Education, Culture and Sport Committee

10th Meeting, 2001

Tuesday 27 March 2001

The Committee will meet at 2.00 pm in Committee Room 2

1. **Sport and Culture in Scotland:** The Committee will take evidence from—
   - The Scottish Rugby Union
   - The Ancient Monuments Board for Scotland
   - The Historic Buildings Council for Scotland
   - Scottish Schoolsport Federation and the Scottish Local Authority Network of Physical Education

2. **Grant-Aided Schools:** The Committee will taken evidence from—
   - Capability Scotland
   - Craighalbert Centre
   - Donaldson’s College
   - Eastpark
   - Harmeny
   - Royal Blind School

The following papers are attached for this meeting—

Submission from Ancient Monuments Board  ED/01/10/1
Submission from Historic Buildings Council  ED/01/10/2
Submission from Scottish Schoolsport Federation and Scottish Local Authority Network of Physical Education (Above three papers agenda item 1)  ED/01/10/3
Submission from Craighalbert  ED/01/10/4
Submission from Donaldson’s College  ED/01/10/5
Submission from East Park  ED/01/10/6
Submission from Harmeny Trust  ED/01/10/7
Submission from Capability Scotland (Above five papers agenda item 2)  ED/01/10/8
The following papers are attached for information—

City of Edinburgh Council (Social Work) Interim Report on Donaldson’s College

Letter from Craighalbert

Letter from Sense

Letter from Deaf Society

Martin Verity
Clerk to the Committee
Room 2.7 Committee Chambers
Ext. 85204
Email: martin.verity@scottish.parliament.uk
### Education, Culture and Sport Committee

**Meeting – Tuesday 20th March 2001**

#### Papers circulated

| Submission from Ancient Monuments Board | ED/01/10/1 |
| Submission from Historic Buildings Council | ED/01/10/2 |
| Submission from Scottish Schoolsport Federation and Scottish Local Authority Network of Physical Education | ED/01/10/3 |
| Submission from Craighalbert | ED/01/10/4 |
| Submission from Donaldson’s College | ED/01/10/5 |
| Submission from East Park | ED/01/10/6 |
| Submission from Harmony Trust | ED/01/10/7 |
| **(Not available in electronic format)** |
| Submission from Capability Scotland | ED/01/10/8 |
| Submission from Scottish Rugby Union | ED/01/10/9 |
| **(Not available in electronic format)** |
Dear Mr Cowan

EDUCATION, CULTURE AND SPORT COMMITTEE
MEETING WITH THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS BOARD FOR SCOTLAND

Thank you for your letter of 9 March to Professor Michael Lynch, Chairman of the Ancient Monuments Board for Scotland, inviting representatives of Board to meet the Education, Culture and Sport Committee at 2.30pm on Tuesday 27 March in Committee Room 2, Committee Chambers, George IV Bridge.

The Board is pleased to accept this invitation and will be represented at the meeting by Professor Michael Lynch (Chairman), Professor of Scottish History and Palaeography at the University of Edinburgh and Dr Carol Swanson, Manager of the West of Scotland Archaeology Service (which covers most of the local authorities in the former Strathclyde Region).

As requested I attach a written submission giving some background information on the Board and listing some areas of concern which the Board have. I note that this will be distributed to all members before the meeting and that there will be a question and answer session.

If you require anything further please let me know.

Yours sincerely

RON DALZIEL
Board Secretary
ANCIENT MONUMENTS BOARD FOR SCOTLAND
NOTE FOR THE EDUCATION, CULTURE AND SPORT COMMITTEE OF THE
SCOTTISH PARLIAMENT

Background

1. The Ancient Monuments Board for Scotland is an advisory non-departmental public body (NDPB). It was set up in 1913 and is currently constituted under section 22 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. The Board advises Scottish Ministers on built heritage matters – the protection and preservation of monuments of national importance and the maintenance and preservation of monuments in State care. The Board’s policy objectives are detailed at Annex A.

2. The Board currently consists of a Chairman and 15 other members. The present Chairman is Professor Michael Lynch, Professor of Scottish History and Palaeography at the University of Edinburgh. The current membership of the Board is attached at Annex B. Appointments are made by Scottish Ministers and include those nominated to represent the three bodies named in section 22(3) of the 1979 Act, namely the Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland, The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. Appointments are normally for a period of three or four years. The appointments are unpaid but members are reimbursed out of pocket expenses.

3. The Board produces an annual report for the First Minister which is presented to the Scottish Parliament in pursuance of section 23 of the 1979 Act. The latest published report is that for 1999 – copy attached. The Board’s report for 2000 is expected to be published in late April. The theme of the Board’s discussions last year were the preservation and presentation of Christian monuments.

4. The Board undertakes an annual tour to a different part of the country and for the last two years has held a public open meeting. Expenditure by the Board totals £12,000 annually on Board members’ expenses, the printing and distribution costs of the annual report, the cost of the Board tour and in respect of the open meeting.

5. The Board being an advisory NDPB is subject to the current review of public bodies.

Areas of Concern

6. The Board has raised the following issues with Scottish Ministers in recent years:-

   (a) the long term future of the local authority archaeology service in Scotland,
   (b) the importance of the built heritage in educational services,
   (c) the resources for the built heritage,
   (d) the national cultural strategy, and
   (e) the contribution of the built heritage to regeneration, particularly of rural areas.
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The Ancient Monuments Board for Scotland was set up under section 15 of the Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment Act 1913 and is currently constituted under section 22 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. It is made up of persons appointed by the Secretary of State (now Scottish Ministers), including those nominated to represent the three bodies named in section 22(3) of the 1979 Act.

POLICY OBJECTIVES

In 1997 the then Secretary of State agreed the following policy objectives for Board business:

Statutory

1. To advise the Secretary of State for Scotland in general on the exercise of his responsibilities under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, and in particular:
   
   a. to advise the Secretary of State on proposals to schedule, reschedule and de-schedule monuments under the 1979 Act.
   
   b. to advise the Secretary of State on the termination of a guardianship agreement under section 14 of the 1979 Act.
   
   c. to advise the Secretary of State on the disposal of any land acquired under sections 10, 11 or 21 of the 1979 Act.

