

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(4)390/13-14  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PS/1/12

**Panel on Education**

**Subcommittee on Integrated Education**

**Minutes of the tenth meeting  
held on Friday, 13 December 2013, at 8:30 am  
in Conference Room 2 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung (Chairman)  
Hon IP Kin-yuen (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP

**Member absent** : Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan

**Public Officers attending** : Item I & II

**Education Bureau**

Mr Kevin YEUNG, JP  
Under Secretary for Education

Ms Sophia WONG  
Principal Education Officer (Special Education &  
Kindergarten Education)

Mrs Anissa WONG  
Senior Education Officer (Special Education  
Support 3)

Ms Y S LAW  
Education Officer (School Places Allocation) 3

**Attendance by Invitation** : Centre for Sign Linguistics and Deaf Studies,  
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Mr YIU Kun-man  
Senior Programme Officer

Dr WONG Chi-tak

Hong Kong Association for Specific Learning  
Disabilities

Ms Snowy CHOI Shuet-chun  
Advocacy Team Convener

Parents Group of SLD Community Support Project,  
Caritas – HK(YCS)

Ms Rainbow WONG  
Member

**Clerk in attendance** : Miss Polly YEUNG  
Chief Council Secretary (4) 4

**Staff in attendance** : Mr Ian CHOW  
Council Secretary (4) 4

Ms Sandy HAU  
Legislative Assistant (4) 3

---

Action

- I. Current mechanism for placing students with special educational needs into mainstream primary and secondary schools, including parental choice and home-school cooperation**
  
- II. New Funding Model for integrated education in primary and secondary schools and the adequacy or otherwise of the funding**

Papers provided by the Administration

(LC Paper No. CB(4)232/13-14(01) - Paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(4)410/12-13(03) - Administration's written response to the Equal Opportunities Commission's Report of the Study on Equal Learning Opportunities for Students with Disabilities under the Integrated Education System

LC Paper No. CB(4)952/12-13(01) - Administration's written response to the consolidated summary of views/concerns raised at the meetings on 30 April and 27 May 2013

LC Paper No. CB(4)1007/12-13(01) - Administration's written response to the consolidated summary of views/concerns raised at the meetings on 18 June and 8 July 2013

LC Paper No. CB(4)146/13-14(01) - Administration's written response to the summary of views/concerns raised at the meeting on 3 October 2013

LC Paper No. CB(4)244/13-14(01) - Administration's written response to a letter dated 11 December 2013 from the Chairman requesting information on the New Funding Model for integrated education in primary and secondary schools)  
(*Chinese version only*)

Papers prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat

(LC Paper No. CB(4)216/13-14(01) - Composite table listing the views/concerns of deputations and members, as well as the responses provided by the Administration in respect of previous meetings (February to October 2013)

LC Paper No. CB(4)824/12-13(01) - A consolidated summary of views/concerns raised at the meetings on 30 April and 27 May 2013

LC Paper No. CB(4)945/12-13(01) - A consolidated summary of views/concerns raised at the meetings on 18 June and 8 July 2013

LC Paper No. CB(4)111/13-14(01) - A summary of views/concerns raised at the meeting on 3 October 2013)

Other paper

(LC Paper No. CB(4)237/13-14(01) - Letter dated 11 December 2013 from the Chairman requesting information on

the New Funding Model  
for integrated education in  
primary and secondary  
schools)

Written submissions from deputations / individuals not attending  
the meeting

- (LC Paper No. CB(4)216/13-14(02) - Submission from  
(*Chinese version only*) Ms Fanny CHOI
- LC Paper No. CB(4)216/13-14(03) - Submission from  
(*Chinese version only*) Mr SHEK Yiu-fai
- LC Paper No. CB(4)216/13-14(04) - Submission from Mr 吳長  
(*Chinese version only*) 耀
- LC Paper No. CB(4)216/13-14(05) - Submission from Ms 陳秀  
(*Chinese version only*) 菁
- LC Paper No. CB(4)232/13-14(02) - Submission from Ms HON  
(*Chinese version only*) Man-fong
- LC Paper No. CB(4)244/13-14(02) - Submission from Hong  
(*Chinese version only*) Kong Integrated Education  
Concern Association
- LC Paper No. CB(4)244/13-14(03) - Submission from SEN  
(*Chinese version only*) Rights)

