

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1142/06-07
(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, 22 January 2007 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 CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
- Member absent** : Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP
- Public Officers attending** : Item II
Mrs Fanny LAM FAN Kit-fong
Principal Assistant Secretary (School Administration
and Support), Education and Manpower Bureau
Ms Eugenie WOO Yu-chun
Senior Specialist (Educational Psychology / Special
Education), Education and Manpower Bureau
Mr Francis YU Shing-ip
Principal Inspector (Comprehensive Review on Special
Education), Education and Manpower Bureau

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

Mr SIT Tung
Assistant Director (Rehabilitation and Medical Social
Services), Social Welfare Department

**Attendance by
invitation** : Item II

Hong Kong Association for Parents of Persons with
Physical Disabilities

Ms Sandy LAM
Executive Member

Ms Cecillia LAI
Member

Support Group on Integrated Education

Mr LAM Seung-wan
Executive Member

Heep Hong Society Parents Association Concern
Group for Inclusive Education

Ms NG Lai-ho
Convenor

The Parents' Association of Pre-School Handicapped
Children (Group of Skill Training School)

Ms LEUNG Chuen-king
Group Convenor

The Parents Association of Autistic Children
Mainstream Education

Ms CHAN Kwai-ling
Group Treasurer

Ms POON Po-ling
Group Member

The Parents' Association of Pre-School Handicapped
Children (Mainstream Education Group)

Ms NG Sui-fong
Group Consultant

Ms POON Wai-ha
Group Member

Education Convergence

Dr PANG I-wah
Concern Group Co-ordinator of Integration Education

Suen Mei Speech and Hearing Centre

Mrs Bessie PANG
Director

Hong Kong Association for Specific Learning
Disabilities

Mrs LAU LI Man-ying
Vice-Chairman

Mrs KWAN TO Chi-wah
Parent

**Clerk in
attendance** : Miss Odelia LEUNG
Chief Council Secretary (2)6

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

Miss Carmen HO
Legislative Assistant (2)6

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes
[LC Paper No. CB(2)911/06-07]

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 December 2006 were confirmed.

Action

II. Implementation of integrated education in primary and secondary schools

[LC Paper No. CB(2)876/06-07(01)]

2. The Chairman recapitulated the areas of concern expressed by members at previous discussions on the subject, including a lack of additional funding to support secondary schools in implementing integrated education; the small number of secondary schools adopting the whole-school approach to integrated education; insufficient support for parents in selecting secondary schools for their children with special education needs (SEN); the mechanism for transfer of student data from primary schools to secondary schools; and the staffing establishment and student enrolment in skills opportunity schools (SOS).

Oral presentation by deputations

Hong Kong Association for Parents of Persons with Physical Disabilities
[LC Paper No. CB(2)2806/05-06(01)]

3. Ms Sandy LAM described the experience of a parent and her son with SEN at Secondary two (S2) to illustrate the need for support from schools and teachers for students with SEN to learn in classrooms, access school facilities and participate in school and extra-curricular activities. She highlighted that the fostering of an inclusive culture was crucial for enhancing integration of students with SEN in ordinary schools. She also stressed that there should be no discrimination against students in special schools in allocation of S1 places under the Secondary School Place Allocation (SSPA) system.

Support Group on Integrated Education
[LC Paper No. CB(2)965/06-07(01)]

4. Mr LAM Seung-wan said that the Support Group on Integrated Education supported the continued provision of support and additional resources for the 37 secondary schools which had adopted the whole-school approach to integrated education. As regards the proposed one-off funding support for those schools which had yet to implement integrated education, the Support Group considered that the Administration should set out clear objectives and criteria, and allow flexibility in the time limit in using the fund. The Support Group had reservations about extending the New Funding Mode for primary schools to secondary schools as the effectiveness of the whole-school approach in primary schools had yet to be ascertained. The Support Group suggested that teachers should receive professional development training programmes on specific types of SEN and could then form a support team to support other teachers in the same school. The Administration should set out the policy and direction for the 10-hour school-based training on special education for schools with a large cluster of students with SEN; formulate policy to enhance follow-up of students

Action

with SEN progressing from primary to secondary schooling; and promote the attractiveness of SOS to enhance enrolment.