Others

2. To advise the Secretary of State on the protection and preservation of monuments of national importance along with their setting.

3. To advise the Secretary of State on the protection, preservation and presentation of monuments in his care.

4. To advise the Secretary of State on issues that affect archaeology in Scotland, including threats, both natural and man made.

5. To advise the Secretary of State on the level of resources he might apply to his various functions under the 1979 Act.

6. To encourage the closest possible working relationship with other bodies and individuals whose objectives affect the safeguarding of Scotland's built heritage and the promotion of its understanding and enjoyment, and more generally to promote the widest possible acceptance of these objectives. (The built heritage includes ancient monuments and archaeological sites and landscapes; historic buildings, parks and gardens; burial grounds and designed landscapes.)

7. To advise the Secretary of State on any legislation or any other matter affecting the protection of the built heritage.
# ANCIENT MONUMENTS BOARD FOR SCOTLAND – MEMBERSHIP AT 1 MARCH 2001

## Chairman

**Professor Michael Lynch**  
Professor Lynch is the Sir William Fraser Professor of Scottish History and Palaeography at the University of Edinburgh. He is the immediate past President of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

## Members

**Dr Colleen Batey**  
Dr Batey is curator of Archaeology at Glasgow Museums and Lecturer in Archaeology at the University of Glasgow.

**Mr Michael Baughan**  
Mr Baughan is the Chief Executive of Learning and Teaching Scotland. He is a former Rector of Webster’s High School, Kirriemuir.

**Dr Jeanne E Cannizzo**  
Dr Cannizzo is a Senior Lecturer in Social Anthropology at the University of Edinburgh. She is an exhibition curator.

**Miss Jill Harden**  
Miss Harden is Regional Archaeologist (Highlands and Islands) with the National Trust for Scotland. She was formerly the Project Manager with The Multimedia Team of the National Museums of Scotland.

**Mr John Higgitt**  
Mr Higgitt is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Fine Art at the University of Edinburgh. He is Chairman of the National Committee on Carved Stones in Scotland.

**Councillor Jean A McFadden**  
Councillor McFadden has been a local Labour councillor in Glasgow since 1971. She is a past President of COSLA. She is a Lecturer in Law at Strathclyde University. She is Convenor of the West of Scotland Joint Archaeological Committee.

**Mr Roger J Mercer**  
Mr Mercer is Secretary (the Chief Official) of the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland. He is a former Reader in European Archaeology at the University of Edinburgh.

**Professor Christopher D Morris**  
Professor Morris is Vice Principal and the Appointed Professor of Archaeology at the University of Glasgow. He is a Commissioner of the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland.

**Dr Scott Peake**  
Dr Peake is Head of Classics at Dollar Academy. He is a Fellow Commoner in Classical Archaeology at Corpus Christie College, Cambridge.

**Mr Alan Saville**  
Mr Saville is Museum Archaeologist – Senior Curator at the National Museums of Scotland and is currently President of the Council for Scottish Archaeology.

**Councillor Eoin F Scott**  
Councillor Scott is an elected member of Orkney Islands Council. A farmer, he is Chairman of Orkney Liberal Democrats. He is a committee member of Orkney Heritage Trust.

**Dr Carol B Swanson**  
Dr Swanson is Manager of the West of Scotland Archaeology Service, which covers most of the local authorities in the former Strathclyde Region.

**Mr Malcolm J Taylor**  
Mr Taylor is a chartered surveyor, an associate in private practice. He is immediate past Chairman of the Rural Practice Division of the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors.

**Miss Lisbeth M Thoms**  
Miss Thoms is a freelance archaeologist and heritage adviser. She was formerly Heritage Services Manager with the Dundee City Council.

**Mr Andrew P K Wright**  
Mr Wright is an architect. He is chairman of an architectural private practice. He is the immediate past President of the Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland.
THE HISTORIC BUILDINGS COUNCIL FOR SCOTLAND

The Historic Buildings Council for Scotland

The Historic Buildings Council for Scotland is an advisory non departmental public body which advises Scottish Ministers on the built heritage. It was established in 1953 and consists of a Chairman, Sir Raymond Johnstone, and 12 other Members (see attached list).

The Secretariat is provided by Historic Scotland, an agency within the Scottish Executive which is directly responsible to Scottish Ministers.

A significant part of the Council’s work consists of making recommendations relating to applications for grants towards the repair of buildings of outstanding historic or architectural interest. The Council also considers a range of policy issues. The Council meets quarterly and also holds a public open meeting.

Current concerns are as follows:

Interest in the Built Heritage

There is increased awareness across society of the importance and value of the built heritage. This is reflected in the increase in the numbers of people visiting historic properties. The great success of European Heritage Days – or Doors Open Days – testifies to this increased interest. More tourists visit Scotland for its built heritage than for any other reason.

Historic building repair grants

The Council believes that the built heritage of Scotland is in much better shape than 25 years ago. This is directly attributable to the historic building repair grants scheme, administered by Historic Scotland. The historic building repair grants budget is £11.7m per annum. It enjoys an excellent leverage rate of over 300% and also creates employment. Many important buildings have been secured for the future and given a new use, although funding has been reducing in both actual and real terms since 1995-96 when it stood at £12.4m.

There remain, however, many important historic buildings needing attention. The ongoing nature of building work means that resources have to be committed for a number of years ahead. The pressure on Historic Scotland’s budget for grants means that new projects are unlikely to receive any funding until the year 2003 at the earliest.

