Future of Hong Kong” published in May 2005. The Administration considered that there were issues relating to the two subjects to be further considered under the new academic structure. DS(EM)5 added that the special education sector also supported the provision of COS, with appropriate adaptation for students with SEN in special schools.

New academic structure for special schools

10-year basic education for ID students

15. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong expressed support for the provision of a three-year junior secondary education and a three-year senior secondary education for students with SEN, including ID students. He considered that like students who were physically disabled (PD students) or hearing impaired (HI students), students with mild, moderate or severe intellectual disability would also attend therapies or hospitalization from time to time and should be provided with 10 years of basic education.

16. Principal Assistant Secretary (School Administration and Support) (PAS(SAS)) responded that ID students who were required to receive frequent therapies or prolonged hospitalisation that had significantly affected their schooling would be allowed to repeat the level of study in the ensuing school year.

17. Ms Panny KONG commented that in an advanced city like Hong Kong, the provision of an additional year of basic education for ID students was

Action

acceptable and feasible. She considered that the provision would help transition of ID students from schools to vocational placement and adult life.

18. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong considered it necessary to adopt a fair and consistent approach in the provision of basic education for students with SEN in different types of special schools. He suggested that the Administration should conduct a survey on the frequency and duration of disruptions in learning in respect of students with mild, moderate or severe intellectual disability to ascertain whether they should be provided with 10 years of basic education. He considered that special schools for students with severe intellectual disability should be given a larger quota for repeaters at different levels of studies. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed support for Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's views. He said that some ID students who were also physically disabled were provided with 10 years of basic education in PD schools.

Adm

19. PAS(SAS) responded that the class sizes of special schools were in general smaller than those in ordinary schools. The Administration would consider the need of individual ID students to repeat a year of study, instead of assigning a fixed percentage of repeaters at different levels for special schools. She pointed out that while PD and HI students would follow the ordinary curriculum, ID students would be provided with individualised education programme tailored by teachers in special schools. In view of members' concern, she said that the Administration might look into the issue of ID students who had to repeat their study arising from their need to receive frequent therapies and prolonged hospitalisation.

20. In response to Ms Panny KONG's queries as to why ID students were required to leave special schools at the age of 18 whereas students in ordinary schools were not subject to such age limitation and whether the requirement was in conflict with the Disability Discrimination Ordinance, PAS(SAS) said that ID students normally enrolled in primary one (P1) at the age of six and they had 12 years of education including the two-year Extension of Years of Education (EYE) Programme. These students thus normally would leave school at the age of 18.

21. Dr Fernando CHEUNG remarked that ID students were now provided with nine years of basic education, followed by a two-year EYE Programme which was introduced from the 2002/03 school year. He added that the Administration had not provided additional funding to special schools for the implementation of the EYE Programme.

Provision and development of the NSS curriculum and the NSS(ID) curriculum

22. Mr Patrick LAU noted that around 50 of the 62 existing special schools operated only one class per level, and students with SEN capable of following the ordinary curriculum would have access to a range of elective subjects as other students. However, the small school size and small number of senior

Action

secondary classes in special schools would limit the choice and combination of NSS subjects to be offered in individual special schools. He considered that the Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB) should encourage special schools to collaborate and share resources with other special schools and/or ordinary schools in the vicinity to provide a wider range of NSS courses. From the perspective of enhancing cost-effectiveness in resources utilisation, Mr LAU asked whether the Administration would consider it more appropriate to implement the NSS curriculum and NSS(ID) curriculum in some or each special school.

23. DS(EM)5 responded that the Administration was committed to the implementation of the NSS academic structure and had earmarked resources to cater for the potential demand for additional classes in special schools. In view of the need to ensure cost-effective use of resources, EMB would also encourage special schools to collaborate and share resources with other special schools and/or ordinary schools in the vicinity to provide a wider range of NSS courses.

24. PAS(SAS) added that it would be educationally more sound for a school to offer more choices for students with SEN in the senior secondary. But some parents had expressed a strong preference for their children with SEN to complete secondary education in the same school.

25. Ms Emily LAU expressed concern about the progress in development of the NSS curriculum and the NSS(ID) curriculum which would determine the appropriate level of resources for special schools under the new academic structure. She invited views from deputations on the Administration's proposal in this respect.

26. Mr Andrew TSE considered that under the new academic structure, recurrent funding for special schools should be provided on the basis of the number of operating classes rather than the number of students enrolled. He was concerned that an existing school with 100 ID students in 10 classes might be required to operate 12 classes, i.e. one class at each level from P1 to secondary six (S6), at the current level of funding allocation.

