The Committee will meet at 10.00 am in Festival Theatre, 13/29 Nicolson Street, Edinburgh.

1. **Special Educational Needs Inquiry:** The Committee will take evidence from the Equity Group—
   - Drew Hunter, Secretary
   - Nancy Hansen, Vice Chairman
   - Heather Anderson, Assistant Secretary
   - Dorothy McDonald, Parent

   and from the Minority Ethnic Learning Disabilities Initiative—
   - Fernando Diniz, Chairman
   - Sophie Pilgrim, Researcher and Development Officer
   - Khushi Usmani, Educational Psychologist

2. **Special Educational Needs Inquiry:** The Committee members will report back on school visits.

3. **Disabled Athletics in Scotland:** The Committee will consider letters from the Scottish Athletics Federation, UK Athletics and Scottish Disability Sport.

4. **Public Petitions:** The Committee will consider the following petition—

   PE 213 by Ms I Silavi and Miss S Silavi calling on the Scottish Parliament to examine the possibility of establishing a post of commissioner for the rights of disabled children.

5. **Update on Committee Business:** The Committee will be updated on business in its current work programme.
6. **Hampden Inquiry (In private):** The Committee will consider the written evidence received in the Hampden Inquiry.

Gillian Baxendine  
Clerk to the Committee  
Room 2.7 Committee Chambers  
Ext. 85204  
Email gillian.baxendine@scottish.parliament.uk

**************************************************************************

The following papers are attached for this meeting—

SEN inquiry- submission from Equity ED/00/21/1

SEN inquiry- submission from Minority Ethnic Learning Disabilities Initiative ED/00/21/2

Note from Committee SEN adviser on oral evidence (Private paper) (All above Agenda item 1)

Letter from Scottish Athletics Federation ED/00/21/4

Letter from UK Athletics ED/00/21/5

Letter from Scottish Disability Sports ED/00/21/6 (All letters Agenda item 3)

PE 213 by Ms I Silavi  
Note by Clerk on PE 213 (Agenda item 4) ED/00/21/7

Hampden Inquiry written evidence (Private papers)  
Note by Clerk on written evidence( Private Paper) (Agenda item 6)

Note: Rescheduling of witnesses resulted in late withdrawal of ED/00/21/3

**************************************************************************

The following paper is attached for information—

Scottish Arts Council letter on Scottish National Theatre initiative
## Education, Culture and Sport Committee

### Meeting – Tuesday 21 June 2000
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<td>ED/00/21/1</td>
<td>Not available in electronic format</td>
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<td>ED/00/21/2</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td>ED/00/21/5</td>
<td>Not available in electronic format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from Scottish Disability Sports</td>
<td>ED/00/21/6</td>
<td>Not available in electronic format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 213 by Mrs I Silavi</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>ED/00/21/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden Inquiry written evidence</td>
<td>Private Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note by Clerk on written evidence</td>
<td>Private Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 1 About the Equity Group

Introduction
Firstly, we would like to say how delighted we are to be invited to contribute evidence to this first national enquiry and we would like to congratulate the Education, Culture and Sport Committee for instigating this enquiry.

The Equity Group is a new organisation made up of people who believe in the benefits of inclusive education and want to see inclusive education as a viable option for disabled children and adults in Scotland. Membership of the Group is open to anyone who supports the aims of the group.

The Group’s aims are:
• To establish the legal right of children with special educational needs to mainstream education with appropriate adjustment and support
• To promote entitlement to inclusive education as a civil rights issue
• To gather and spread information about good practice in inclusive education, both in Scotland and internationally
• To help schools, parents, children and communities learn together how to achieve and sustain inclusive schools for all

Although the Group only began to formally meet in October 1999, many of the individuals involved in the group have been campaigning for equity within education for many years and, in some cases, decades. We emerged as a group because we could find no other organisation or body in Scotland which nationally promoted and campaigned exclusively for inclusive education. The rapid growth in our membership (we now have nearly 100 members from all over Scotland) over the last couple of months has validated our view that there was a need for such a campaigning voice to be heard.

Who we are
Members of the Group share a commitment to inclusive education. The work of the Group is directed by a Policy Committee elected by the membership. At least a third of the Policy Committee’s membership must be disabled adults and at least a third must be parents of disabled children and young people. This is to ensure the organisation is disability led. The combination of parents and disabled adults is innovative.

Following our first Annual General Meeting in February 2000, 15 individuals (the maximum number) were elected onto the Policy Committee. The Committee also agreed to co-opt a further 4 members as non-voting advisors. The names of the elected Policy Committee members are listed over the page.

Representatives of the Equity Group gave evidence on inclusive education to the Equal Opportunities Committee of the Parliament on Tuesday 2 November 1999 and MSPs will have had access to the transcript of that meeting. The Group are also keen to be given the opportunity to present their evidence to the Education, Culture and Sport Committee.

Our evidence in this submission is based on the first hand knowledge and day to day experience of our members. We are consumers and parents of consumers of both the mainstream and segregated education systems. In addition to our evidence, we have included a list of recommendations in relation to each area.
Much of what we believe has been backed up by research in other parts of the country, Europe and North America. As far as we are aware, virtually no research on inclusive education in Scotland has been commissioned.

At the date of writing the Group is not funded and people meet and produce the material in their own time. We have no paid staff. The costs of the newsletter production and associated materials have been underwritten to date by the Scottish Human Services Trust. The Group is actively seeking funding.

Policy Committee members as at 1 March 2000 are:-

1. Heather Anderson [assistant secretary]
2. Enrico Barone
3. Raymond Bertram
4. Corrina Carson
5. Brian Cavanagh
6. Billy Forbes
7. Helen Gibson
8. Nancy Hansen [vice chair]
9. Anne Harkes [chair]
10. Drew Hunter [secretary]
11. Wilma Lawrie
12. Dorothy McDonald
13. Shona McInally [assistant treasurer]
14. Jimmy McIntosh [treasurer]
15. Sophie Pilgrim

Non-voting advisors
1. Meg Heggie
2. Peter Miller
3. Andrew Muir
4. Pete Ritchie
Section 1 (cont) About the Equity Group

Our interest and expertise

What we believe - we all belong
We believe that all disabled children and adults are part of society - not separate from it. We believe that disabled children and adults have the right to be seen as and treated as equal citizens in Scottish society. They must be allowed to both be part of and contribute to family, community and civic life. The start of that community and civic life is school.

The requirement for support
Many disabled children and adults, due to their individual impairment, need support to contribute and participate. Whatever the impairment, whether physical, sensory, intellectual or emotional, we would argue for their right to this support. The need for support, whether this be in the form of aids, adaptations or personal assistance, should not be used as a criterion for exclusion of that person from civic and community life.

We would also argue that the support should accompany the child or adult. It should enable them to live the life they want to live, where they want to live it. The need for support should not require the person to live their life in segregated environments because support is currently buildings based.

We believe that if a child has a local school they should be supported to attend that school - they should not be sent to a separate school because we currently only organise specialist support in certain buildings. The most important thing about a child should not be their disability. Batching people on the grounds of their impairment is no longer acceptable.

We know that the whole debate about inclusion always focuses on resources. However, inclusion is not a resources issue - it is a philosophical issue. It is about how we see disabled children and adults and where we expect them to be. If we believe they are part of our society and community, then resources will be reorganised.

The difference between integration and inclusion.
We want to preface our evidence by an explanation of why we prefer not to use the term integration. The difference between integration and inclusion is not semantic, it is conceptual.

In practice, integration starts from the belief that the person who is currently excluded can be brought into the mainstream. The onus on the person being integrated is to 'fit in' and 'not disrupt' the mainstream. In order to ensure that the mainstream carries on as normal, we know that children are added on to the school roll, but still excluded and apart from the main activity of the school and class for all of their educational life.

We measure the success of integration by monitoring the behaviour and performance of the integrated child - if they can not 'fit in', 'keep up' and behave 'appropriately', they are again at risk of exclusion. Many members of our group talk about the struggle to be included and the feeling that they would be “sent back” if they did not behave appropriately.