Meeting with deputations / individuals and the Administration for  
agenda items I and II

2. The Subcommittee deliberated (index of proceedings attached at **Annex**).

3. Members noted the Administration's written response to a letter dated 11 December 2013 from the Chairman requesting information on the new funding mode for integrated education in primary and secondary schools (LC Paper No. CB(4)244/13-14(01) tabled at the meeting).

EDB 4. The Education Bureau ("EDB") was requested to take follow-up actions on the following issues –

- (a) as far as practicable, to inform the Subcommittee of the number of students requiring support in each of the three tiers under the 3-tier intervention model, as a supplement to the information provided in LC Paper No. CB(4)244/13-14(01);
- (b) to advise whether the Administration had, in the past, given any consideration to the feasibility of including sign language as part of the school curriculum for ordinary schools;
- (c) to provide information on the claw back, if any, of any unspent amount of Learning Support Grant ("LSG") to the Government over the past three years, including the amount and the number of schools involved;
- (d) to set out, in the form of a table, details of the modes of support provided to ordinary schools under the two-year Pilot Project on Integration of Children with Special Needs in Ordinary Schools launched in 1997 and under the current new funding mode for integrated education;
- (e) to enable members to better ascertain whether ordinary schools were receptive of students with special educational needs ("SEN"), EDB was asked to provide information on the transfer of schools (primary and secondary) by regular students, and by SEN students. Where practicable, a breakdown of the latter by the types of SEN should be provided;
- (f) where applicable, to provide information on the distribution of SEN students in each of the three Bands of secondary schools; and
- (g) to provide information on the arrangements and resources for supporting SEN students in schools under the English Schools Foundation, such as the South Island School as referred to by a member.

5. The Chairman was concerned about parental choice of schools for students with an intelligence quotient ("IQ") slightly above 70 (e.g. between 70 and 72), as they could not send their children to special schools even if educational psychologists and other professionals recommended that the student would benefit from education in a special school. EDB advised that it would handle individual cases with flexibility and with due consideration to the specific circumstances.

6. The Chairman suggested that the Research Office of the Information Services Division of the Secretariat would be invited to research on the legislation on integrated education in selected jurisdictions. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that the research should cover Taiwan. Members agreed.

*(Post-meeting note: The Chairman recommended that the United Kingdom, the United States and Taiwan should be included in the study.)*

### **III. Any other business**

7. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:35 am.

Council Business Division 4  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
17 February 2014

**Proceedings of the meeting of the  
Subcommittee on Integrated Education  
on Friday, 13 December 2013, at 8:30 am  
in Conference Room 2 of the Legislative Council Complex**

| Time marker   | Speaker(s)   | Subject(s)  | Action required |
|---|--|---|-----------------|
| <i>Agenda Item I – Current mechanism for placing students with special educational needs into mainstream primary and secondary schools, including parental choice and home-school cooperation</i> |  |   |                 |
| <i>Agenda Item II – New Funding Model for integrated education in primary and secondary schools and the adequacy or otherwise of the funding</i>  |  |   |                 |
| 000647 -<br>000748  | Chairman   | Opening remarks   |                 |
| 000749 -<br>001300  | Dr WONG Chi-tak<br>Chairman  | Presentation of views   |                 |
| 001301 -<br>001816  | Centre for Sign Linguistics and<br>Deaf Studies, The Chinese<br>University of Hong Kong<br>("CSLDS")<br>Chairman | Presentation of views [LC Paper No. CB(4)237/13-14(02)]   |                 |
| 001817 –<br>002342  | Ms CHOI Tsz-wan<br>Chairman  | Presentation of views   |                 |
| 002343 -<br>003404  | Chairman<br>Education Bureau ("EDB")   | <p>Members noted EDB's written response [LC Paper No. CB(4)244/13-14(01)] to the Chairman's request for information on the new funding mode for integrated education in primary and secondary schools [LC Paper No. CB(4)237/13-14(01)]. The Chairman remarked that information on the number of students requiring support in each of the three tiers under the 3-tier intervention model had not been provided.</p> <p>The Chairman sought the Administration's comments on the deputations' views and also enquired about the following –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) the suggestion to designate certain ordinary schools as schools specialized in the intake of students of specified types of special educational needs ("SEN");</li> <li>(b) whether the Administration would consider increasing the amount of Learning Support Grant ("LSG") for integrated education ("IE") which had not been adjusted over the past decade; and</li> <li>(c) whether EDB would provide more information for parents of SEN students to facilitate their choice of schools suitable for their children.</li> </ul> |                 |