Regeneration

Conservation of the built heritage can play a very positive role in economic and social life. Development need not be inconsistent with conservation, nor conservation incompatible with new design. It is through managing change that we can pass on what we value to future generations. Conservation means much more than the restoration of buildings. It can help to rebuild and revive areas, contributing in a very real way to the continued regeneration not only of our towns and cities but also rural areas. A sense of place and an attractive built environment can make a huge difference to the quality of life.

Sustainability

Conservation of the built heritage can contribute to the Executive’s agenda for sustainable development. Both share the common ground that resources should be husbanded with care,
thinking of future as well as current generations. Council recognises the contribution which Historic Scotland has made and notes the forthcoming policy document on the sustainable management of the historic environment.

**Local Authorities**

Council is very much aware of the contribution which local authorities can make to the built heritage. Council is aware, however, that the priority which authorities give to the protection and enhancement of the heritage varies. We have been particularly concerned over the treatment of conservation areas in some authority areas. We would welcome the production of guidance on conservation areas.

A related factor is the lack of or low importance accorded to specialist staff, including archaeologists and conservation officers, in some local authorities. Council regards it as very important that local authorities have access to specialist conservation advice; indeed, it is difficult to see how local authorities can properly carry out their statutory responsibilities for the built heritage without access to the proper expertise.

**Redundant health service buildings**

Council is particularly concerned over the disposal of redundant health service buildings. Many of these are of considerable historic and architectural significance. We feel that Health Trusts and Boards should take a wider view of their responsibilities. Council believes that a more systematic approach should be adopted and that health authorities should plan ahead and anticipate changes in requirements. By this means, timely arrangements can be made for the adaptation or disposal of buildings to ensure that they have a future use.

**Education and training**

The built heritage provides an important educational resource. Council welcomes efforts to expand the opportunities children have to learn about the built heritage in schools. We hope that the National Cultural Strategy will produce results in this area.

Council is also keen to promote higher standards of training and competence amongst those involved in building conservation at professional level. There are particular problems caused by the way architecture is now taught in universities with the concentration on new build. There is a serious shortage of people skilled in the traditional building and crafts skills.

**Traditional materials**

Council wishes to emphasise the importance of securing and using traditional materials. The supply of Scottish slate is now becoming a critical issue. There have been no new supplies of Scottish slate since the 1950s, and the supply of second hand slates, taken from one building to roof another, is drying up. Council applauds the efforts which Historic Scotland is making to establish a new supply of Scottish slate. This is of crucial importance for historic buildings, but could also bring economic benefits as well. We are importing large quantities of inferior performing slate when adequate supplies could be sourced in Scotland.

Historic Buildings Council for Scotland
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Raymond Johnstone</td>
<td>Chairman of the Forestry Commission, President of Murray Johnstone Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Robert Cairns</td>
<td>Member City of Edinburgh Council; Chairman East of Scotland Water; Board Member Edinburgh World Heritage Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Pat Chalmers</td>
<td>Member Glasgow City Council; Chair of Alexander Greek Thomson Trust; Board Member of Glasgow Building Conservation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Mario Conti</td>
<td>RC Bishop of Aberdeen; President Scottish Catholic Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Liz Davidson</td>
<td>Project Director, Glasgow Townscape Heritage Initiative; Chair Scottish Association of Preservation Trusts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Althea Dundas-Bekker</td>
<td>Arniston House, Midlothian; National Trust for Scotland (Council Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Graham Forbes</td>
<td>Provost of St Mary’s Episcopal Cathedral, Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Frew</td>
<td>Art Department, St Andrew’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Denis Gauci</td>
<td>Director, Pan-Ocean Engineering, Aberdeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mark Hopton</td>
<td>Partner, LDN Architects; Royal Incorporation of Architects Conservation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Eric Jamieson</td>
<td>Former Non-Executive Director Telewest Communications, Edinburgh; Vice President Cramond Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Pamela Robertson</td>
<td>Senior Curator of Hunterian Art Gallery, University of Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Fiona Sinclair</td>
<td>Conservation architect and architectural historian; Design Tutor, University of Strathclyde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting with the Scottish Parliamentary Committee for Education Sport and Culture on Tuesday, 27 March 2001 at 3.00 pm

1. Witnesses

Charlie Raeburn, Chair SSF and SLANOPE (West Lothian Council)
Blair Young, Treasurer SSF (Biggar HS)
Christine Watson SLANOPE (City of Glasgow Council)

2. Background

The Scottish Schoolsport Federation (SSF) was established in 1988 in the “shadow” of the teacher’s industrial action, which had targeted extra curricular activities in schools. The Federation comprises some fourteen Scottish School Sport Associations. The aims of the Federation are to further the cause of school sport in the “extended curriculum”. The Federation also creates the framework for Scotland to participate in International Schoolsport Federation (ISF) events. Member associations create the framework for the majority of national and local sports events and frequently the associations’ stage development activities both for teachers and for children.

The Scottish Local Authority Network of Physical Education (SLANOPE) was constitutionally formed after the former Scottish Association of Advisers in Physical Education (SAAPE) wound up due to the decreasing number of “specialist” Advisers left in Local Authorities who had a Physical Education training.

SLANOPE is representative of all sectors of Physical Education within the educational domain: officers with LA responsibility, secondary, primary, special education and early years teachers and has 26 Local Authorities as members.

With this representative base from the Physical Education profession, we feel that we are in a position to respond to any national initiatives or reports that are issued and be a sounding board and advisory body for taking Physical Education and Physical Activity forward within our schools.

3. Purpose of meeting with the Education Sport and Culture Committee

(a) To inform the committee of several issues of concern, including

- School Sport Post McCrone
- Developing a wider concept of physical education in the school curriculum

(b) That the committee agrees with the suggestion of employment of specialist teachers of physical education in primary schools linked to the reduction of “contact time” for primary class teachers.

(c) To seek further discussion by the Committee about the issues, rationale and delivery of the “extended curriculum” of school.