The culture of the school, the expertise of the teacher and the behaviour of other children are not brought under the same scrutiny. The need for the class to adapt is seen as a problem, not an opportunity for better learning.
We see the changes in the classroom as positive. We know that the chance for children to meet one another, play together, learn together and support one another is a huge opportunity which immediately benefits both parties. When all these children become the parents, teachers, neighbours, employers, employees and politicians of the future, the dividends will be enormous. Social inclusion is a process which starts at school.

**Children with emotional and behavioural difficulties**
Whenever we advocate for inclusive education, we are asked about children with emotional and behavioural difficulties and the need to exclude them from school.

Firstly, all schools are involved in the work of dealing with children who are disruptive on a daily basis and we would accept that disabled children in schools need to be subject to the same rules and regulations as other children. We do not accept the assumption that all disabled children are somehow more likely to be emotionally and behaviourally disruptive.

Secondly, we would even suggest that the expertise many teachers currently working in the special school sector could bring to this area would benefit the whole of the mainstream school. Research has shown that better learning management is equivalent to better behaviour management. When schools are better at including a wider range of children and adapting the curriculum to make this happen, they become better schools for all the children.

Lastly, children who behave badly are excluded from mainstream for limited periods of time. Many disabled children are excluded for a period of up to 15 years, whether they have ever behaved ‘badly’ or not. In the year 2000 we should no longer be defending inclusion; others should be defending exclusion and segregation.

**Finally, the issue of access**
A final point on the issue of physical access. We have very little to say about this other than if the building is inaccessible, it should be made accessible - not just for children with physical or sensory impairments, but also for disabled teachers, disabled relatives, disabled councillors, disabled lolly pop ladies and any one else who has difficulty lifting their foot or pushing their buggy up a kerb.

We are hoping that the extension of the Disability Discrimination Act to educational establishments will ensure that some issues of access will be resolved. We also know that many issues of access can be resolved through imagination as well as ramps.
Specific Evidence

Summary of evidence

1. A diversity of provision across Scotland in special educational needs
   - Due to historical, geographical and financial differences between local authorities, there is a huge disparity in the way families with children with special educational needs are treated.
   - There is little nationally gathered evidence to enable effective comparisons to be made.
   - The information currently gathered is not used to inform or direct current policy.

2. The effectiveness of current integration strategies at all levels of pre-school and school education
   - There is, as far as we can see, no national integration strategy.
   - The pace of current integration is virtually stationary, with no change over the last 12 years.
   - Integration is discretionary, conditional and temporary.
   - Inclusion involves more than physical integration.
   - Support should travel with the child, the child should not have to travel to the building where the support is warehoused.

3. The effectiveness of transition arrangements for special needs pupils at each stage of the school education system
   - Transition within the special school system is sometimes hard to recognise.
   - Transition from the special school system into mainstream becomes increasingly less likely the older the child.
   - Some secondary schools are not gearing up to include the children currently in their feeder primaries.
   - Being included at present gives no guarantee of future or continued inclusion.

4. How well the requirements of special needs families are understood and how far the education services cope with these often diverse needs
   - Disabled adults and their families are not ‘special needs’ families – they are ordinary adults and families who need support to get the same treatment as others.
   - The legacy of low expectations and institutionalised underachievement mean that people expect and are satisfied with less.
   - Parents are offered a Hobson’s choice at the moment – support in specialist, segregated centres or units OR limited support within a restricted range of mainstream schools.
A diversity of provision across Scotland in special educational needs

The range of diversity
We know without a doubt that there is a significant diversity in the provision of education for children and young adults with special educational needs. The range of this diversity is seen by some members of our group as being equivalent to discriminatory practice.

In some areas there are very few or no special schools, in other areas there are so many special schools that there is very little chance of a child with special needs being considered for mainstream education. The reasons for these disparities are historical, geographical and financial, not educational.

We know from our personal experience that where you live determines whether you receive any formal assistance to access inclusive education. If your house is in a different local authority area from your neighbour, you could have a completely different experience.

Some authorities are pro-inclusion and are working with schools and parents to actively include children in mainstream classes and activities. Others do not understand the issues. Some authorities are aware they are not doing enough and could do better. Others confuse inclusion with the placement of a child with special educational needs in a segregated annex or unit physically located within the school campus, but psychologically a million miles away from the activity and life of the school.

Some authorities recognise both the financial and psychological costs of sending children away from their families to some form of residential care and they work creatively to include disabled children in local schools. Others are either unwilling or unable to organise suitable local provision, even when this costs less than out of area placement. They consequently have children at home receiving no school education at all.

Some authorities are actively recruiting and importing children to ensure they fill the special schools they already have. Some are espousing a policy of inclusive education on paper while commissioning segregation on the ground. One is commissioning the construction of a new Catholic school, a new non-denominational school and a new special school on the same campus, as if the religious preference of disabled children was irrelevant.

The complexity of the current situation is compounded by the difficulties we experience in trying to build up a picture of the national situation. Figures detailing how each individual authority deals with children are not readily available and no comprehensible comparison of provision is published. We often have part of the picture, but not all of it. The unit of measurement also changes – sometimes we are talking about money, sometimes we are talking about schools, sometimes we are talking about numbers of children.

At present we can get information about the number of children who spend all of their time in wholly segregated schools and who spend more than one third of their week in segregated units within mainstream schools. We can also obtain overall figures about the amount of money spent on special schools.

However, no information is available on the number of children who do not receive any school-based education. No information is published about the amount spent by education authorities on special units, learning support in mainstream and therapeutic services in mainstream.
Information about the exam results for special schools or the levels of attendance and absence is not published. Nor is information about how much we are spending on out of area education in residential schools in other parts of Scotland and the rest of the UK.

More importantly, this information is not used to inform or evaluate policy. We are not measuring change or mapping where disabled children are within the system.

**Recommendations on identifying diversity of provision**

- Annually gather, publish and compare information about how much money each authority spends on educating children with SEN:-
  - outside their area
  - in special school placements within their area
  - in special units within mainstream schools
- Annually gather, publish and compare information about the number of children with SEN in each authority who:-
  - spend all of their time in wholly segregated schools
  - who spend more than one third of their week in segregated units within the mainstream
- Keep records of the numbers of children with special educational needs registering in mainstream and special school, the numbers of children moving from one kind of provision to the other and the number of children being refused access to mainstream
- Use the above figures to identify trends – do we have more inclusion this year than last year? If not, why not?
- Gather, publish and compare information about the amount of money being spent on learning support and, more importantly, compare ideas about how this support is being organised and provided
- Audit local authorities on the basis of their inclusion policies and commission the publication of a guidebook which would give an authority by authority guide to inclusive practice within each authority.
The effectiveness of current integration strategies at all levels of pre school and school education

The national picture
As far as we understand the current situation, there is no national policy on inclusion. The current “presumption of inclusion” mentioned in the consultation document on the Standards in Scotland’s Schools etc Bill is not yet law, but it is as close as we can get to a statement of intent.

Based on Scottish Office statistics, there has been no overall increase in the number of children being educated in mainstream education in the last 12 years. There has however been an increase in the number of children being educated in special (ie grouped by disability) schools and units. When people say we have to take integration slowly, we would like to ask “how slowly”? In the present climate, if your daughter was 6, we would be anticipating no improvement for all of her educational life.

Discretionary integration
The overwhelming view of our group is that the current system is entirely discretionary. Disabled children and adults have no statutory right to be included. Their inclusion is conditional, temporary and in the gift of the key professionals within that education authority. Even if children and young adults gain inclusion at some point in the system, they face the constant threat of segregation at any stage of the process.