27. PAS(SAS) responded that the Administration had considered Mr Patrick LAU's view on the provision of senior secondary education in selected special schools to enhance cost-effectiveness and diversity of curriculum choices in the implementation of the new academic structure for special schools. However, parents would prefer that their children with SEN would complete primary and secondary education in the same school. In this connection, the Administration would pilot the NSS(ID) curriculum programmes in various types of special schools and examine the delivery of the new academic structure and its impact on the operation of the special schools during the transition period leading up to 2009.

Action

28. Ms Maria WONG said that the Curriculum Development Council (CDC) was working on the development of the COS subject curriculum and the NSS(ID) curriculum for pilot runs in special schools. She agreed that the level of resources for different types of special schools should be determined in the light of the NSS(ID) curriculum, but should not be worked out on the basis of the pilot runs on the NSS(ID) and the individualised education programmes in some special schools during the transition period. She suggested that the Administration should further consult the stakeholders before determining the appropriate level of recurrent funding for implementation of special education under the new academic structure in due course.

29. The Chairman asked about the Administration's progress in the development of the NSS(ID) curriculum and assessment framework. Deputy Secretary General, Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority responded that the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority would take part in the development of learning outcome and advise on the validity and assessment design and processes. The Committee on Special Educational Needs of CDC was collaborating with local and international experts and frontline teachers to develop the various subject curriculum frameworks. So far the progress of development was smooth and satisfactory.

30. Principal Assistant Secretary (Curriculum Development) PAS(CD) supplemented that unlike the 24 NSS subject curriculum for ordinary schools which had a long history of development, the NSS(ID) curriculum was new in school education. As Hong Kong had little experience in this area, the Administration would make reference to overseas experiences and collaborate with local and international experts in the design and development of the NSS(ID) curriculum. The draft NSS(ID) curriculum would be piloted in conjunction with the 24 draft subject curriculum frameworks for students of the mainstream curriculum and be validated to develop a more consolidated and reliable learning outcome framework. She added that Appendix 6 of the consultation document had set out a continuum of the learning needs of students with ID.

Resources considerations

31. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed appreciation of the Administration's response to the concern of members and the special education sector about the provision of a three-year junior and a three-year senior secondary education for students with SEN. He, however, questioned whether the Administration had the intention to allocate additional resources for special schools to implement the new academic structure for special education. He pointed out that paragraph 11.3 of the consultation document highlighted the findings of the Study that some special schools were not managed in a cost-effective manner. He considered that the Administration was more inclined to improve cost-effectiveness in management of special schools than to allocate additional

Action

resources for special education.

32. DS(EM)5 responded that the Administration was committed to the implementation of the NSS academic structure and had earmarked resources to cater for the potential demand for additional number of classes in special schools. As highlighted in paragraph 7.13 of the consultation document, the Administration proposed that students with ID should be provided with three years of junior secondary and three years of senior secondary education. In collaboration with stakeholders in the special education sector, EMB was currently working on an adapted curriculum for special education under the new academic structure. The Administration had taken into account the different capabilities and needs of students with ID and would design a balanced and manageable adapted curriculum for them. The experiences gained from the existing EYE Programme for ID students would provide valuable input to developing the NSS(ID) curriculum.

33. Dr Fernando CHEUNG asked about the total funding for implementation of special education under the new academic structure. He also asked about the distribution of the \$115 million committed for the implementation of the pilot COS programmes for special education. Ms Emily LAU considered it reasonable to allocate additional resources to support the implementation of special education under the new academic structure. She asked whether the \$115 million was sufficient to support the operation of the pilot COS and senior secondary classes in special schools during the transition period leading up to 2009.

34. DS(EM)5 clarified that the \$115 million was committed for the transition period leading up to 2009 to encourage the growth of diversity of curriculum, assessment and pathways in the senior secondary schools including COS pilots. The Administration was confident that the allocation was sufficient for piloting the COS courses and the NSS(ID) curriculum in conjunction with the draft subject curriculum framework for students with ID in special schools.

35. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed dissatisfaction that the amount of \$115 million was not designated for the use of special education only. He opined that the Administration should have set out clearly the intended use of the funding. At Ms Emily LAU's request, DS(EM)5 agreed to explain in writing how the amount of \$115 million was worked out. He undertook to provide estimates of the expenditure for the COS pilots and the NSS(ID) curriculum after consultation with the special education sector.