(d) To seek the support of the Committee for the establishment of Scottish Agency/Unit to support and develop school sport and physical education.
SLANOPE would wish to state that Sport is not the only area of physical activity or health and well-being that requires careful scrutiny and action as there is a broad spectrum within the Physical Education domain that needs to be considered. We would seek clarification of the role of sportscotland within this area and would possibly question some of the initiatives that have been introduced as being of best practice or being sustainable in the longer term.

There has never been a more opportune time to consider this whole area of physical activity, play and sport. There is a growing body of evidence to suggest that importance should be placed on the physical development of the child from as early as birth as this could have a direct effect on brain development and consequently academic attainment in later life. A “cradle to grave” strategy should be adopted rather than what seems at present to be an age or group targeted strategy. Amongst our concerns is evidence that “physical literacy” is not being addressed in many schools.

SLANOPE warmly welcomes the positive message that clearly emanates from the Education, Culture and Sport Committee Paper entitled “Report into Sport in Schools” and the recommendations that followed from the aims of that report which were:

- To set out the value of sport in schools
- To describe the institutional and policy contexts
- To examine the needs of school sport
- To make recommendations for improving current practice

We agree that schools have the potential and indeed are in place to maximise these benefits and it is from this viewpoint that we would want to offer comments and suggestions for discussion and debate. As already stated we agree in broad terms with the recommendations within the report and those that have particular reference to the work in schools of the PE specialist would be our focus for discussion. However we also feel that to get the “total picture” certain other factors, issues and areas of concern require to be addressed. These include:-

- Physical Education in the Primary School Sector
- Health and Safety
- Health and Physical Activity – Lifestyles
- Participation and core PE versus certification and a narrowing of the curriculum in the secondary school
- Facilities and their availability
- Extra curricular activities and school sport

The identification of National Priorities in school education does not specifically include physical education. The challenge is how to demonstrate and to implement quality physical education opportunities which can deliver the national priorities. SLANOPE urges consideration of the appointment of PE specialist teachers in primary schools. This could be achieved when considering the implementation of the McCrone Committee Report and its recommendation to reduce the class contact time of primary teachers to 22.5 hours.

The absence of PE advisers in Scotland now creates a vacuum in which consideration; advice and action can be combined to improve local practice of physical education. This at a particularly acute time for Scottish Education which is facing major changes. A small Scottish agency/unit would assist in this process.
School sport has a long tradition in Scottish Education and the vast majority of our national sporting heroes cut their teeth on the school playing field, gymnasium and more recently games hall.

The well documented decline – often attributed to teacher industrial action of the mid-1980’s – has avoided a terminal outcome due to the efforts of the volunteer staff in schools the length and breadth of Scotland who continue to give of their time in an ever increasingly busy schedule.

These local efforts have been co-ordinated by the various Schools’ Associations again in a purely voluntary capacity and in most cases receiving very little support from either Education or mainstream sport.

The current sportscotland policy of funding leaves no independent support available for Schools Sports Associations. Revenue Lottery Fund Applications have also proved fruitless. Relationships between Schools Associations and their respective National Governing Body (NGB) vary greatly with some enjoying an excellent relationship but others suffering from the various conflicts of interest between the pupil centred activity of Schools and the sports development responsibility of the NGB’s.

Many NGB’s offer short term development opportunities and the best promote coach education for teachers. Team Sport Scotland (TSS) also offer mainly short-term help and the limited time available to TSS means that many Schools have little or no experience of their programmes.

Long term work however, remains the raison d’être of the schools based teacher and to a major extent so does the sporting health of the nation.

The recently published research by Bob Littlefield described the current patchwork of provision in Scotland today and has led to calls for the establishment of an entitlement to sport for all Scottish School children.

**RECENT DEVELOPMENTS**

(a) **School Sports Co-ordinators**

Now in its third year the phased introduction of this programme has achieved 50% penetration. Attitudes towards the programme vary between Local Authorities and between schools within individual Authorities.

- Where authorities lack PE specific officers there appears to be a lack of co-ordination and leadership.
- There are also a wide variety of funding options in operation, which in some Authorities prevent Schools from joining the programme.
- As a one day per week equivalent the position of School Sports Co-ordinator is seen as being swamped by expectation!
- Teachers are now in short supply, causing cover difficulties.

It should be stressed that in Authorities and Schools, which have well co-ordinated programmes, these make a very significant contribution to encouraging the volunteer teachers to be involved.
(b) Scottish Teacher Release Scheme (STRS)

In 1999 the Scottish Schoolsport Federation (SSF) met the then Scottish Education Minister, Brian Wilson to seek “oxygen” for the system. The STRS was created to allow teachers who are involved at a National level to be released from teaching duties to undertake work with National Associations and International teams. To date eleven Associations have benefited from the STRS and although there have been difficulties in obtaining appropriate cover staff, the Scheme has been successful in maintaining and in many cases enhancing the work of member Associations.

(c) Active Primary Schools

The introduction of the Active Primary Schools Programme is welcomed as the level of activity in primary age children both in and out of school has greatly decreased in recent years. This is witnessed every August in Secondary Schools throughout the country with ever lowering levels of both fitness and basic co-ordination skills.

Games and activities in the extended curriculum have always been of a more limited nature within Primary Schools. However, initiatives by various Schools’ Associations including: Gymnastics, Swimming, Athletics, Orienteering and Football have been favourably received by Schools, and more importantly by the pupils who took part in both training and competitions. The Youth Sports Trust TOPS programmes are in the process of being rolled out to enhance sporting activity both within the curriculum and after school.

THE WAY AHEAD

In SSF discussions with many other organisations including: sportscotland, Headteachers’ Association of Scotland, EIS, major sporting NGB’s, all agreed that the status quo is not an option.

Indeed, both the Depute Education and Sport and Culture Ministers at a recent meeting with SSF Office Bearers echoed this.

We would therefore suggest the following as an outline of the way ahead.