*Heep Hong Society Parents Association Concern Group for Inclusive Education
[LC Paper No. CB(2)931/06-07(01)]*

5. Ms NG Lai-ho said that Heep Hong Society Parents Association Concern Group for Inclusive Education considered it imperative for schools to formulate policies on the provision of individualised education programmes (IEPs), provide support, conduct regular reviews on IEPs, and establish a mechanism for parents to monitor their children's learning progress in class and lodge appeal in this respect. The Concern Group considered that apart from the provision of funding on per student basis, secondary schools should be provided with an additional teacher and teaching assistant for enrolment of every five students with SEN. The Concern Group suggested that the Administration should set up a mechanism to monitor the transfer of students with severe emotional or adjustment difficulties from ordinary schools to attend short-term intervention/attachment programmes in special schools cum resource centre.

*The Parents' Association of Pre-School Handicapped Children (Group of Skill Training School)
[LC Paper No. CB(2)913/06-07(01)]*

6. Ms LEUNG Chuen-king described the experience of her son to illustrate the need to reduce the class size from 30 to 20 students and provide a social worker for each SOS. She pointed out that SOS admitted a large number of students with different SEN including autistic spectrum disorder and hyperactivity disorder, and it was impossible for teachers to cope with a class size of 30 students with SEN. She requested the Administration to increase resources allocation for SOS to support students with various types of SEN in learning.

*The Parents Association of Autistic Children in Mainstream Education
[LC Paper No. CB(2)913/06-07(01)]*

7. Ms POON Po-ling described the experience of her son to illustrate the need for EMB, principals, teachers, teaching assistants and educational psychologists to collaborate in support of students with autistic spectrum disorder to learn in primary schools. She considered that schools should be provided with additional resources to support students with SEN in learning, and EMB should proactively assist schools in implementing integrated education. She stressed the need for teachers and teaching assistants to understand the behavioural characteristics of students with autism and EMB to collaborate with schools to provide a safe and supportive learning environment for them.

Action

The Parents' Association of Pre-School Handicapped Children (Mainstream Education Group)

[LC Paper No. CB(2)913/06-07(01)]

8. Ms NG Sui-fong said that to improve the implementation of integrated education, the Administration should set a minimum intelligence quotient score of 65 for enrolment of students with SEN in ordinary schools, and that students with multiple disabilities should not attend ordinary schools. She also requested EMB to explain the senior secondary curriculum for students with SEN in ordinary schools under the new academic structure and specify the additional resources allocation for primary and secondary schools to implement integrated education in the 2007-2008 school year.

9. Ms POON Wai-ha described the big difference in performance of her son with autism in reading, writing, listening and speaking of Chinese Language and other subjects to illustrate the difficulty of parents to select the appropriate secondary school for their children with SEN. She urged the Administration to reinforce support for parents in selection of secondary schools by providing appropriate assessment and support measures for students with SEN in primary schools.

Education Convergence

[LC Paper No. CB(2)931/06-07(02)]

10. Dr PANG I-wah presented the views of the Education Convergence as detailed in its submission. In brief, the Convergence urged the Administration to conduct a comprehensive review on policies and support for students with SEN. The Convergence considered that schools should establish an internal framework to support students with SEN and the stakeholders in the community including non-governmental organisations (NGOs), health care bodies, parent groups, alumni associations and schools should also collaborate to support students with SEN in education. The Convergence suggested that the Administration should work with the pre-primary education sector to identify students with SEN at kindergartens and increase the number of mainstreamed SOSs. To facilitate cost-effective implementation of integrated education, the Administration should amend the Disability Discrimination Ordinance (DDO) to enable schools to confine enrolment of students with only one to two specified types of SEN.