Adm

36. Ms Audrey EU pointed out that at the meeting of the Subcommittee to Study Issues Relating to the Provision of Boarding Places, Senior Secondary Education and Employment Opportunities for Children with Special Educational Needs (the Subcommittee), the Administration had been reluctant to confirm the provision of a three-year junior and a three-year senior secondary education for

Action

students with SEN. Referring to paragraph 7.13 of the consultation document, she asked about the financial implications for the implementation of the NSS(ID) curriculum for students with ID, including those in special schools for VI, HI or PD students.

37. PAS(SAS) responded that the appropriate level of resources for special schools for students with ID would be determined when details of the NSS(ID) curriculum, the learning outcomes and assessment standards had been worked out with the consensus of key stakeholders. The Committee on Special Educational Needs of CDC was collaborating with local and international experts and frontline teachers to develop the various subject curriculum frameworks. The NSS(ID) curriculum would be piloted, and the additional resources for full implementation would be worked out based on the results of the pilots.

38. Responding to Ms Audrey EU, Ms Panny KONG said that parents accepted the proposal in paragraph 7.13 of the consultation document, and agreed that the additional resources required was dependent on the design and contents of the NSS curriculum and the NSS(ID) curriculum.

School fees

39. Dr Fernando CHEUNG noted that according to paragraph 11.10 of the consultation document, existing government policy on tuition fee required students to pay 18% of the cost of senior secondary education and the same policy would apply to senior secondary students in both ordinary and special schools. He pointed out that ID students in special schools were not required to pay additional tuition fees for the two-year EYE Programme. He requested the Administration to clarify whether tuition fees in special schools would be increased under the new academic structure.

40. DS(EM)5 responded that the current policy was that senior secondary students in both ordinary and special schools would pay the same level of school fees at 18% of the total unit cost of secondary education. In computing the average unit cost, the cost of both ordinary and special schools would be aggregated. In other words, students in both ordinary and special schools at the same level of study would pay the same level of school fee.

41. Dr Fernando CHEUNG noted that the Administration had proposed in paragraph 5.14 of the consultation document a funding model for the third cohort of the COS pilots in the 2005-07 school years, under which the students would contribute not more than 18% of the costs, and the Government would make up the remaining 82% with the schools contributing 41% from existing resources. He asked whether the Administration had worked out estimates of NSS fees for special schools. He considered that parents should be informed of the possible increase in school fees after implementation of the new academic structure.

Action

42. DS(EM)5 responded that the school fees for senior secondary classes would be known nearer the time as the total unit cost of senior secondary schooling would need to take account of all the investment in the new senior secondary, including that in special schools.

School conversion work and boarding services

43. Mr Patrick LAU asked how the Administration would assist existing special schools not operating senior secondary class at present to offer NSS programmes under the new academic structure. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong shared Mr LAU's concern. He urged the Administration to plan the necessary conversion work for existing special schools to be equipped with sufficient classrooms, facilities and boarding places, if applicable, for providing the new NSS(ID) curriculum from the 2009/10 school year.

44. DS(EM)5 responded that resources had been earmarked for capital works including conversion works for ordinary and special schools for the implementation of the new academic structure in the 2009/10 school year. PAS(SAS) supplemented that EMB was aware of the need for additional facilities in some special schools, and had already commenced discussion with these schools on the necessary conversion and improvement works that should be carried out in connection with NSS.

Career-oriented Studies

45. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that under the planned COS pilots, students with SEN would be provided with a limited number of COS courses such as cleansing services and food preparation and servicing. He expressed dissatisfaction with the limited choice and the arrangement for students with SEN to attend COS courses at venues provided by course providers.

46. DS(EM)5 responded that the COS curriculum as an integral part of the NSS curriculum was intended to provide choices to meet the diverse learning needs of students, including those with SEN. To ensure quality and consistency of standards, the number of courses offered under COS would be kept within a manageable limit at the initial stage. When relevant parties including schools, parents and the relevant industries built up sufficient experiences, the scale of COS would be expanded to provide a wider range of choice for students. Students without ID would follow the ordinary school curriculum and join the same COS courses as other students, with special arrangements and support as necessary and appropriate. ID students would be provided with COS courses with appropriate adaptation that would suit their needs better. Currently, EMB was working with potential course providers to offer suitable courses for these students under the COS pilot.

Action

47. Mr Patrick LAU asked whether the Administration would consider the provision of COS to students who were less academically-inclined at SS1 level by training institutions such as the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE). He considered it appropriate to provide students with opportunities to pursue COS offered by IVE from SS1 level.