We seek:

A rationale for the “extended curriculum”

- Bring together representatives of all stakeholders in the field of School sport, and other afterschool activities (music, debating, homework clubs) to develop the rationale and good practice guidelines

The promotion of conditions to support and encourage School Sport

- Implicit inclusion of school sport in negotiations regarding McCrone implementation
- Implicit inclusion of school sport in all aspects of the extended curriculum including NOF funded projects.

Encouragement by the Education system

- Formal recognition of the important role and success of School sport.
- Empowerment of stakeholders through consultation on all relevant issues.
- Establishment of an Agency to encourage, support, advocate and develop on behalf of Physical Education and Schools sport particularly at National and Local Government levels.
• The establishment of an **entitlement** of 2 hours to Physical Education and sport for every Scottish school pupil.

The conclusions and recommendations of the recent Report into Sport in Schools are seen as strongly supporting sport within Scotland’s Schools at all levels.

**Conclusion**

This “bottom up” approach agrees with the philosophy of both Scottish Schoolsport Federation and Scottish Local Authority Network for PE. We particularly welcome the suggestions:

• to increase involvement in Primary Schools;
• moves to pilot “focus” schools for sport, (we have noted the investment in specialist colleges in England and Wales);
• recommendations associated with increased consultation and ownership for all stakeholders.
APPENDIX I

The case for an Agency for Scottish School Sport

BACKGROUND AND PERSPECTIVE

Scottish secondary schools are generally well facilitated for sport. Facilities include sports halls, gyms, dance studios, fitness suites, swimming pools and playing fields. There has been a successful tradition within Scotland and the UK for secondary school sport at all levels. This tradition was centered on extracurricular sport offered in the main by volunteer teachers. In the mid 1980’s during a prolonged period of industrial action teachers worked to rule. Consequently school sport and many other activities offered by teachers were gravely affected. More than ten years later school sport is alive and well. The major challenge is to unlock the considerable further untapped potential of schools and teachers.

The secondary schools sports co-ordinators project is now assisting school sport by creating a support structure for these volunteers in schools.

It is the exceptional primary school that offers a range of activities after school. Apart from football, which is frequently offered in primary schools, other sports are commonly given some competitive/performance opportunities at a national level by Scottish school sport associations. SportsScotland and three local authorities have initiated a number of primary schools a pilot project called Active Primary Schools which is attempting to increase physical activity levels of primary children.

For several years school sport was being considered under the generic title “school-aged sport”. However school sport has now emerged as a potentially very useful and important issue for national development; though as yet significantly not identified as such by the educational establishment. It is ironic that the concept of an extended curriculum has as yet to be recognized by the establishment, highlighted by conflict between supported study and the traditional extracurricular activities.

For the future, the New Opportunities Fund presents exciting potential to develop and extend the boundaries and participation in Scottish school sport. Few schools or local authorities have thus far demonstrated in their applications for New Opportunities funding that school
sport could benefit. Indeed there are examples of how school sport may suffer as study support is developed almost in competition with a voluntary school sport scenario.

**CHALLENGES TO BE FACED: FULFILLING VISIONS**

It is now important for school sport to base itself at the heart of school life, enhancing the school as an institution and enhancing the pupils/student experience of school. To do that it must be recognized that schools and teachers can only do so much. School sport has the potential for fulfilling and complementing a range of often quite disparate aims. These include: -

- Health Enhancing Physical Activity
- Physical Education
- Raising Achievement/Standards
- Sports Development
- Personal and Social Development
- Working with Others

The complication is that schools have difficulties fulfilling all these visions, as the agenda for schools is largely defined by the Raising Achievement Agendas. It is however clear that with much increased participation in all sectors of the schooling system so much could be achieved to improve schools, schooling experience of youngsters, healthier lifestyles, and eventually the national sporting profile.

A major challenge is to identify and to recruit both teachers and others to coach school youngsters. It may well be, for example, with the leadership of appropriate teaching staff, that senior pupils could contribute. In addition, corporate sector employees would contribute toward this process, as part of an **active citizenship** programme.

Too little recognition has been given to the difficulty faced in recruiting credible coaches available to coach youngsters of all ages. Even those who have undertaken degree courses in Sports and Leisure Management courses have few of these qualifications.

The youngsters require **quality learning experiences** of sport and physical activity. They also need to experience performance and competition; to learn **about** the sport, its culture its
pitfalls and problems; to assist youngsters to make informed choices as adults, as sport has become such a powerful phenomenon in society. This despite considerable problems created by the media, by the market place and by the professional world of sport. Perhaps by investing in education about and through sport, some of the recent trends could be reversed. Perhaps there might be more interest in participation, rather than simply spectating and viewing.

PROPOSAL: SCHOOLSPORT SCOTLAND - A MULTISPORT AGENCY

To assist in the major task of devising and developing an infrastructure for sport within the extended curriculum, an agency called “Schoolsport Scotland” should be established. Such an agency should be managed by representatives of the education system and include representation from the volunteer teachers who deliver school sport. An appendix to this paper demonstrates the range of school sport agencies in other countries. The Scottish Schoolsport Federation recommends a multisport agency similar to that of the UNSS in France or similar to the various German Lander organisations. In recommending such an agency SSF recognizes that its own organization would require to be changed and adapt. Member associations may well become School Committees within sports governing bodies. Schoolsport Scotland, we envisage, would act as an interface with the sports agencies, such as governing bodies, sportscotland and the Scottish Education establishment in all its manifestations. Schoolsport Scotland would promote school sport by:

- Developing the recruitment and conditions of teachers and volunteers
- Advising schools on sports related issues
- Coordinating teacher/coach and leader courses for those involved in school sport
- Liaising and supporting the development of school-based community sports clubs
- Creating and supporting local/area school sports associations
- Delivering support for School Sport Coordinators
- Assisting with the concept and development of “healthy/active schools”
- Arranging for performance and competitive opportunities for pupils of all abilities
- Opening and developing communication channels in which both teachers and pupils are heard
- Interfacing with the corporate sector on active citizenship schemes
- Developing external funding schemes for school sport
• Co-ordinate the development of sports schools/colleges

Before discussing the structure of such an agency, it is essential to recognise that the agency could have various areas of reference: -

1. **School sport** in Scotland has been traditionally considered as a largely secondary schools and extracurricular phenomenon, centering itself on the after school opportunities (recently labeled “Out of School Hours Learning Activities”). In the state sector teachers volunteer, occasionally with the support of other volunteers, to offer sporting opportunities both to learn and to perform. The recent advent of the secondary school sports coordinators has assisted in developing some local support for these volunteers and to develop vital links to the local sporting communities. Current primary school piloting work on the concept of “Active Primary Schools” is being centered on the enhancement of cross-curricular and playtime activities for children. Such activity could also be considered part of school sport.