Suen Mei Speech and Hearing Centre

[LC Paper No. CB(2)931/06-07(03)]

11. Mrs Bessie PANG presented the views of Suen Mei Speech and Hearing Centre as detailed in its submission. In brief, the Centre suggested that the Administration should start the process for identification of students with SEN at pre-primary levels; amend the DDO to enable schools to confine enrolment of

Action

students with only one type of SEN; conduct a pilot study on implementation of integrated education in secondary schools; adopt a class size of 20 students for implementing integrated education; increase the number of mainstreamed SOS; and involve more NGOs and parents who were dedicated to and experienced in supporting students with SEN in the design and development of IEPs for student with SEN. In gist, the Centre suggested that the Administration should comprehensively review the policy, methods and pace for implementing integrated education.

*Hong Kong Association for Specific Learning Disabilities
[LC Paper No. CB(2)931/06-07(04)]*

12. Mrs KWAN TO Chi-wah said that according to the study conducted by Professor Connie HO Suk-han of the University of Hong Kong, around 9% to 12% of students in primary and secondary schools had dyslexia. The Hong Kong Association for Specific Learning Disability urged the Administration to allocate resources for secondary schools, including private independent schools and schools under the Direct Subsidy Scheme to support students with specific learning disability (SpLD students) in learning; adopt a small class of 12 students to teach students with SpLD; establish a resources, research and development centre for SpLD; ensure the continuity of accommodation measures for SpLD students in primary and secondary schools; and make reference to overseas experience in developing IEPs for individual SpLD students.

13. Mrs LAU LI Man-ying said that the Association strongly urged the Administration to allocate resources for the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority to provide more special examination arrangements and accommodations for SpLD students in public examinations, such as the provision of computer and multi-media aids in written examinations. The Association considered that SpLD students should have the right to enjoy equal opportunities in education and the Administration should provide them with appropriate support in this regard.

The Administration's response

14. Summing up the issues of concern raised by the deputations, the Chairman said that the deputations stressed the need for early identification of students with SEN at pre-primary level; the provision of additional resources for primary and secondary schools to implement integrated education; the provision of IEPs for students with SEN; interface in the provision of accommodation measures for students with SEN in primary and secondary schools; an increase in mainstreamed SOS to support students with SEN who had difficulty to learn in ordinary schools; a review on the policy, methods and pace for implementing integrated education; and amendment to the DDO to enable schools to confine enrolment of students with only one to two specified

Action

types of SEN. He invited the Administration to respond to the views of the deputations.

15. In response, Principal Assistant Secretary (School Administration & Support) (PAS(SAS)) said that the Administration would take note of the views and suggestions of the deputations expressed at the meeting in formulating the support measures for students with SEN. She pointed out that apart from the provision of additional resources and teacher professional development to build up schools' capacity in catering for student diversity, the availability of professional advice and support was equally important for smooth implementation of integrated education. She highlighted the 3-tier intervention model for students with SEN and the 13 new measures and initiatives to support students with SEN attending ordinary primary and secondary schools as detailed in the Administration's paper. She elaborated on the following -

- (a) EMB would encourage schools to provide more information on SEN support such as their support strategies, teacher training and special facilities for the provision of integrated education in the School Profiles, and conduct briefings for Student Guidance personnel to update them with the current SEN support services in secondary schools so that they would be better equipped to advise parents in selection of schools for their children with SEN;
- (b) the three mainstreamed SOS were located in Hong Kong, Kowloon and New Territories and mainly admitted students with severe learning difficulties. They were allowed to reserve up to 80% of the total S1 places for discretionary enrolment. The remaining places together with the unfilled discretionary places would be allocated through central allocation under the SSPA System. SOS served all SSPA nets and characteristics of these schools were highlighted in the SSPA Secondary Schools List to facilitate parents to make choices; and
- (c) EMB would continue to issue a circular to remind primary schools to ensure the transfer of student data to the secondary schools concerned within one month after the parents had confirmed the enrolment of their children with SEN to the respective secondary schools. The EMB officers would monitor the situation closely.

Discussion

Confining enrolment of students with one to two specified types of SEN in each school

16. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that despite the introduction of the new support measures, the Administration should review and adjust the pace of

Action

implementing integrated education in primary and secondary schools. He considered that the main problem with integrated education was the requirement on schools to admit students with different types of SEN but insufficient resources and support were provided for schools and teachers to cater for the diversity of students. He suggested that the Administration should amend the DDO to enable schools to confine enrolment of students with only one to two specified types of SEN in order that individual schools could focus efforts and resources to develop the professional expertise for handling students with specific types of SEN and parents could then select the schools with the appropriate expertise to cater for the SEN of their children.