The decision about whether or not a child is included can be influenced by a number of individuals within this system -

- the director of education may or may not have a pro-inclusion view and this will be reflected in the inclusive education policy and practice, or lack of it, within the authority
- the head of the school - again the view of the head teacher is pivotal. If the head teacher is willing to include your child and be flexible, the chances for inclusion are immeasurably increased. The head teacher often sets the tone and establishes the culture for the school
- the psychological services staff- whether they support the view that your child benefits from being included within the class or school has enormous influence and their interpretation of “the best interests of the child” dominates the discussion at the present time
- the classroom teacher - in many instances this is the key person. If the teacher likes your child, the environment is welcoming and accommodating. If the teacher is resistant to inclusion, then life is very difficult. Many parents feel they become “problem parents” and every transaction with the school feels like a battle ground, often focusing around the contents of the record of needs and their child’s “appropriateness”.
- other parents or pupils who can object to the inclusion of the child

Disability is the only remaining ground on which individuals have such discretion. They could not refuse a placement request from a parent on the grounds that the child is from a specific ethnic minority, or of a particular religious persuasion. We have legislation to prevent discrimination on the grounds of sexual and racial discrimination, but not disability.
If a family of a child from an ethnic minority was being advised that their child would be better in a different school because of racial harassment in the school, we would expect the school to deal with the harassment, not to exclude the child who may be the victim.

**Working with the best of intentions**

We know that a minority of people are philosophically or ideologically opposed to the idea of inclusion. However, we believe that the majority of the individuals who refuse requests for inclusion are doing so because they believe it to be for the best. They have fears and genuine concerns about their ability and capacity to include children.

One of the key reasons given for continued segregation is that it is in “best interests of the child”. This whole debate needs to be widened and the life long impact of segregated education on children needs to be taken into account. The anxiety experienced by a family of a 6 year old grows into the despair of a family of a 19 year old facing a day centre placement for the rest of their life. Ignorance, fear and prejudice continues as we keep disabled and non-disabled children apart.

To many of the people working with good intentions, we would like stress our frustration with the misuse of the word ‘special’. ‘Special’ implies better, safer, nicer. That’s what parents who are choosing ‘special’ education hear. However, ‘special’ can be used to disguise discrimination. For many people in our group, ‘special’ means segregated, second rate, stigmatised, different and of less value.

We need a national, strategic programme of training for teachers, parents, pupils and professionals around these issues if we are going to overcome the current levels of misunderstanding and discrimination.

**Inclusion is more than integration**

Even if a child or young adult is accepted into a mainstream school, their day to day experience of the school can be anything but inclusive. Inclusion means being part of the class and participating to the best of your capacity in the meaningful work of the class, with the support you need to do this. It means having friends and being missed when you are not there. It means being treated with respect, not sympathy.

Some children make it to the school, but never make it out of the segregated unit within the school campus. Some children make it into the regular classroom, but spend most of their time being taken out of the class or separated from the work of the class by their auxiliary support. Some children are in the class, but never get on the outings. Some children may be there through the day, but are not involved in the after hours community life of the school.

Inclusion is not an issue of geography, it is not just a change of address. Accessible buildings are part of the picture, but accessible minds are essential if change is to happen. The key resources are creativity, moral leadership and imagination.
Recommendations on developing an effective inclusion strategy

- agree that inclusive education is something worth investing in and making a reality
- set some national targets for inclusion. For example, by the year 2005 all primary one classes in Scotland will be inclusive; by the year 2010 all secondary schools will be inclusive
- develop incentives to ensure that children currently included, stay included
- provide some form of bridging finance to enable authorities to fund inclusion while continuing to run segregated provision
- look at mechanisms to enable the support to travel with the child, not force the child to travel to the support
- encourage social work, education and health to work together to pool budgets around individual children instead of projects or buildings
- ring fence money for individual children to enable parents to make real choices - ask parents whether they want the same sum of money spent on residential placement outside their area, segregated schooling within their area or the equivalent funding to make inclusion in their local school more likely
- commission face to face training with all school staff around inclusion - either as part of or in addition to existing in-service training days. This training could be carried out by disability equality trainers and parents who share a commitment to inclusive education.
- encourage discussions and presentations on inclusive education to school boards, education authorities, associations of teachers, trade unions on inclusive education
- create of a forum for the exchange of stories of good practice around inclusion
- give a national award for best inclusive practice at nursery, primary and secondary level schools
- facilitate the development of school inclusion policies in consultation with teachers, pupils, parents and educational professionals
- fund an annual summer school with a totally practical focus on inclusive educational practice. This would be open to authority based teams of parents, teachers, support staff and educational professionals
- commission action research into what is working across Scotland in order to disseminate good practice
Effectiveness of transition arrangements for special needs pupils at each stage of the school education system

Transition within special education
For many children trapped in the segregated education system, there is no effective transition. They are in the same school from the age of 5 through to 19 or 20 years of age. To many parents the period of transition from special education onto real life or further education is an area fraught with difficulties and low expectations. The range of options available are ludicrously limited with most individuals being directed to some form of segregated day provision. Some parents in one local authority area are being told to keep their sons and daughters at home while the services “come up with something”.

Whilst age appropriate groupings are now more prevalent, we can still find examples of children being taught in non-age appropriate groups and being continually surrounded by child like imagery and material, although they are, in fact, teenagers.

Some professionals still talk about people having a “mental age of”, in spite of the fact that the theory on which this way of assessing people is based has been totally invalidated. The system is still committed to a mental model where we assess and sort children into groups rather than providing individual support.

For children within segregated schools, the range of academic subjects is often restricted and the curriculum is not age appropriate. Members of our group who were in special school had to undertake distance learning courses in order to complete higher grades as there were no teachers available within their school to teach the subjects.

Transition from special to mainstream
We know that if a child is included in the school system, there is an increasing likelihood of exclusion as the child progresses up the system. More children are now included in nursery and pre-school provision, but the number decreases on entry into primary. Similarly the numbers being included at secondary level are less than those at primary level.

The pressure to remain included intensifies the further the child progresses within the system. The experience of many disabled adults is that inclusion is something you have to fight for throughout your educational life - there is no guarantee you will continue to be included even if you are at present. We mentioned earlier in this submission the fear a number of our group had of being “sent back”, no matter how well they were doing.

Some parents have children included in mainstream primary, but they know that nothing is being done to enable the secondary school to get ready either physically or academically for their child. We know from national figures that we are talking about the inclusion of an average of 2 children in each primary school and up to 10 in each secondary. Work on inclusion has to happen at both levels of provision simultaneously to ensure that the children who have been included at primary are not segregated when they reach 12 because no one seemed to know they were coming.
Recommendations on improving transition arrangements

- raise expectations about inclusion at all levels in the system - once a child is included, there should be a presumption that they will continue to be included
- ensure that even when a child is in special provision, mainstream with support is raised at an option
- ensure that the liaison between primary and secondary schools includes disabled children
- raise the level of debate - children with special educational needs should also be receiving guidance about employment and further education.
- gather and publish statistics on the number of special school leavers in June 2000 who went on to
  - paid employment
  - further education (and the type of further education)
  - the New Deal
  - a day centre
  - other options
  - nothing
How well the requirements of special needs families are understood and how far the education services cope with these often diverse needs.

Firstly, many parents and disabled adults in the group are tired of being regarded as “special need families”. They are just families. Often they have more than one child and they are expecting the same treatment for all of their children - good education in their local school with their peers.

Given their frustration with the current regime, they wanted to stress that they didn’t want “specialist treatment” in a segregated settings. They wanted equal treatment, with the support they needed, in ordinary settings.

The impact of low expectations
We recognise that many people are working very hard all over Scotland to increase the chances of disabled people achieving their full potential and being part of their local communities. Hundreds and hundreds of family members and professionals are totally committed to bringing the best out of all children and many of these people are battling against daunting odds.

However, despite the powerful work on the ground, we know on a daily basis that we live in a culture of low expectations. Many people and their families have been forced to give up any dreams and aspirations they may have had for themselves or their disabled children. Until this issue is addressed, many people will be satisfied with second best.

We know that in Scotland in 2000 many parents “chose” special education. We respect the right of these parents to make this choice and we are not talking about taking this choice away from parents. We know that most parents make the best choice they can, given the information they have in front of them.

However, we would question the information that parents are currently given. In our experience, we think parents are given a Hobson’s choice - support in a ‘specialist’ setting or virtually no support and a lot of misunderstanding and resistance in a mainstream setting. As mentioned before, much of the discussion about options plays on the parent’s fear and anxiety “your child would be better provided for...”, “your child would be safer”, “it is more appropriate for your child to be in a special school”.