There can be measurable outcomes for health, the current Raising Achievement/Standards agenda and sports development. Currently the school systems will largely only focus on the Raising Achievement/Standards agenda.

2. **Physical education and school sport.** School sport can also be considered as both formal and informal aspects of Scottish schooling. By jointly structuring the support mechanisms for both these elements, it would be possible to bring together the formal aspects of physical education, which all youngsters should experience with the school sport, which may often be voluntary. The advantages of scale are obvious; for example the opportunities to work and develop in partnership with sports and arts organisations for mutual benefit. Outcomes would clearly include those listed in paragraph 1, but also might include an enhanced physical education provision, in line with, for example 5-14 guidelines and with the development of Higher Still courses. There may also great advantages to incorporate Health Enhancing Physical Activity agenda, which the Scottish Executive Policy *Towards a Healthier Scotland has* identified as a Health priority.
3. **Youth Sport, or School Aged Sport.** It is also possible to consider youth sport as the umbrella term. Sport being the main reference point. The advantages would include the potential for all services and agencies to pool their energies. The Scottish Sports Council Report “Laying Foundations” (1990) suggested this route. However, it is clear from experience that as the reference point tends to be sport, rather than education, there has been very limited success solely on this basis. Few teachers or schools will commit to sport unless it is seen as central to the schooling process and measurable outcomes. The interests of schools as institutions and teachers and of course of pupils would require to be dovetailed into the interests of sport.

The Scottish Schoolsport Federation (SSF) has argued for sometime that a bureau/agency is required to further develop school sport in Scotland. SSF has demonstrated that the majority of other countries have a national school sport bureau or commission. The responsibilities of such commissions are structured to support one of the three models outlined above:

- School Sport
- Physical Education and School Sport
- Youth Sport.

The SSF takes the view that the model established must take into account the best interests of schools and schooling. The important priority must be to establish a framework within which sporting opportunities and the quality of experiences can be enhanced. It has become very clear that few of the thirty-two local education authorities have structures currently in place that can realistically deliver the support required for school sport. Therefore the status quo cannot be viewed as a viable option.

An appropriate structure for Schoolsport Scotland to consider would be as a trust, or as some form of limited company. Officers would be employed as seen to be appropriate. It would be envisaged that initially a small team of officers is employed to establish both a national structure and to suggest appropriate local infrastructures. As suggested in an earlier paper the French structure of the UNSS could be of interest, where there is both a national and also local structures in place.

The agency would consist of a Management Committee whose membership would be drawn from: -
COSLA
Scottish Executive

**sports**scotland

Health Education Board for Scotland

**Scottish Business in the Community**
Scottish Schoolsport Federation
Scottish Sports Association
Teaching and Learning Scotland
Scottish Network of Local Authority PE Officers
Headteachers Association of Scotland

The Scottish Schoolsport Federation hopes to confirm in the near future the support for an agency as described in this paper from Scottish Business in the Community, Headteachers Association of Scotland, Scottish Rugby Union and the Scottish Football Association. Clearly it should prove easy to establish a budget and progress made towards this national structure. It is suggested that a modest start should be made in 2000/2001.
APPENDIX II

International Schoolsport Federation

Article for “Open Door”

Physical Education and Schoolsport in Scotland

Overall responsibility for all aspects of education in Scotland lies with the Scottish Ministers acting through the Scottish Executive Education Department. It may surprise readers from many countries that Scotland has had independent education and legal systems for many years. The recent devolution of further powers to the Scottish Parliament has increased this autonomy for education in Scotland. The duty of providing education locally in Scotland rests with Education Authorities. They are responsible for construction of buildings, the employment of teachers and other staff and provision of equipment and materials. Devolved School Management (DSM) is in place for all primary and secondary schools. There are 1,010 nursery schools for children pre school age, 2,300 primary schools for children aged 5 to 12, 401 secondary schools for children aged 12 to 16 and for those who choose to stay on to 18. Most secondary schools in Scotland are co-educational. In addition there are 414 independent schools receiving no grants from public funds. These charge fees and are owned and managed under special trusts with profits being used for the benefit of the schools concerned.

The content and management of the curriculum in Scotland are not prescribed by statute and are the responsibility of education authorities and the individual headteachers. Advice and guidance are provided by the Scottish Executive Education Department and an agency - Teaching and Learning Scotland. The Scottish Executive Education Department has produced guidelines on the structure and balance of the curriculum for the 5 to 14 age groups as well as for each of the curriculum areas for this age group. Physical Education is one of four subjects within the Expressive Arts area. A minimum of 15% of overall curriculum time should be spent on Expressive Arts. There are also guidelines on reporting to parents and on standardised national test for English language and mathematics at five levels. The curriculum for 14 to 16 year olds include study within each of eight modes: language and communication; mathematical studies; science; technology; social studies; creative activities; physical education and religious and morale education. There is a recommended percentage of class time to be devoted to each area over the two years. The minimum for physical education is 80 hours. Pupils may also choose to follow a certificated course for 120 hours.