| Time marker | Speaker(s) | Subject(s)   | Action required   |
|-------------|------------|--|---|
|             |            | <p>EDB explained that there was difficulty in reporting accurately the number of students requiring support in each of the three tiers under the 3-tier intervention model as the number might vary from time to time in view of students' performance and progress subsequent to the support rendered by schools. EDB nevertheless took note of the Chairman's advice and would provide the information as far as practicable.</p> <p>EDB further advised that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) while the Administration noted the deputations' views, designating certain schools to cater for students with specific types of SEN deviated from the purpose of integrated education and might result in these schools becoming an alternative type of special schools, which might not be in the best interest of SEN students. Such arrangement was not consistent with the Whole School Approach in implementing IE;</li> <li>(b) EDB had kept the implementation of IE under ongoing review and would continue to seek the necessary additional resources for its implementation having regard to the needs of SEN students;</li> <li>(c) EDB had taken steps to provide parents of children with SEN with information on admission to ordinary schools such as by holding briefings and publishing relevant information on EDB's website;</li> <li>(d) EDB would step up public education and publicity efforts to enhance public understanding of IE and the needs of SEN students;</li> <li>(e) the support that students with hearing impairment ("HI") required might vary. It would be more appropriate for individual schools to implement support measures to cater for their HI students' specific needs under the professional support of EDB as appropriate. All along, EDB had been encouraging teachers to use the most appropriate mode(s) of communication in teaching or communication with HI students, having regard to the students' abilities as well as their learning and communication needs; and</li> <li>(f) the operation of the allocation systems of primary and secondary school places was applicable to all students, including SEN students. For instance, in the stage of Discretionary Places Admission under the</li> </ul> | <p>EDB was requested to provide the information as stated in paragraph 4(a) of the minutes.</p> |

| Time marker     | Speaker(s)                                      | Subject(s)   | Action required |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------------|
|                 |   | <p>Primary One Admission System, priority was given to children who had siblings attending or parents working at the primary schools for the purpose of facilitating taking care of these children. In the stage of Central Allocation under the Secondary School Places Allocation System, Secondary One places were allocated according to parents' choice of schools, individual student's allocation band and random number.</p>   |                 |
| 003405 - 004212 | <p>Ms Cyd HO<br/>CSLDS<br/>EDB<br/>Chairman</p> | <p>Ms HO remarked that according to her understanding, there were different schools or systems of sign language, and asked whether –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) there was a unified pedagogy for sign language; and</li> <li>(b) the Government would allocate resources to support and promote the teaching and learning of sign language.</li> </ul> <p>CSLDS explained that although there were slight variations in sign languages, such as in the vocabularies, persons with HI had no problem with communicating in sign language.</p> <p>Ms HO asked whether the sign languages in use in Hong Kong, Taiwan and the Mainland could be standardized.</p> <p>CSLDS explained that when communicating in sign language, persons with HI would also make use of their gestures, facial expressions, etc. to express themselves. Promoting the teaching, learning and use of sign language was far more important than attempting to standardize the variations in the language which might be due to cultural or geographical differences.</p> <p>EDB informed members that to support the use of sign language in teaching for those in need, the Quality Education Fund had, in 2012, allocated funding to the Lutheran School for the Deaf for a period of three years on a project named Development of New Vocabulary of Sign Language for Special Education Need on New Senior Secondary Curriculum. EDB would continue to support the Working Group on Promoting Sign Language under the Rehabilitation Advisory Committee in promoting the use of sign language in the school sector.</p> |                 |
| 004213 - 010534 | <p>Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung<br/>EDB<br/>Chairman</p>  | <p>Mr LEUNG said that he might lodge a complaint to the Equal Opportunities Commission as there was a serious lack of sign language services in Hong Kong.</p>   |                 |