People who have been in the special school system describe it as being like educational apartheid. They stress that the implications of having been segregated stay with them into their adult life. At present the bulk of resources and specialist support is locked up in the segregated system. Parents are directed to the building where the support is currently accommodated. In some areas they may be directed towards a couple of mainstream schools who might be positive towards inclusion. They are not given the same range of provision to chose from.

Until we raise people’s expectations about what might be possible, until people can imagine how it might be better, we will carry the legacy of low expectations and institutionalised under achievement.

The consultation response document entitled Improving our Schools states that there will be a duty on local authorities to “provide education directed at the development of the
personality, talents and mental and physical abilities of the child or young person to their fullest potential”. We welcome this statement.

We need to ensure that we as a country believe that disabled children and adults have a right to be part of our society. Disabled children and adults have potential, like all other children and adults in our community. It is the job of teachers, families and communities to explore, develop and release this potential for the benefit of all in our society.

We in the Equity Group want to do whatever we can to make this dream come true.

**Recommendations on understanding the special needs of families**

- believe that change is possible - stop telling parents that the only possibilities are the options available at the moment
- help people to see the big picture – work with parents to build a vision of what’s possible rather than telling them to expect less
- involve parents in the discussions about how their children can be effectively included and supported and create a climate where teachers and families work on the problems together
- change the focus of assessment from deficit based thinking to capacity based thinking – work with what children can do rather than constantly telling parents what their children can’t do
- recognise how emotional this is for parents and provide advocacy and support at key points in the system – remember that their children are being asked to be pioneers
- see inclusion as a work in progress rather than a finished state – it is never too late to start, it always needs maintenance and it always changes
- create a climate of enquiry and debate in the field - be critical of bad inclusion and explore why the attempts to include some children failed.
- give people a second chance – even when an attempt at inclusion fails, try an alternative approach
- run a programme of training for staff and students in schools to raise awareness of how inclusive education can work both here in Scotland and other countries
- run discussion groups with parents around the issues of inclusive education

We would like to thank the committee for their time in reading this submission.

**The Equity Group**
3 March 2000

(final amended version agreed by the Policy Committee of the Equity Group at their March meeting)
7 March 2000

Dear Mr Fleming

Summary of amended submission on behalf of the Equity Group

You should have by now received the amended submission. I am now sending you a summary version, in case anyone finds this easier to read. I have also included the word version of the summary on the email.

Best wishes

Heather Anderson

Heather Anderson
Assistant Secretary to the Equity Group

working for inclusion and excellence in Scottish education
Education, Culture and Sport Committee
Special Needs Inquiry

Submission from the Equity Group

Report summary –

Summary of evidence and recommendations
Summary of evidence

1  A diversity of provision across Scotland in special educational needs
   ➢ Due to historical, geographical and financial differences between local authorities, there is a huge disparity in the way families with children with special educational needs are treated.
   ➢ There is little nationally gathered evidence to enable effective comparisons to be made.
   ➢ The information currently gathered is not used to inform or direct current policy.

2  The effectiveness of current integration strategies at all levels of pre school and school education
   ➢ There is, as far as we can see, no national integration strategy.
   ➢ The pace of current integration is virtually stationary, with no change over the last 12 years.
   ➢ Integration is discretionary, conditional and temporary.
   ➢ Inclusion involves more than physical integration.
   ➢ Support should travel with the child, the child should not have to travel to the building where the support is warehoused.

3  The effectiveness of transition arrangements for special needs pupils at each stage of the school education system
   ➢ Transition within the special school system is sometimes hard to recognise.
   ➢ Transition from the special school system into mainstream becomes increasingly less likely the older the child.
   ➢ Some secondary schools are not gearing up to include the children currently in their feeder primaries.
   ➢ Being included at present gives no guarantee of future or continued inclusion.

4  How well the requirements of special needs families are understood and how far the education services cope with these often diverse needs
   ➢ Disabled adults and their families are not ‘special needs’ families – they are ordinary adults and families who need support to get the same treatment as others.
   ➢ The legacy of low expectations and institutionalised underachievement mean that people expect and are satisfied with less.
   ➢ Parents are offered a Hobson’s choice at the moment – support in specialist, segregated centres or units OR limited support within a restricted range of mainstream schools.
Recommendations on identifying diversity of provision

• Annually gather, publish and compare information about how much money each authority spends on educating children with SEN:-
  • outside their area
  • in special school placements within their area
  • in special units within mainstream schools

• Annually gather, publish and compare information about the number of children with SEN in each authority who:-
  • spend all of their time in wholly segregated schools
  • who spend more than one third of their week in segregated units within the mainstream

• Keep records of the numbers of children with special educational needs registering in mainstream and special school, the numbers of children moving from one kind of provision to the other and the number of children being refused access to mainstream

• Use the above figures to identify trends – do we have more inclusion this year than last year? If not, why not?

• Gather, publish and compare information about the amount of money being spent on learning support and, more importantly, compare ideas about how this support is being organised and provided

• Audit local authorities on the basis of their inclusion policies and commission the publication of a guidebook which would give an authority by authority guide to inclusive practice within each authority.
**Recommendations on developing an effective inclusion strategy**

- agree that inclusive education is something worth investing in and making a reality
- set some national targets for inclusion. For example, by the year 2005 all primary one classes in Scotland will be inclusive; by the year 2010 all secondary schools will be inclusive
- develop incentives to ensure that children currently included, stay included
- provide some form of bridging finance to enable authorities to fund inclusion while continuing to run segregated provision
- look at mechanisms to enable the support to travel with the child, not force the child to travel to the support
- encourage social work, education and health to work together to pool budgets around individual children instead of projects or buildings
- ring fence money for individual children to enable parents to make real choices - ask parents whether they want the same sum of money spent on residential placement outside their area, segregated schooling within their area or the equivalent funding to make inclusion in their local school more likely
- commission face to face training with all school staff around inclusion - either as part of or in addition to existing in-service training days. This training could be carried out by disability equality trainers and parents who share a commitment to inclusive education.
- encourage discussions and presentations on inclusive education to school boards, education authorities, associations of teachers, trade unions on inclusive education
- create a forum for the exchange of stories of good practice around inclusion
- give a national award for best inclusive practice at nursery, primary and secondary level schools
- facilitate the development of school inclusion policies in consultation with teachers, pupils, parents and educational professionals
- fund an annual summer school with a totally practical focus on inclusive educational practice. This would be open to authority based teams of parents, teachers, support staff and educational professionals
- commission action research into what is working across Scotland in order to disseminate good practice
Recommendations on improving transition arrangements
- raise expectations about inclusion at all levels in the system - once a child is included, there should be a presumption that they will continue to be included
- ensure that even when a child is in special provision, mainstream with support is raised at an option
- ensure that the liaison between primary and secondary schools includes disabled children
- raise the level of debate - children with special educational needs should also be receiving guidance about employment and further education.
- gather and publish statistics on the number of special school leavers in June 2000 who went on to
  - paid employment
  - further education (and the type of further education)
  - the New Deal
  - a day centre
  - other options
  - nothing

Recommendations on understanding the special needs of families
- believe that change is possible - stop telling parents that the only possibilities are the options available at the moment
- help people to see the big picture – work with parents to build a vision of what’s possible rather than telling them to expect less
- involve parents in the discussions about how their children can be effectively included and supported and create a climate where teachers and families work on the problems together
- change the focus of assessment from deficit based thinking to capacity based thinking – work with what children can do rather than constantly telling parents what their children can’t do
- recognise how emotional this is for parents and provide advocacy and support at key points in the system – remember that their children are being asked to be pioneers
- see inclusion as a work in progress rather than a finished state – it is never too late to start, it always needs maintenance and it always changes
- create a climate of enquiry and debate in the field - be critical of bad inclusion and explore why the attempts to include some children failed.
- give people a second chance – even when an attempt at inclusion fails, try an alternative approach
- run a programme of training for staff and students in schools to raise awareness of how inclusive education can work both here in Scotland and other countries
- run discussion groups with parents around the issues of inclusive education
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6 June 2000

Gillian Baxendine
Clerk to the Committee
Education, Culture and Sport Committee
Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP

Dear Ms Baxendine

Disabled Athletics in Scotland

I would like to make the following comments in response to your letter dated 1 June.