17. PAS(SAS) responded that EMB had consulted the key stakeholders, the Department of Justice and the Equal Opportunities Commission on the feasibility and legality of allowing schools to confine admission of students with only one to two types of SEN for the implementation of integrated education. According to the legal advice obtained, confining the student intake of SEN types in a school to a certain number, say one or two, would probably go against the fundamental principle of the DDO that there should be no discrimination against disability in all aspects of life including education. In addition, the high incidence rates of certain types of SEN, the existence of multiple disabilities and the preference of schools for certain SEN types also rendered the proposal impracticable.

18. PAS(SAS) further said that the prevailing international trend was to provide integrated education for students with SEN in ordinary schools without discrimination. In principle, parents had the right to make school choices for their children, including those with SEN. Instead of amending the DDO and hence changing its fundamental principle, the Administration considered it more appropriate to provide resources and professional support to schools to enhance their capacity and teachers' knowledge and skills in catering for students with SEN.

19. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong remarked that if schools were allowed to limit enrolment of students with only one to two specified types of SEN, parents would have the option to send their children with SEN to these schools or other schools during the discretionary stage of school place allocation. Students with particular types of SEN who were unable to secure a place at the discretionary stage could still apply for the allocation of a P1 or S1 place under the central allocation stage of the Primary One Admission system or the SSPA system.

20. Senior Specialist (Educational Psychology / Special Education) (SS(EP/SE)) explained that ordinary schools had been admitting students with SEN for more than thirty years, before the implementation of the Integrated Education Programme (the IE Programme) in mid-1990s to encourage schools to adopt a whole-school approach to support students with SEN. In fact, students with autistic spectrum disorder and average intelligence had always been

Action

studying in ordinary schools. The Administration promoted the whole-school approach in order to enhance the capacity of ordinary schools in providing an inclusive environment for the development of students' potential. If schools were allowed to confine student intake to one to two types of SEN, these schools would gradually become "special schools" for the respective types of students with SEN.

21. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong remarked that the social value and expectation on the right of students with SEN to access education had changed substantially over the past thirty years. He stressed that the provision of integrated education for students with the same or similar type of SEN in nowadays schools was different from the provision of special classes for students with different types of SEN in the past. The experience of integrated education in primary schools showed that not all schools and teachers were ready to cater for the different SEN of students at this stage.

22. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan considered it necessary to amend the DDO to facilitate implementation of integrated education. He expressed doubt about the Administration's concern that allowing schools to confine enrolment to only one to two types of SEN might lead to a situation that no school would prefer to enrol students with certain types of SEN such as autism and hyperactivity disorder. He considered that should this really be the case, the Administration might encourage schools to admit students with these types of SEN by providing additional resources and support.

23. PAS(SAS) responded that primary schools were now provided with an additional grant of \$20,000 for enrolment of each student with autism and average intelligence or hyperactivity disorder. If schools were allowed to opt for confining enrolment to only one or two SEN types, it was likely that autism and hyperactivity disorder would become the least preferred SEN types. In effect, such arrangement would inevitably restrict parents' school choices and it might happen that students of a certain SEN type might be left with very few (or even no) schools willing to admit them in their respective school nets. She pointed out that the whole-school approach to integrated education had been implemented since 1997, and there were many cases of students with SEN being able to integrate into ordinary schools and performed satisfactorily. The Administration considered it inappropriate to regress by allowing schools to confine enrolment to only one to two SEN types in student intake.

24. Ms Audrey EU considered that there was no need to amend the DDO to enable schools to confine enrolment to certain types of SEN in student intake. She considered that the Administration should provide financial incentives to encourage schools to enrol students with specific types of SEN such as autistic spectrum or hyperactivity disorder.