| Time marker | Speaker(s) | Subject(s)   | Action required   |
|-------------|------------|--|---|
|             |            | <p>He opined that every Hong Kong student should learn sign language. He asked whether –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) EDB would require sign language to be taught in ordinary schools;</li> <li>(b) EDB would allow SEN students who were unable to adapt to education in ordinary schools to transfer to special schools; and</li> <li>(c) more full-time teachers would be provided to cater for the needs of SEN students.</li> </ul> <p>EDB responded that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) when considering whether a new subject should be included in the school curriculum, it was necessary to take into account various factors including the range of subjects under the existing curriculum, the impact on students' learning and the consequential work required on teachers and students;</li> <li>(b) currently, sign language was not included as part of the school curriculum for ordinary schools and EDB would check if there had been in the past any consideration of including sign language as part of the school curriculum for ordinary schools;</li> <li>(c) where necessary and on the recommendations of professionals, EDB would assist parents of SEN students to seek admission of their children to special schools; and</li> <li>(d) EDB had been providing ordinary schools with additional resources apart from LSG, such as the Enhanced Speech Therapy Grant and additional teachers to support academically low achievers. Schools could pool together and deploy the resources flexibly to support their SEN students. The Administration had kept under review the provision of resources to schools for supporting SEN students.</li> </ul> <p>The Chairman expressed concern about parental choice of schools for students with an intelligence quotient slightly above 70 (e.g. between 70 and 72), as he noted that there were cases in which the parents could not send their children to special schools even if educational psychologists and other professionals had recommended that the students would benefit from education in special schools.</p> <p>EDB advised that students' learning needs would be the most important consideration. For individual</p> | <p>EDB was requested to provide the information as stated in paragraph 4(b) of the minutes.</p> |

| Time marker | Speaker(s) | Subject(s)   | Action required  |
|-------------|------------|--|--|
|             |            | <p>cases, it would handle with flexibility and with due consideration to the specific circumstances.</p> <p>Mr LEUNG said that according to his knowledge, some schools had returned part or all of LSG to the Government due to reasons such as difficulty in procuring the necessary services or lack of knowledge on how to make appropriate use of the grant. He commented that instead of disbursing LSG, the Administration should provide additional teaching manpower to enable schools to cater for the needs of SEN students and to alleviate the heavy workload of existing teachers.</p> <p>The Chairman recalled that additional teachers had been provided under the two-year Pilot Project on Integration of Children with Special Needs in Ordinary Schools launched in 1997 ("the Pilot Project"). However, under the current arrangements, the Government had opted to provide support in the form of cash grants.</p> <p>EDB advised that an annual claw back mechanism was in place to encourage schools to make use of LSG to support SEN students. On the use of LSG, it was the practice of EDB to arrange for its professional staff to conduct school visits to advise on and ensure the effective deployment of resources for supporting SEN students. It was worth noting that there had been an increase in the number of teachers over the past few years, and in the 2012-2013 school year, the student-to-teacher ratio in primary and secondary schools were 14.4 to 1 and 14.5 to 1 respectively as compared to 20.4 to 1 and 18.2 to 1 respectively in the 2002-2003 school year.</p> <p>Mr LEUNG remarked that it was understandable for ordinary schools to deploy the bulk of their resources to cater for regular students who made up most of their student body. He considered that EDB should provide schools with additional resources and teachers specifically for supporting SEN students.</p> <p>EDB responded that the disbursement of cash grants under the new funding mode provided greater flexibility for schools to cater for the specific needs of their SEN students, such as by acquisition of the necessary professional services. Adopting a standardized practice of providing additional teachers might lack flexibility as the number of SEN students might vary from year to year and the service needs of the students also differed.</p> <p>EDB was asked to provide information on the claw back, if any, of any unspent amount of LSG to the Government over the past three years, including the</p> | <p>EDB was requested to provide the information as</p> |