There are a number of organisations each playing an important role in supporting and providing opportunities for athletes with a disability to compete on the international stage, including UK Sport, UK Athletics, sportscotland, the Scottish Athletics Federation and Scottish Disability Sport.

It appears that there are three distinct issues which have caused concern over the past few weeks and I offer my perspective on these in some detail below.

Standards of Performance Required for Lottery Funding

The World Class Performance Plan created by UK Athletics uses three sets of criteria to assess the particular lottery category of each athlete, which in itself may be the route cause of the differing views. It is the Lottery categorisation of Karen Lewis which has highlighted some of these difficulties.

Unfortunately unlike in able bodied athletics there are no recognised world rankings for athletes with a disability and this significantly hinders any objective process for determining and predicting future performance.

In relation to Karen Lewis who is current world champion, there is a difference of opinion as to her current world standing. Under UKA criteria, the top two in the world are eligible for category A lottery funding and it is UK Athletics' understanding that she is not ranked no 1 or 2. This matter is disputed by Scottish Disability Sport who appear to have evidence to the contrary.

On current performance it would appear that Karen Lewis has an excellent opportunity to win a medal in the Paralympics in Sydney and given that she is currently world record holder, it is indeed difficult to reconcile the fact that she is not regarded as a category A lottery funded athlete.
I understand from those more involved in the world of disabled athletics that world records are bettered much more frequently than in able bodied athletics and that it is not unreasonable to expect new world record standards from medal winners in Karen's event in Sydney.

Whilst Karen's position highlights the problem, it is very important that the appropriate organisations work towards the long term solution, which is to create world rankings for disabled athletics events over the next few years in order to overcome this problem in the future.

**Involvement of SDS within UK Athletics performance Planning**

Currently UK Athletics will not recognise Scottish Disability Sport as an organisation which should be involved in the production of the UKA Performance Plan. UK Athletics as an organisation in its recent re-organisation has moved away from a strict policy of representation of each of the home countries within all of its committees as this proved to be very ineffective in the past. The UKA performance planning group has been made up a small number of disability specific, disabled sports organisations which in name have responsibility throughout the UK. As I am sure many of your members will be aware, the reality is often different and some of these organisations have little locus within Scotland. It is these organisations which have been largely responsible for working with UKA in establishing the criteria for the Lottery categories and their credibility in Scotland may have suffered as a result.

Scottish Disability Sport is the pan disability organisation for disabled sport in Scotland. It has an excellent reputation and excellent tradition of co-ordinating and developing sport for disabled athletes in Scotland.

Whilst the other UK organisations would appear happy for SDS to be around the planning table, UK Athletics have taken a position that it is for SDS to liaise appropriately with the selected disability specific organisations, and to have their views represented through them.

My own view, given that the other organisations were happy for SDS to be involved, and given the considerable success of Scottish athletes in the team, it would have been appropriate and pragmatic for an invitation to have been extended to SDS for their involvement in the planning process. This has not been the case and UK Athletics have been unwilling to this point to negotiate on this position.

**GB Team managers and Coaches**

A further issue which is linked to the issue of representation is the lack of involvement of Scottish coaches or team management within the Great Britain team planned for Sydney. It would appear that despite the certainty of several Scottish athletes making the team and the long tradition of excellence in Scotland, there will be no Scottish representation within the coaching and team management structure of the British athletics group travelling to the Paralympics. This is at best unfortunate and does little
to help the motivation of those involved nor the international development of Scottish coaches and team managers. As Scottish athletes are only able to compete under the banner of Great Britain on the world stage, it is very important that there is an element of representation in the management teams if progress is to be maintained on an equitable basis throughout the UK.

Whilst there is an argument for entirely competency based appointments, within Scottish Athletics we feel most strongly that there also has to be a recognition that UK Athletics is made up of the athletes from four countries and that there ought to be an element of representation taken into account in the appointment of team coaches and management. The failure to appoint Scottish Coaches to the Paralympic Team does little to strengthen the relationship between the UK and Scottish bodies, and fails to recognise the quality of the work in Scotland which has produced several athletes with real medal potential.

Given all of the above, the Scottish Athletics Federation has an excellent working relationship both with UK Athletics and Scottish Disability Sport. Both are committed to the same goals. I don’t believe that this matter has been discussed at Chief Executive level within the organisations involved, and this might have been a more appropriate course of action prior to it being drawn to the attention of the Scottish Parliament. I will be raising this matter with David Moorcroft the Chief Executive of UK Athletics and I am sure that he will be keen to meet with representatives of SDS during his visit to Scotland later this month.

Kind regards

Yours sincerely

David Joy
Chief Executive

Cc   Richard Brickley Scottish Disability Sport
     David Moorcroft Chief Executive UK Athletics
     Frank Clement, Chairman the Scottish Athletics Federation
     Allan Alstead, Chief Executive sportscotland
Gillian Baxendine  
Clerk to the Committee  
The Scottish Parliament  
Education, Culture and Sport Committee  
Edinburgh  
EH99 1SP

Dear Ms Baxendine

DISABILITY ATHLETICS

Thank you for your letter dated 1 June 2000 concerning the article that appeared in the Herald newspaper recently. The article by Doug Gillon expresses concern over the treatment of Scottish athletes preparing for the Sydney 2000 Paralympic Games.

In June 1999 UK Athletics took over responsibility from the British Paralympic Association for all UK-lottery funded athletes with a disability. It is important to point out that UK Athletics is not the governing body for disability athletics within the UK. What has been agreed, is that UKA would co-ordinate the programme of support for the 53 athletes identified in the World Class Performance Plan. In November 1999 UK Athletics appointed Ken Kelly as Technical Director for Disability Athletics. With his appointment, Ken assumed responsibility for the World Class Performance Plan, designed to support the UK’s top athletes who were preparing for Sydney 2000. The Plan has a clearly stated aim of supporting athletes who are strong medal potential for Sydney. As a result of this aim, the standards set are necessarily high as it is intended that those athletes identified should be capable of competing with the very best in the world.

Prior to being implemented, the WCP Plan was circulated by the UK Sports Council to all the home country sports councils as part of the assessment process. Whilst the comments from the home countries to UK Sport are confidential, the Plan was eventually approved unconditionally.

Ken Kelly has been made aware of the concerns expressed by Scottish Disability Sport. Ken has met with the chief executive from the Scottish Athletics Federation and athletes and coaches from Scotland on a number of separate occasions, as well as travelling to Northern Ireland, in order to explain the Plan more clearly. UK Athletics recognises that the tight timescales it has been obliged to operate to, have meant that the time available to explain the Plan in full has been less than ideal. Ken does however meet with the athletes regularly.
the Plan in full has been less than ideal. Ken does however meet with the athletes regularly at each squad weekend, in order to listen to their concerns and will be travelling to Scotland again in the near future, to continue to speak with and reassure athletes and coaches.

One of the Technical Director’s main tasks is to prepare and secure funding for a long term WCP Plan. Ken has sought the views of; British Blind Sport, British Wheelchair Racing Association, British Wheelchair Athletics Association, British Amputee and Les Autres Sports Association, Dwarf Athletics (UK), UK Sports Association for People with Learning Disability and CP Sport. One representative from each of these organisations meet with Ken Kelly on a regular basis to provide an input to this new Plan. He feels that having one representative from each group is a reasonable offer to disability organisations. Scottish Disability Sport has chosen to accept this proposal as a channel through which the interests of top Scottish athletes who have a learning disability are concerned – but sadly not in the case of Cerebral Palsy athletes or wheelchair racers. Ken has made it clear, both to the SAF Chief Executive and SDS, that he is happy to help mend the apparent rift between SDS and other disability organisations and even though SDS has expressed a reluctance to discuss any form of joint representation, it receives copies of the minutes of the meetings that take place.

In addition, athletes are free at any time to contact UKA directly about any aspect of the WCP Plan or their own individual support programme.