Action

25. PAS(SAS) responded that this approach of encouraging schools to indicate their preference for certain types of SEN was more feasible than allowing schools to confine their enrolment to certain types of SEN. The Administration would be prepared to encourage and promote those schools which were willing to indicate their preference in admitting students with specific types of SEN. However, schools still could not reject applications for admission from students with other types of SEN under the existing DDO. The Administration had all along provided professional support and resources to schools which admitted students with SEN. SS(EP/SE) supplemented that many schools had developed expertise and a reputation in catering for the needs of students with specific types of SEN, and many parents had readily selected these schools for their children.

26. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan considered that schools should be provided with additional teachers and resources to implement small class teaching for students with SEN. He considered it more pragmatic to reduce the class size than to improve the teacher-to-students ratio in helping students with SEN in learning.

27. PAS(SAS) responded that schools which had enrolled students with persistent learning difficulties were provided with additional teachers and resources to enable them to arrange small group teaching. The Administration expected schools to make flexible use of their resources and to exercise their own professional discretion on whether to conduct small group teaching or adopt other teaching strategies.

Support for students with autism or hyperactivity disorder

28. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong considered that schools with enrolment of students with autistic spectrum disorder or hyperactivity disorder should be provided with additional resource teachers or teaching assistants to support them in learning.

29. PAS(SAS) responded that tier-3 support would be provided to students with autistic spectrum disorder or hyperactivity disorder who had difficulties in learning or adjustment with regard to their needs. Where necessary, additional support to both primary and secondary schools in the form of support from resource schools, secondment of resource teachers from EMB on a short term or part-time basis, or the provision of a time-limited programme fee for employing teaching assistant would be provided for hardcore cases and/or schools with a large cluster of students with SEN.

Resources and support for secondary schools adopting a whole-school approach to integrated education

30. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong pointed out that while there were 357 and 292 primary schools providing integrated education under the Intensive

Action

Remedial Teaching Programme (IRTP) and New Funding Mode respectively in the 2006-2007 school year, only 37 secondary schools had adopted the whole-school approach under the IE Programme. He called on the Administration to allocate resources to support more secondary schools in enrolment of students with SEN to ensure continuity in the provision of integrated education for students progressing from primary to secondary schooling.

31. PAS(SAS) explained that secondary schools were provided with various resources such as the Capacity Enhancement Grant to support students with diverse learning needs, including students with SEN. Starting from the 2006-2007 school year, secondary schools with a larger enrolment of Band 3 and bottom 10% S1 to S3 students would be provided with additional teachers, and as at September 2006, 380 additional teachers had been provided for 169 schools under the initiative. The Administration noted the fact that only 37 secondary schools participating in the IE Programme were provided with additional resources to adopt the whole-school approach to implementing integrated education. The Administration was now planning to extend support on implementation of the whole-school approach to catering for SEN in about 50 selected secondary schools with relatively more hardcore or clustered cases of SEN. The focussed support might start from the second term of the current school year. The Administration would also review the implementation of the new funding mode for primary schools and in the light of the experience in primary schools and that in secondary schools, the Administration might explore the feasibility of extending the approach to secondary schools to further strengthen the implementation of the whole school approach to integrated education.

32. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that apart from the provision of additional resources to secondary schools and professional development for their teachers, the Administration should consider the teaching requirement and learning environment in secondary schools and provide appropriate support for teachers to teach students with SEN in a class of 40 students. He suggested that the Administration should standardise the adoption of small class teaching for students with SEN, instead of leaving the schools to exercise discretion and flexibly deploy their resources to teach students with SEN in small groups.

33. PAS(SAS) responded that the Administration was aware of the difference in teaching requirement and school settings between primary and secondary schools. She also said that given an improved teacher-to-students ratio of 1:18, some secondary schools were able to flexibly use their resources and organise small group teaching for students with SEN

34. PAS(SAS) added that starting from the current school year, the Administration had assigned to each primary school a Special Education Support Officer (SESO) from EMB as a resource person to help schools promote the