| Time marker                | Speaker(s)                                  | Subject(s)  | Action required   |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|
|                            |   | <p>amount and the number of schools involved.</p> <p>EDB reiterated that all along, EDB had encouraged and provided advice to schools regarding the use of resources to support SEN students. Under the claw back mechanism, about 10% of the ordinary primary schools had returned unspent LSG to the Government.</p>  | <p>stated in paragraph 4(c) of the minutes.</p>   |
| <p>010535 -<br/>012426</p> | <p>Deputy Chairman<br/>EDB<br/>Chairman</p> | <p>The Subcommittee requested EDB to set out, in the form of a table, details of the modes of support provided to ordinary schools under the Pilot Project and under the current new funding mode for IE.</p> <p>The Deputy Chairman queried whether the provision of a cash grant under the new funding mode was as effective as the provision of additional teachers under the Pilot Project in supporting SEN students.</p> <p>The Deputy Chairman said that according to his observation, certain ordinary schools had a much larger concentration of SEN students than other schools. He was concerned whether this was indicative that some schools had not been receptive of SEN students, resulting in the latter's enrolment in only a few schools. He opined that SEN students might find it necessary to transfer schools because they had not been provided with sufficient support or there was a lack of capacity on the part of the schools to cater for their needs.</p> <p>To enable members to better ascertain whether ordinary schools were receptive of SEN students, the Deputy Chairman requested EDB to –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) provide information on the transfer of schools (primary and secondary) by regular students and by SEN students;</li> <li>(b) where practicable, provide a breakdown of the SEN students in (a) above by the types of SEN; and</li> <li>(c) provide information on the distribution of SEN students in each of the three Bands of secondary schools.</li> </ul> <p>EDB took note of the Deputy Chairman's request for consideration, but cautioned that the transfer of schools might be caused by reasons other than those suggested by the Deputy Chairman, such as the change of residence, adaptation problems, popularity of certain ordinary schools with good reputation in supporting SEN students etc.</p> | <p>EDB was requested to provide the information as stated in paragraph 4(d) of the minutes.</p> <p>EDB was requested to provide the information as stated in paragraph 4(e) of the minutes.</p> <p>EDB was requested to provide the information as stated in paragraph 4(f) of the minutes.</p> |

| Time marker     | Speaker(s)  | Subject(s)  | Action required |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------------|
|                 |   | <p>EDB stressed that under the Disability Discrimination Ordinance and existing IE policy, schools could not refuse SEN students' application for admission. Parents could make a complaint to EDB if there were cases of non-compliance.</p>   |                 |
| 012427 - 013148 | <p>Mr TAM Yiu-chung<br/>Chairman<br/>EDB</p>  | <p>Mr TAM said that Members of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong considered that additional resources should be provided for supporting SEN students. Noting members' concerns about the claw back of unspent LSG to the Government, Mr TAM remarked that schools should not be encouraged to exhaust the funding unless for worthwhile use. He also opined that the needs of individual SEN students should be ascertained so that appropriate support could be rendered to them.</p> <p>EDB took note of members' concerns, and advised that the allocation of financial resources for education initiatives in the coming financial year would be detailed in the Estimates of Expenditure for 2014-2015.</p>   |                 |
| 013149-013758   | <p>Parents Group of SLD<br/>Community Support Project,<br/>Caritas – HK(YCS)<br/>Chairman</p> | <p>Presentation of views [LC Paper No. CB(4)237/13-14(03)]</p>  |                 |
| 013759-014629   | <p>Chairman<br/>EDB</p>   | <p>To enhance transparency and provide parents with the necessary information, the Chairman suggested that EDB should require schools to include more detailed information in their school profiles on the support available for SEN students, as well as the number and types of SEN students, the relevant training received by the teachers, etc.</p> <p>EDB advised that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) all schools were required to report its SEN policies, additional resources and support measures on IE in their annual reports, and upload such information on their websites;</li> <li>(b) EDB held briefings for parents regularly each year to provide them with information on choosing the suitable schools for their children with SEN;</li> <li>(c) currently, information on the support provided for SEN students and the relevant training received by teachers was included in the school profiles; and</li> <li>(d) some schools had not included details such as the levels and contents of the training</li> </ul> |                 |