As part of the next assessment process, a draft of the new long term World Class Performance Plan is scheduled to be circulated by UK Sport towards the end of the year and this will provide all home countries with an opportunity to comment on the proposed plan for Athens.

UK Athletics remains committed to providing support to athletes to allow them to achieve success, both in Sydney and also Athens and is confident that this will be the case.

I hope this explains the situation more clearly. However should you require any further clarification, I would ask you to please contact Ken Kelly who will be pleased to provide any additional information you may require.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

David Moorcroft
Chief Executive
03:30/8/RCB/NB

12 June 2000

Ms Gillian Baxendine
Clerk to the Committee
Education, Culture and Sport Committee
The Scottish Parliament
EDINBURGH  EH99 1SP

Dear Ms Baxendine

**Disabled Athletics in Scotland**

I thank you for your letter of 1 June requesting I respond to the comments outlined by Doug Gillon in the Herald Article on Friday, 26 May.

As Chairman of Scottish Disability Sport I am disappointed at the refusal of UK Athletics to recognise Scottish Disability Sport as an organisation appropriate to sit at the table determining the future of British athletics. UK Athletics is currently engaged in preparing the World Class Performance Plan for the quadrennium following the Sydney Paralympics. SDS is not being given the opportunity to contribute despite my repeated requests. UK Athletics prefers that SDS operates through the individual representatives of a number of English based disability specific organisations, in preference to one Scottish representative at the table representing all Scottish athletes with a disability. SDS organises its athletics programme on the multi-disability basis and questions the appropriateness of operating through a series of disability specific groups. The logistics of operating in such a way are impossible for this Association’s volunteers.

The second issue which causes concern is the fact that UK Athletics considers Scottish coaches inappropriate individuals to support British teams participating in leadup events to the Paralympics and at the Paralympics proper. For the first time in over 15 years it would appear there will be no Scottish coach involved with the Great Britain athletics team despite the fact that there could be a strong Scottish athlete representation. During the leadup phase only selected Paralympic coaches have supported teams travelling abroad. Consequently Scottish coaches are not receiving exposure to the high level competitions that are necessary for their own personal development and to enable them to provide the best possible support to Scottish athletes with a disability.
The third issue, which gives rise for concern, is the breakdown in relationship between individual top Scottish athletes with a disability, their respective coaches and UK Athletics. A considerable amount of time and energy is being spent on letters, e-mails and telephone calls, many of which remain unanswered. There is considerable unrest and all of this cannot but unsettle the athletes during a most important period of their Paralympic preparations. Selection for the Great Britain Paralympic team is what they all aspire to. To enable them to meet that challenge successfully there needs to be harmony, understanding and a healthy rapport between athlete and the controlling body. That clearly does not exist at the present time and last week I met with a group of top Scottish athletes and coaches and they clearly identified a range of issues about which they are clearly dissatisfied.

Significant changes have taken place in the way that sport for disabled people is run at UK level. Previously, co-ordination at the top level was the responsibility of the British Paralympic Association but this has now moved over to specific governing bodies of sport. SDS supports this move and as an organisation has worked very closely with a number of Scottish based governing bodies of sport. Many of the partnership programmes currently in operation are highly successful. Individual officers and volunteers have committed considerable time and effort to ensure the new structures are viable.

Currently in operation is a swimming model which is successful. SDS and Scottish Swimming are represented at GB level on a co-ordinating group facilitated by the Amateur Swimming Association. Its representatives are consulted and SDS and Scottish Swimming feel they may play an important part in developing and shaping British swimming for swimmers with a disability. However a similar model does not operate in athletics and there is no doubt that currently we Scots feel excluded from the decision making process. What we seek is a representative on a UK Athletics body who speaks on behalf of Scottish Athletics and Scottish Disability Sport and clearly represents the interests of athletes with a disability north of the border.

SDS members have enjoyed considerable success at International and Paralympic level in both athletics and swimming. The GB swimming model works and SDS is currently satisfied with the role it plays in influencing policy and procedures. However in athletics the SDS/SAF partnership has little or no input and consequently we feel marginalised and unable to represent the interests of our athletes at UK level.

I hope the above explanations give a clearer picture of why there is unrest in Scotland and why UK Athletics is seen by many of us to be a distant body in which we have little or no input to the development of athletics for disabled people.

Yours faithfully,

Richard Brickley, MBE
Chairman, SDS
THE SOCIAL INCLUSION OF BLACK/MINORITY ETHNIC CHILDREN WITH SEN

Submission to the Scottish Parliament Committee of Inquiry on SEN Provision.
From The Minority Ethnic Learning Disabilities Initiative Ltd [MELDI],
Edinburgh

TACKLING INSTITUTIONAL RACISM IN SEN

MELDI is a black-led voluntary sector organisation which provides advocacy support to black/minority ethnic disabled persons and their families. It has gained a sound understanding of the needs of families and the institutional barriers which they experience in caring for their children. This statement sets out the key principles which we feel must be recognised and strategic questions which are critical to ensure that the rights of children of black/minority ethnic background are acknowledged and honoured by the Scottish Executive, Local Authorities, Schools, Support Services and Voluntary Agencies. Only when this is so will it demonstrate a commitment to the elimination of institutional racism and Social Inclusion become a reality.

There is an abundance of evidence to demonstrate that black/minority ethnic communities experience institutional and structural barriers in accessing their entitlements to public services [The MacPherson Report, 1999]. MELDI believes that institutional racism can be eliminated if policy and practice must be founded on the following principles:

- Black/minority ethnic communities are explicitly acknowledged and valued, their dignity and aspirations recognised and they play an active part in policy formulation.
- In the planning and delivery of the Children's Services, due regard is given, without discrimination, to the religious persuasion, racial origin, cultural and linguistic background of black/minority ethnic children and their families.
- This commitment is understood and consistently implemented by policy makers and professionals across the areas of health, education and social work in their contact with children and families.
- Ethnic monitoring is employed in detecting trends and assessing the impact of the services to children and families.

PRIORITY 1: DIVERSITY OF PROVISION

Special needs education varies considerably between different local authorities in Scotland. In particular, provision of special schools is largely determined the historical circumstances of local authority reorganisation with some authorities inheriting many special schools and other authorities inheriting few or none. These differences mediate against a consistent national wide policy towards special educational needs. Families are well aware of these issues, especially if at some point they have been unsuccessful in making a placing request because of local authority boundaries. For black and minority ethnic families who are predominantly resident in Scotland’s city authorities, this situation means that it is difficult to access consistent support and advice. Variation between local authorities further adds to a sense of isolation which many black families experience. There is no national policy or research data on the assessment and placement of black/minority ethnic children in SEN provision despite the recommendations of the formal inquiry by the CRE(1996).

PRIORITY 2: INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Policy moves towards inclusive education are very welcome but need to be supported by appropriate provision. At present, particular areas of provision (for example speech and language units) are in great demand. Children from black and minority ethnic groups may be at a structural disadvantage where there is great demand for a particular resource. MELDI has just commenced a research and development project on SEN (funded by the Scottish Executive) and early findings from this project show that families from black and minority ethnic groups have less access to voluntary sector information and support. Excellent information packages and educational advice services which are developed by specialist voluntary organisations are not reaching families from black and minority ethnic groups. For them to benefit from moves towards inclusive education, the government must ensure that situations in which there is competition over scarce resources are addressed so as to not compound the problems encountered by black communities.

PRIORITY 3: ASSESSMENT, PLACEMENT & TRANSITION
At present, educational psychologists are given the role of allocating resources and of making assessments of individual children. This is a conflict of interest in that the psychologist is inevitably under pressure to make assessments which will match provision available. This is an area of concern at all transitional stages and particularly when a child is first assessed before starting school. Professionals must have due regard to the religious persuasion, racial origin, cultural and linguistic background of the families with whom they are working. This is not possible unless assessments focus on the potential of the child and are not affected by resources. Parents need to be confident that the particular circumstances of their child are under consideration and that processes and procedures are racially inclusive.