Action

inclusive culture and develop the school-based policy for education of students with SEN. These SESOs visited schools at least three times a year to discuss with teachers their areas of concern and to see that the whole-school approach was being implemented in an effective way. They also conducted case conferences, provided on-site support for difficult cases, met with parents, helped schools draw up staff development plans and advised schools on resources deployment. The SESOs would also identify good practices in schools for professional sharing. The Administration had planned to extend the consultative and advisory visits to about 50 secondary schools with hardcore or clustered cases of SEN, possibly starting from the second term of the current school year. The Administration would examine the necessary support for secondary schools to adopt a whole-school approach to implement integration through the exercise and the experience gained from the 37 secondary schools participating in the IE Programme

35. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung considered that the allocation of \$10,000 or \$20,000 per student per annum, depending on the degree of support required, under the new funding mode for primary schools was insufficient for schools to provide the necessary support and services for students with SEN. He pointed out that the situation was particularly acute for those schools which had a few students with SEN as the small amount of additional allocation was far from enough to employ an additional teaching assistant to support students with SEN in learning. He asked how the Administration would ensure the provision of sufficient resources for secondary schools to implement integrated education.

36. PAS(SAS) responded that the Administration understood the expectation of secondary schools for more resources specifically targeted at students with SEN although most of them were covered under the initiative for academically low achievers. The Administration would review the implementation of the new funding mode in primary schools in the 2007-2008 school year. In the light of the experience in primary schools, the Administration would explore the feasibility of extending the new funding mode approach to secondary schools to further strengthen the implementation of the whole-school approach to integrated education.

Professional development for teachers

37. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong pointed out that the current policy on integrated education would require teachers to learn different knowledge and skills for handling students of different types of SEN. He considered it impossible to expect all serving teachers to attend the various training programmes on SEN, and unrealistic to expect teachers who had attended training on specific SEN to teach peers in schools to handle students with SEN. If schools were allowed to confine enrolment of students with similar types of SEN, the teachers in individual schools could then concentrate on the acquisition of the relevant knowledge and skills.

Action

38. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chjung highlighted that EMB should examine the difficulties encountered by teachers in the implementation of integrated education. The Chairman also asked for information on the arrangement for professional development of teachers to support students with SEN in the context of the current emphasis on specialised teaching in secondary schools.

39. PAS(SAS) responded that equipping teachers with the relevant knowledge and skills was the first step towards effective teaching and supporting students with SEN, which would in turn inculcate an attitude of accepting student diversity, leading to an inclusive culture in schools. To this end, a range of teacher training courses on special education were being offered to school heads and teachers. In addition, experience sharing among peers and professional on-site support arranged by EMB would enhance teachers' knowledge and skills in handling students with SEN.

Bullying of students with SEN

40. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong noted that the Administration would increase the number of resource schools and enhance their capacity in supporting and networking ordinary primary and secondary schools with enrolment of students with SEN through teacher empowerment, on-site support, and sharing of experience and resources. He expressed support for the short-term intervention/attachment programmes in special schools cum resource centres for students with severe emotional and adjustment difficulties, with a view to providing temporary relief for and transferring the necessary skills to the ordinary schools concerned. He requested the Administration to provide more details on the short-term transfer arrangements for students with SEN who had been bullied by peers or had difficulties in adjusting to the learning environment in ordinary schools.

Admin

Support for mainstreamed SOS

41. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong considered it impossible for a teacher to look after the needs of students with SEN in a class size of 30 in SOS. He urged the Administration to immediately reduce the class size of SOS to 20 students.

42. PAS(SAS) responded that the Administration had provided additional teachers for mainstreamed SOS. She pointed out that the teaching staff establishment for mainstreamed SOS was comparable to that of the former SOS. These mainstreamed SOS might exercise flexibility in deployment of the additional manpower and resources and arrange to teach students with SEN in small groups where appropriate.

43. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan remarked that if the staffing establishment for mainstreamed SOS was comparable to that of the previous SOS, they should be allowed to adopt a class size of 20 students as and when appropriate.

Action

Identification of SEN at pre-primary education

44. Ms Audrey EU said that many parents had complaints about the identification of their children with SEN at a late stage, although their children had displayed SEN symptoms during pre-primary education.

45. SS(EP/SE) responded that EMB had developed various teachers' observation checklists and assessment tests to assist teachers in ordinary schools to identify students with learning difficulties and speech problems as early as three months after the students had entered P1. Teachers of students identified to have learning difficulties at P1 were advised by Psychologist Assistants to provide adjusted teaching and appropriate support in learning. If their learning difficulties persisted, the students would then be referred to educational psychologists for further assessment.