48. DS(EM)5 responded that the Administration considered it beneficial for all students to attend SS1 classes drawing on the range of key learning areas offering before they engaged in a particular orientation of studies. On grounds of equity, all students should be provided with choice in NSS subjects and COS according to their interests, aptitudes and abilities, and be taught and assessed in flexible ways under the same curriculum framework and expected learning outcomes. He explained that COS complemented the NSS subjects by offering studies with stronger elements of applied learning linked to broad professional and vocational fields. The introduction of COS in NSS curriculum signified a big step towards diversified learning opportunities in senior secondary education, and would in particular benefit students with a strong practical orientation in learning.

49. Mr Patrick LAU remarked that SS1 students with a strong inclination to pursue specific career-oriented programmes should be given the opportunities to switch their studies from secondary schools to training institutions such as IVE.

50. DS(EM)5 explained that the Administration anticipated that school-age students could complete their secondary education in schools. He pointed out that there was worldwide evidence suggesting that premature or early departure from school life had adverse impact on a student's life prospects. The NSS curriculum would provide a wide range of academic and work-related learning experience for students. Having said that, the Administration acknowledged the need of some students to pursue quality vocational learning offered by training institutions such as IVE, and had no intention to discourage these students from so doing.

51. PAS(CD) supplemented that students would be introduced to the range of curriculum choices available at SS2 and SS3 levels, and they could choose up to three COS electives. Under the NSS curriculum framework, learning and teaching packages for both English and Chinese Languages and Mathematics with learning contexts taken from various COS courses would be developed for school-based adaptations. In particular, English Language would offer "Learning English through Workplace Communication" as one of its elective modules. Furthermore, the international benchmarking results had suggested that the content of Liberal Studies suited the needs of all students owing to its contemporary nature.

52. Ms Audrey EU said that students in schools formerly known as skills opportunity schools were now provided with COS courses in classes of 30

Action

students. She asked whether the Administration would consider reducing the class size to enhance teaching and learning outcome.

53. PAS(SAS) responded that classes in these schools currently accommodated 25 to 30 students. She pointed out that under the NSS curriculum, many COS programmes would be conducted in smaller groups to enhance teaching and learning effectiveness.

54. Ms Audrey EU pointed out that students in the two schools formerly known as skills opportunity schools were not intellectually disabled, but required closer attention and more assistance from teachers in learning. They were more interested to learn in non-academic areas and should be taught in smaller classes. Although they might learn in small groups on COS courses under the NSS curriculum, the recurrent resources for these schools would still be provided on the basis of the number of classes with 30 students. She urged the Administration to allow these schools to operate smaller classes and provide them with appropriate level of resources.

55. PAS(SAS) responded that under the new academic structure, additional resources would be allocated for the operation of senior secondary classes and COS programmes. The Administration was aware of the needs of the students in the two schools formerly known as skills opportunity schools, and would provide appropriate support for the schools to implement the new senior secondary curriculum.

Professional development programmes for teachers

56. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that as 55% of schools had indicated their intention to offer COS courses during the second consultation on the NSS curriculum, the Administration should carefully plan and coordinate the provision of professional development opportunities and arrangements for secondary school teachers who intended to take up COS teaching. He asked how the Administration would ensure a steady teaching workforce in schools during the transition period when some 400-500 serving teachers would be arranged to attend the professional development programmes.

57. DS(EM)5 responded that around 500 serving secondary school teachers had indicated their wish to take part in the teaching of COS courses. They would be arranged to participate in the COS pilots in order to work out the appropriate arrangements for serving teachers to attend COS development programmes without affecting the operation of the schools concerned leading up to 2009/10 school year.

Follow-up

58. Dr Fernando CHEUNG pointed out that the consultation document had

Action

not incorporated sufficient details for implementing the new academic structure for special schools, such as recognition for COS under the qualifications framework and recurrent funding for special schools to implement the NSS(ID) curriculum. He suggested that the Subcommittee should follow up discussion of the consultation document. Members raised no objection.

Adm

59. In view of the concerns of members and deputations, the Chairman requested the Administration to provide the Panel with a progress report on the results of the current consultation at an appropriate time.

V. Any other business

60. Members noted that Miss Odelia LEUNG would take over from Miss Flora TAI the clerkship to the Panel. On behalf of the Panel, the Chairman recorded a note of thanks to the services provided by Miss TAI in the past years.

61. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:45 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
20 March 2006