PRIORITY 4: EQUAL & ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF FAMILIES

Despite the rhetoric of ‘partnership’, MELDI has found that parents are seriously under-represented in making decisions about their children. Even in difficult circumstances of caring for children who are disabled, these parents can and do demonstrate positive qualities in responding to their situation, are resourceful, self-reliant, supportive of other parents and show perseverance. Yet, they have complained that professionals have low expectations of them and they have found themselves having to liaise between different parties in order to ensure that the child’s needs are understood by all professionals. Children’s Services, particularly education and health, are at the top of the list of priorities for black/minority ethnic parents; in addition to concerns about access to services, they worry about the safety of their children from racial attacks. It is therefore critical that in the planning and delivery of services, explicit account is given to issues of racial equality in assessing the needs of black/minority ethnic families of children with SEN? Summarised below are brief indicators:

Factors in Assessing the Needs of Families

- ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds: avoiding stereotypes!
- physical demands: 24 hour call, lack of relief, etc
- health and welfare: relationships, health of carers, particularly women.
- stigma: blame, guilt, community reactions
- economic: finance, child-care etc
- family response: knowledge, skills and qualities, support network, etc

Factors in Assuring Racial Equality in Actively Working with Families

- Range & Culturally appropriate services and professionals: which, why, how, what?
- Support in decision-making: critical stages at entry, assessment, progress at school; statutory requirements, policy and provision for SEN; parental rights, Bilingualism, etc
- Communication:
  (i) Professionals- & Families [Is it a genuine Partnership?]
  Culturally and linguistically appropriate information, dialogue, role in assessment and review, accountability etc
  (ii) Inter-professional Practice [ Is it Collaborative?]
  Inter-agency, coherent policy, client-centred services, Interpretation & Translation etc
- positive relationships: inclusive, pro-active, effective or inaccessible, reactive, discriminatory?
- racism: combat differential treatment (direct/indirect) on grounds of race, ethnicity, language; legal framework, ethnic monitoring, etc

STRATEGIC ISSUES FOR SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE, LOCAL AUTHORITIES, SCHOOLS, SUPPORT SERVICES AND VOLUNTARY AGENCIES.

MELDI would like the Committee of Inquiry to investigate if and how the above range of bodies:

- Ensure that issues of Racial Equality are evident? Do they ensure that statistical information about the presence and composition of black/minority ethnic communities inform strategy?
- Ensure equitable distribution of funding to children from black/minority ethnic backgrounds?
• Include 'race & ethnicity' as factors of analysis and monitoring in auditing needs?
• Review whether staffing measures are present in Strategic Plans which are consistent with its commitment to Racial Equality? How is the Scottish Executive tackling the serious deficit of black/minority ethnic professionals?[i.e. Teachers, Social Workers, Psychologists, Speech therapists, etc]
• Actively include black/minority ethnic communities in policy and practice matters?

March 2000.
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Gillian Baxendine
Clerk to the Committee
Education, Culture and Sport Committee
Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP

Dear Ms Baxendine

Disabled Athletics in Scotland

I would like to make the following comments in response to your letter dated 1 June.

There are a number of organisations each playing an important role in supporting and providing opportunities for athletes with a disability to compete on the international stage, including UK Sport, UK Athletics, sportscotland, the Scottish Athletics Federation and Scottish Disability Sport.

It appears that there are three distinct issues which have caused concern over the past few weeks and I offer my perspective on these in some detail below.

Standards of Performance Required for Lottery Funding

The World Class Performance Plan created by UK Athletics uses three sets of criteria to assess the particular lottery category of each athlete, which in itself may be the route cause of the differing views. It is the Lottery categorisation of Karen Lewis which has highlighted some of these difficulties.

Unfortunately unlike in able bodied athletics there are no recognised world rankings for athletes with a disability and this significantly hinders any objective process for determining and predicting future performance.

In relation to Karen Lewis who is current world champion, there is a difference of opinion as to her current world standing. Under UKA criteria, the top two in the world are eligible for category A lottery funding and it is UK Athletics' understanding that she is not ranked no 1 or 2. This matter is disputed by Scottish Disability Sport who appear to have evidence to the contrary.

On current performance it would appear that Karen Lewis has an excellent opportunity to win a medal in the Paralympics in Sydney and given that she is currently world record holder, it is indeed difficult to reconcile the fact that she is not regarded as a category A lottery funded athlete.
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I understand from those more involved in the world of disabled athletics that world records are bettered much more frequently than in able bodied athletics and that it is not unreasonable to expect new world record standards from medal winners in Karen’s event in Sydney.

Whilst Karen’s position highlights the problem, it is very important that the appropriate organisations work towards the long term solution, which is to create world rankings for disabled athletics events over the next few years in order to overcome this problem in the future.

**Involvement of SDS within UK Athletics performance Planning**

Currently UK Athletics will not recognise Scottish Disability Sport as an organisation which should be involved in the production of the UKA Performance Plan. UK Athletics as an organisation in its recent re-organisation has moved away from a strict policy of representation of each of the home countries within all of its committees as this proved to be very ineffective in the past. The UKA performance planning group has been made up a small number of disability specific, disabled sports organisations which in name have responsibility throughout the UK. As I am sure many of your members will be aware, the reality is often different and some of these organisations have little locus within Scotland. It is these organisations which have been largely responsible for working with UKA in establishing the criteria for the Lottery categories and their credibility in Scotland may have suffered as a result.

Scottish Disability Sport is the pan disability organisation for disabled sport in Scotland. It has an excellent reputation and excellent tradition of co-ordinating and developing sport for disabled athletes in Scotland.

Whilst the other UK organisations would appear happy for SDS to be around the planning table, UK Athletics have taken a position that it is for SDS to liaise appropriately with the selected disability specific organisations, and to have their views represented through them.

My own view, given that the other organisations were happy for SDS to be involved, and given the considerable success of Scottish athletes in the team, it would have been appropriate and pragmatic for an invitation to have been extended to SDS for their involvement in the planning process. This has not been the case and UK Athletics have been unwilling to this point to negotiate on this position.

**GB Team managers and Coaches**

A further issue which is linked to the issue of representation is the lack of involvement of Scottish coaches or team management within the Great Britain team planned for Sydney. It would appear that despite the certainty of several Scottish athletes making the team and the long tradition of excellence in Scotland, there will be no Scottish representation within the coaching and team management structure of the British athletics group travelling to the Paralympics. This is at best unfortunate and does little
to help the motivation of those involved nor the international development of Scottish coaches and team managers. As Scottish athletes are only able to compete under the banner of Great Britain on the world stage, it is very important that there is an element of representation in the management teams if progress is to be maintained on an equitable basis throughout the UK.

Whilst there is an argument for entirely competency based appointments, within Scottish Athletics we feel most strongly that there also has to be a recognition that UK Athletics is made up of the athletes from four countries and that there ought to be an element of representation taken into account in the appointment of team coaches and management. The failure to appoint Scottish Coaches to the Paralympic Team does little to strengthen the relationship between the UK and Scottish bodies, and fails to recognise the quality of the work in Scotland which has produced several athletes with real medal potential.

Given all of the above, the Scottish Athletics Federation has an excellent working relationship both with UK Athletics and Scottish Disability Sport. Both are committed to the same goals. I don't believe that this matter has been discussed at Chief Executive level within the organisations involved, and this might have been a more appropriate course of action prior to it being drawn to the attention of the Scottish Parliament. I will be raising this matter with David Moorcroft the Chief Executive of UK Athletics and I am sure that he will be keen to meet with representatives of SDS during his visit to Scotland later this month.

Kind regards

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

David Joy
Chief Executive

Cc  Richard Brickley Scottish Disability Sport
    David Moorcroft Chief Executive UK Athletics
    Frank Clement, Chairman the Scottish Athletics Federation
    Allan Alstead, Chief Executive sportscotland
Dear Ms Baxendine

DISABILITY ATHLETICS

Thank you for your letter dated 1 June 2000 concerning the article that appeared in the Herald newspaper recently. The article by Doug Gillon expresses concern over the treatment of Scottish athletes preparing for the Sydney 2000 Paralympic Games.