16 to 18 year olds follows a unified framework of units and courses. Courses and units are offered at 5 levels. Provision is backed by a wealth of materials, including video and CD Rom.
Within the PE curriculum for 5-14 years, teachers are asked to teach towards three attainment “outcomes” viz Using, Expressing and Evaluating: - **Using** comprises, Investigating and Developing Fitness, Using the Body and Applying Skills. **Expressing** includes creating and designing, cooperating and sharing. **Evaluating** includes Observing Reflecting and Responding which play an important role in developing the understanding of pupils about how the body moves; how techniques are required; how improvements in these techniques can be brought about. These skills provide the tools for structuring pupils thoughts, for making decisions and for evaluating others work.

The recently developed course of Higher Still in PE creates an intriguing range of opportunity up to Advanced Higher courses, which could be used prevocational attainment for example in coaching or sports leadership. There is currently much discussion on the assessment procedures linked to physical education.

School sport in Scotland has a tradition as an after school activity. Most of this tradition has been based around the secondary and independent schools where there are facilities. These schools frequently have facilities such as swimming pool, games hall, gymnasium, playing fields, all weather playing field pitches, and fitness rooms. Schoolsport after school up to now has been a voluntary activity by both staff and by students. This is particularly variable because of this voluntary effort; schools can have a very extensive range of opportunity offered by these volunteer teachers and other volunteers. Fifty per cent of the volunteer teachers are non PE teachers and there are now considerable number of sports clubs and other individuals volunteering to support school sport outwith the formal curriculum. The opportunities currently in the primary school sector are much more limited. The facilities in the primary school are usually much more limited and of course it is perhaps more difficult for the primary class teachers to volunteer themselves after a full days work and to take children after school after 3.30 pm.

Co-ordination of programmes within individual schools has always been a matter exclusively for each school concerned. Historically local inter-school competition has lead in virtually all sports to the formation of a local and eventually National Schools Association. In 14 sports there are National School Sport Associations and which constitute the vertical strands of the organisational lattice. Many of these associations have local organisations working with local authorities to offer opportunity at local level. Over the past three years the new post of School Sport Co-ordinator has been introduced where one day an of teacher’s time is given to co-ordinating and supporting school sport in the (Extended) curriculum. This innovation is 50% funded from the National Lottery and has generated an increase in activity in many of the schools.
The Scottish Schoolsport Federation has argued for some time that the “extended curriculum” should be more formally recognised and more formally supported. SSF is also arguing the case for a multi sport agency for school sport in Scotland.

Charlie Raeburn  
Chair  
Scottish Schoolsport Federation  
Charlie.raeburn@westlothian.gov.uk

9 October 2000
20 March 2001

Karen Gillon MSP
Convenor, Education, Culture and Sport Committee
The Scottish Parliament
Room 2.7, Committee Chambers
George IV Bridge
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP

Dear Mrs Gillon,

Report on Inquiry into Special Educational Needs

The Committee’s Assistant Clerk, Ian Cowan’s requested in his letter of 9 March that we provide a written submission prior to our meeting with the Committee on the 27th.

The Grant-Aided Schools

The seven schools each offer a very different range of provision, the principal common link being the receipt of a direct grant from the Scottish Executive Education Department.

With regard to the Report, I believe the schools share a common view on the following points:

• We are very supportive of the Executive’s policies for social inclusion. However, successful social and local inclusion will be dependant upon strong support systems including national schools, which have developed expertise in each of their specific areas.

• Although the good work being performed at these schools is not in question, it appears there remains some doubt over the requirement for national centres. It is important therefore to clarify the function and identity of such national centres and it is recommended the National SEN Advisory Forum be given the opportunity to carry out this task. This review would consider not only the current group of grant-aided schools, but also others in Scotland who may fulfil the National Centre criteria.

• It is disappointing that the membership of the Committee changed before the Report was finalised as a great deal of time had been invested by the schools and, in particular, the committee members in visits which undoubtedly furthered their understanding of the school’s functions. We believe that even detailed Official Reports and written evidence cannot provide the same level of understanding as first hand experience.

Funding Issues – The Craighalbert Centre

Our greatest concern is the need to provide a stable funding environment in which the Centre can operate. The current arrangements are largely successful in achieving this goal. We believe the proposed change to the funding mechanism will threaten our ability to provide
education for the children who attend Craighalbert and to support our colleagues in mainstream through the provision of CPD.

National funding, direct from the Executive, continues to be appropriate because:

- In order to continue to provide high quality education for our pupils and to support our colleagues in mainstream education as they strive to provide an inclusive education for their pupils, it is critical that we retain staff trained in the specialised field of conductive education who are greatly experienced in working with young children with cerebral palsy. By reallocating the grant, Craighalbert would be dangerously exposed to the financial impact of fluctuations in children numbers, the result of which would be the need to lose expert staff, recruiting trainees when children numbers permit. This is not a responsible way in which to fund a resource holding such expertise and which is available to families throughout Scotland. Our ability to support colleagues in mainstream would clearly be challenged by such circumstances.

- In order to maintain and develop our expertise we must ensure that children continue to attend and benefit from Craighalbert. We estimate the proposal to reallocate the grant will result in our fees more than doubling. We believe the plan to have COSLA oversee the reallocation of the funding would be insufficient to ensure that the children who benefit from it through their attendance at Craighalbert would continue to do so. Even if the funding were ring-fenced for education, or more specifically SEN expenditure, we believe it is likely we would experience a reduction in children attending the Centre. Our grant is currently around £0.5m per annum which equates to under £16000 for each of Scotland’s 32 local authorities. The reallocation will undoubtedly provide some much needed additional cash to some of the authorities but this will be achieved at what cost to the Craighalbert Centre? We have recently witnessed the threat to COSLA’s existence as a result of a reduction in income of 25%. We believe it is not difficult to foresee how such a situation could arise at Craighalbert if the current proposals are implemented.

**Summary**

We fear the proposed reallocation of grant-aid will destabilise Craighalbert’s funding and consequently adversely affect our ability to educate the children, present and future, who attend the Centre from throughout Scotland. Successful implementation of the Executive’s policies for social inclusion will require the maintenance of essential support systems and expertise such as those offered by Craighalbert. We believe the proposed changes to funding will also hinder our efforts in this area.