46. PAS(SAS) supplemented that before their admission to primary school, children with SEN were assessed by the Department of Health. Upon receipt of notice from parents and assessment reports from the Department of Health, the school would provide remedial support to the children according to their nature of difficulties. Teachers also made use of the various checklists to identify students' SEN as early as possible, and provide adjusted teaching for the students concerned in line with the principle of "assessment through teaching". Students with persistent difficulty in learning would be referred to the educational psychologist for further assessment.

Way forward

47. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that the pace for implementing integrated education in ordinary schools should be pragmatically adjusted in the light of the operational experience in the past years. He considered that if schools were not allowed to confine enrolment of students with only one to two types of SEN, the implementation of integrated education in ordinary schools would be doomed to fail and all key stakeholders would suffer. He urged the Administration to consider the views of members and the deputations with a view to providing appropriate support for students with SEN in education.

48. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung urged the Administration to carefully consider the views and suggestions of members and the deputations with a view to resolving the problems in the implementation of integrated education. He expressed disappointment that the Administration seemed to be satisfied with the results of the implementation of integrated education in the past years, and did not consider it necessary to review the policies and the pace in this regard. He suggested that EMB should consider the current problems with integrated education from the perspectives of parents and front-line teachers.

Action

49. PAS(SAS) responded that in response to the views of members and the deputations collected earlier, the Administration implemented or would implement altogether 13 new initiatives and measures as from the current school year to facilitate the implementation of integrated education. In response, the Chairman requested the Administration to provide more details on individual new initiatives and measures. PAS(SAS) said that the 13 new initiatives and measures were already set out in the paper under discussion.

50. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that despite the Administration's efforts and initiatives, the problems identified in the implementation of integrated education had remained unsolved. She pointed out that the main problem was a lack of sufficient resources to support schools and teachers. She suggested that schools should be provided with additional resources for enrolment of each student with SEN, and the Administration should consider adopting a voucher system to support students with SEN in education. She also suggested that the Subcommittee might consider arranging a meeting with the Secretary for Education and Manpower concerning the provision of resources for implementing integrated education.

51. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong moved the following motion -

"小組委員會促請政府當局在 2007-2008 學年開始 —

1. 鼓勵學校專業分工，發展專長處理一至兩類有特殊教育需要的學童；學校的收生類別應在選校表為家長知悉，該校的教師按學校的收生類別而集中培訓；而政府須按該類學童的需要提供專項人力和資源；
2. 就自閉症和過度活躍症兒童，實行以資源跟學生的原則，讓學校每收一個學童，均可得到第三級的支援，包括可聘用學校助理或資源老師，為這些學童提供貼身的個別照顧；
3. 在中學資助模式未有定案之前，先將小學的新資助模式擴展至中學，解決當前的嚴重樽頸問題；
4. 在技能訓練學校實行小班教學，以 20 人為一班；及
5. 必須以小班教學推行融合教育，才有成效。"

(Translation)

"That the Subcommittee urges the Administration to do the following from the 2007-2008 school year:

- (a) encourage professional division of labour in schools to develop expertise in handling students with one to two types of special

Action

educational needs; specify the student categorization of the schools in the school selection forms for parents' information and provide focused training to teachers according to the categorization of their schools; and provide specific manpower and resources in the light of the needs of students in those categories;

- (b) in respect of autistic and hyperactive children, adopt the principle of "funding following the student" so that for enrolment of every such student the school will receive tier-3 support, which may include hiring teaching assistants or resource teachers to render individualized caring services for these students;
- (c) extend the new funding model for primary schools to secondary schools to resolve the current problem of a serious bottleneck, pending finalization of the secondary school funding model;
- (d) implement small class teaching with a class size of 20 in the skills opportunity schools; and
- (e) implement integrated education by way of small class teaching, which is imperative for achieving the desired effect."

52. The Chairman put the motion to vote. All members present supported the motion. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

III. Any other business

53. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:57 pm.