In June 1999 UK Athletics took over responsibility from the British Paralympic Association for all UK-lottery funded athletes with a disability. It is important to point out that UK Athletics is not the governing body for disability athletics within the UK. What has been agreed, is that UKA would co-ordinate the programme of support for the 53 athletes identified in the World Class Performance Plan. In November 1999 UK Athletics appointed Ken Kelly as Technical Director for Disability Athletics. With his appointment, Ken assumed responsibility for the World Class Performance Plan, designed to support the UK's top athletes who were preparing for Sydney 2000. The Plan has a clearly stated aim of supporting athletes who are strong medal potential for Sydney. As a result of this aim, the standards set are necessarily high as it is intended that those athletes identified should be capable of competing with the very best in the world.

Prior to being implemented, the WCP Plan was circulated by the UK Sports Council to all the home country sports councils as part of the assessment process. Whilst the comments from the home countries to UK Sports are confidential, the Plan was eventually approved unconditionally.

Ken Kelly has been made aware of the concerns expressed by Scottish Disability Sport. Ken has met with the chief executive from the Scottish Athletics Federation and athletes and coaches from Scotland on a number of separate occasions, as well as travelling to Northern Ireland, in order to explain the Plan more clearly. UK Athletics recognises that the tight timescales it has been obliged to operate to, have meant that the time available to explain the Plan in full has been less than ideal. Ken does however meet with the athletes regularly
the Plan in full has been less than ideal. Ken does however meet with the athletes regularly at each squad weekend, in order to listen to their concerns and will be travelling to Scotland again in the near future, to continue to speak with and reassure athletes and coaches.

One of the Technical Director’s main tasks is to prepare and secure funding for a long term WCP Plan. Ken has sought the views of; British Blind Sport, British Wheelchair Racing Association, British Wheelchair Athletics Association, British Amputee and Les Autres Sports Association, Dwarf Athletics (UK), UK Sports Association for People with Learning Disability and CP Sport. One representative from each of these organisations meet with Ken Kelly on a regular basis to provide an input to this new Plan. He feels that having one representative from each group is a reasonable offer to disability organisations. Scottish Disability Sport has chosen to accept this proposal as a channel through which the interests of top Scottish athletes who have a learning disability are concerned – but sadly not in the case of Cerebral Palsy athletes or wheelchair racers. Ken has made it clear, both to the SAF Chief Executive and SDS, that he is happy to help mend the apparent rift between SDS and other disability organisations and even though SDS has expressed a reluctance to discuss any form of joint representation, it receives copies of the minutes of the meetings that take place.

In addition, athletes are free at any time to contact UKA directly about any aspect of the WCP Plan or their own individual support programme.

As part of the next assessment process, a draft of the new long term World Class Performance Plan is scheduled to be circulated by UK Sport towards the end of the year and this will provide all home countries with an opportunity to comment on the proposed plan for Athens.

UK Athletics remains committed to providing support to athletes to allow them to achieve success, both in Sydney and also Athens and is confident that this will be the case.

I hope this explains the situation more clearly. However should you require any further clarification, I would ask you to please contact Ken Kelly who will be pleased to provide any additional information you may require.

Yours sincerely

David Moorcroft
Chief Executive
03:30/8/RCB/NB

12 June 2000

Ms Gillian Baxendine
Clerk to the Committee
Education, Culture and Sport Committee
The Scottish Parliament
EDINBURGH EH99 1SP

Dear Ms Baxendine

Disabled Athletics in Scotland

I thank you for your letter of 1 June requesting I respond to the comments outlined by Doug Gillon in the Herald Article on Friday, 26 May.

As Chairman of Scottish Disability Sport I am disappointed at the refusal of UK Athletics to recognise Scottish Disability Sport as an organisation appropriate to sit at the table determining the future of British athletics. UK Athletics is currently engaged in preparing the World Class Performance Plan for the quadrennium following the Sydney Paralympics. SDS is not being given the opportunity to contribute despite my repeated requests. UK Athletics prefers that SDS operates through the individual representatives of a number of English based disability specific organisations, in preference to one Scottish representative at the table representing all Scottish athletes with a disability. SDS organises its athletics programme on the multi-disability basis and questions the appropriateness of operating through a series of disability specific groups. The logistics of operating in such a way are impossible for this Association’s volunteers.

The second issue which causes concern is the fact that UK Athletics considers Scottish coaches inappropriate individuals to support British teams participating in leadup events to the Paralympics and at the Paralympics proper. For the first time in over 15 years it would appear there will be no Scottish coach involved with the Great Britain athletics team despite the fact that there could be a strong Scottish athlete representation. During the leadup phase only selected Paralympic coaches have supported teams travelling abroad. Consequently Scottish coaches are not receiving exposure to the high level competitions that are necessary for their own personal development and to enable them to provide the best possible support to Scottish athletes with a disability.
The third issue, which gives rise for concern, is the breakdown in relationship between individual top Scottish athletes with a disability, their respective coaches and UK Athletics. A considerable amount of time and energy is being spent on letters, e-mails and telephone calls, many of which remain unanswered. There is considerable unrest and all of this cannot but unsettle the athletes during a most important period of their Paralympic preparations. Selection for the Great Britain Paralympic team is what they all aspire to. To enable them to meet that challenge successfully there needs to be harmony, understanding and a healthy rapport between athlete and the controlling body. That clearly does not exist at the present time and last week I met with a group of top Scottish athletes and coaches and they clearly identified a range of issues about which they are clearly dissatisfied.

Significant changes have taken place in the way that sport for disabled people is run at UK level. Previously, co-ordination at the top level was the responsibility of the British Paralympic Association but this has now moved over to specific governing bodies of sport. SDS supports this move and as an organisation has worked very closely with a number of Scottish based governing bodies of sport. Many of the partnership programmes currently in operation are highly successful. Individual officers and volunteers have committed considerable time and effort to ensure the new structures are viable.

Currently in operation is a swimming model which is successful. SDS and Scottish Swimming are represented at GB level on a co-ordinating group facilitated by the Amateur Swimming Association. Its representatives are consulted and SDS and Scottish Swimming feel they may play an important part in developing and shaping British swimming for swimmers with a disability. However a similar model does not operate in athletics and there is no doubt that currently we Scots feel excluded from the decision making process. What we seek is a representative on a UK Athletics body who speaks on behalf of Scottish Athletics and Scottish Disability Sport and clearly represents the interests of athletes with a disability north of the border.

SDS members have enjoyed considerable success at International and Paralympic level in both athletics and swimming. The GB swimming model works and SDS is currently satisfied with the role it plays in influencing policy and procedures. However in athletics the SDS/SAF partnership has little or no input and consequently we feel marginalised and unable to represent the interests of our athletes at UK level.

I hope the above explanations give a clearer picture of why there is unrest in Scotland and why UK Athletics is seen by many of us to be a distant body in which we have little or no input to the development of athletics for disabled people.

Yours faithfully,

Richard Brickley, MBE
Chairman, SDS
EDUCATION CULTURE AND SPORT COMMITTEE

Petition PE 213: Ms I Silavi and Miss S Silavi

1. The Public Petitions Committee referred this petition to the Committee for further consideration on 6 June 2000 and asked that it consider the issues raised. The Public Petitions Committee suggests that the Education, Culture and Sport Committee may wish to consult with the Health and Community Care Committee; the Social Inclusion, Housing and Voluntary Sector Committee; and the Equal Opportunities Committee.

The Petition

2. The petitioners consider that while the rights of disabled children are equal to those of able-bodied children the obtaining of those rights can be difficult and can often be subject to the decision of individual social workers. The petitioner is concerned at the lack of uniformity of decision making and is concerned that the present allocation of funding for respite care is subject to regional variation and inconsistencies. They requested that the Parliament debate the issue.

Recommendations

3. It is recommended:

- that the views of the petitioners should be taken into account in the Committee’s current inquiry on the possibility of establishing a Children’s Commissioner, whose remit would encompass the rights of all children.

- that the Committee consults the Health and Community Care Committee; the Social Inclusion, Housing and Voluntary Sector Committee; and the Equal Opportunities Committee; and asks that they report back, for the Committee to consider further.

Ian Cowan
Assistant Clerk