| Time marker   | Speaker(s)                                    | Subject(s)   | Action required |
|---------------|---|--|-----------------|
|               |   | <p>programmes received by teachers in their school profiles due to limited space in the relevant webpage.</p>  |                 |
| 014630-015938 | <p>Dr Elizabeth QUAT<br/>EDB<br/>Chairman</p> | <p>Dr QUAT did not subscribe to the Administration's explanation. According to her observation, quite a number of SEN students had not been able to adapt to education in ordinary schools and had transferred to special schools. She considered that the implementation of the current policy of placing SEN students in ordinary schools should be reviewed. Dr QUAT asked the Administration to look into the feasibility of placing SEN students into certain ordinary schools which were experienced in handling SEN students and providing these schools with additional resources to support these students. She highlighted the following problems in the implementation of IE –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) inadequate resources for special schools;</li> <li>(b) heavy workload on teachers of ordinary schools rendering them unable to give adequate attention to SEN students and to receive relevant training; and</li> <li>(c) inadequate information published by individual schools on their SEN services, making parental choice of suitable schools for their children with SEN very difficult.</li> </ul> <p>In response, EDB explained that the current implementation of IE was in line with the global trend. Confining the intake of SEN students to a handful of ordinary schools deviated from the policy of IE and in practice gave rise to an alternative type of special schools, and was contradictory to the purposes of IE.</p> <p>EDB supplemented that if an SEN student could not adapt to an ordinary school, with professionals' recommendations and parents' consent, EDB would assist him/her to transfer to a special school. There were cases in which the parents had opted to place their children with SEN in ordinary schools despite professional assessment and recommendation that their children were suitable for placement in special schools. To support the adaptation of the SEN student, if necessary, the schools would hold case conferences, with the support of educational psychologists and other specialists as appropriate, to discuss strategies in supporting the student concerned.</p> <p>Noting that currently, schools were expected to admit different types of SEN students and provide appropriate support accordingly, the Chairman and Dr</p> |                 |

| Time marker                                 | Speaker(s)   | Subject(s)  | Action required  |
|---|--|---|--|
|   |  | QUAT urged that the existing policy should be reviewed.   |  |
| 015939-020523                               | Chairman<br>Mr Abraham SHEK<br>Deputy Chairman<br>Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung | <p>The Chairman suggested that the Research Office of the Information Services Division of the Legislative Council Secretariat would be invited to research on the legislation on IE in selected jurisdictions. Mr LEUNG said that the research should cover Taiwan. Members agreed.</p> <p>Mr SHEK requested EDB to provide information on the arrangements and resources for supporting SEN students in schools under the English Schools Foundation, such as the South Island School. Mr SHEK considered the implementation of IE in these schools very effective.</p> | <p>Research Office of the Information Services Division of the Legislative Council Secretariat was requested to provide the information as stated in paragraph 6 of the minutes.</p> <p>EDB was requested to provide the information as stated in paragraph 4(g) of the minutes.</p> |
| <i>Agenda Item III – Any other business</i> |  |   |  |
| 020524-020546                               | Chairman   | Arrangement of next meeting and closing remarks   |  |