For these reasons direct funding from the Executive continues to be the appropriate way in which to support national centres such as Craighalbert and we believe the Executive should take this opportunity to conduct a review which would produce a group of schools able to meet the challenges of the 21st Century, supporting social inclusion.

I look forward to our meeting on 27 March and the opportunity to discuss these matters further with the Committee.

Yours sincerely,

Lillemor Jernqvist PhD
Director
Donaldson’s College submission to
Scottish Parliament Education Culture & Sport Committee

An inclusive society must ensure that the potential of each individual is fully developed through education and that their attainment and achievements are valued and respected. It is on the realisation of this potential that inclusiveness depends: An inclusive society and education system will therefore strive to ensure that it creates the range of approaches and opportunities to ensure that this is brought about.

- Riddell Report

Much has been written about mainstreaming, integration and inclusion and frequently without any clear understanding of the differences. Mainstream and integration are ways of organising the delivery of the curriculum – they are about where we educate our children. Inclusion is a more fundamental ideal and one with which few would disagree – it is the entitlement of all of our young people – it is the subjective experience of being accepted and, as Riddell says, permitted to function in a way which maximises your potential and respects your uniqueness.

To be included, you have to be enabled to communicate – the lack of a common accessible language is arguably the single most excluding human experience. A number of profoundly deaf sign using young people cannot access the language of the mainstream classroom or the playground. They have never heard English and never will. They have an entitlement to use the only language they have access to – not only via an assistant to the teacher but in the playground, the extra curricular life of the school, in the lunch hall and the school office – all the ordinary interpersonal situations the rest of us take for granted daily. The absence of a shared language is real social exclusion, the existence of an accessible peer group is essential for personal and social development which is so central to effective modern education.

The time since the publication of the Riddell Committee’s report has seen a number of significant developments:

- the publication of the Standards in Scotland’s Schools Act 2000 - this clarified the presumption of mainstreaming except under 3 specific conditions, the most pertinent for our purposes being where mainstreaming is not suited to the ability or aptitude of the child.

- the Human Rights Act (1998) states in Article 3 that no one shall be subjected to degrading treatment – to deny access to language is surely a degrading experience.

- the publication of the Parliamentary report on Inquiry into Special Education Needs.

Para 7 (ii) the definition of inclusive education made in the report, “maximising the participation of all children in mainstream schools and removing environmental, structural and attitudinal barriers to their participation” defines the ideal of inclusion as placement in mainstream
schools. Those who cannot be so placed, and there is widespread acceptance of the need for a small number to be in receipt of specialised schooling, have an equal entitlement to be included in the Parliamentary definition of inclusion if they are not to become disenfranchised in our society.

*Donaldson’s College would urge the committee to widen its definition of inclusion to include all our children.*

Para 7 (x) states that “an indication on the Record of Needs of the choices parents have been offered should be included in any future system for assessing needs; and Para 39 notes that “Parents identify a need for access to independent and full information about educational provision and the choices available to them.”

*Donaldson’s College fully supports the Parliament in its desire to give parents and indeed, young people their statutory right to choice.*

Para 7 (xiv) states “the justification [for special schooling] must include a statement about how the special school will contribute to the child’s inclusion eg arrangements for part-time participation in mainstream, plans for later transfer to mainstream or extra-curricular activities.”

*Donaldson’s College already has an integrated Carer and Toddler group, and an integrated Nursery. We have part-time placements for approximately 30% of our pupils and offer integrated experiences with no fewer then five mainstream schools. We have mainstream pupils in our PE classes and will, in August, open an integrated After School Club.*

Para 16 “The Riddell Report expressed doubt as to whether broader roles distinguish the Grant Aided Special Schools as national centres and uncertainty about whether such centres are necessary. If they are, there are clear implications for how additional activities might be funded.”

*Donaldson’s College would like to draw your attention to the wide range of services we offer to the people of Scotland in addition to the statutory education we provide*

- We are the largest community of British Sign Language users in Scotland.

- We are, therefore, the cradle of the language and culture of deaf people across the country. Not to share a language with those around you is the single most excluding feature in anyone’s experience.

- We are a unique community of deaf and hearing people learning and working together in an inclusive atmosphere. We employ fourteen deaf staff in a wide range of posts – they are essential role models for our young people.
• We provide respite residential care for “at risk” deaf children or vulnerable families.

• We offer a wide range of sign classes to parents, hence ensuring the child’s most basic right of inclusion, that of inclusion into his/her family.

• We offer a huge range of signing classes to staff, young people from other schools and adults from industry and statutory bodies

• We are a unique resource offering help to deaf speech and language disordered children and young people

• We provide much needed in-service training for teachers and speech & language therapists on a national scale and have provided outreach in-service training as far afield as the Highlands.

• We take an active role in research at a national level. We are currently involved as the pilot study in the Scottish Executive funded “Achievements in Deaf Education” project and with Queen Margaret University College, are partners in national research on electropalatography.

• We service national developments in education e.g. in rewriting National Assessment Bank items for deaf young people and in developing, along with the University of Edinburgh, Deaf Studies as part of 5-14 and National Qualifications provision

• We are contracted by SQA to scrutinise external examination papers for accessible English for Deaf students

• We are involved in training across Scotland e.g. the National Training Project (SEN), St Andrews College, Glasgow, Teacher of the Deaf Qualification, University of Edinburgh, Training of Speech & Language Therapists in conjunction with Queen Margaret University College, classroom assistant and nursery nurse training modules with a variety of colleges

• We supply support in the form of interpreters, notetakers, lipspeakers and educational audiology for further and higher education students throughout Scotland. This enables the students to take their rightful place as autonomous contributing adults in our society – the ultimate aim of inclusion

• We are “home” to a number of other voluntary groups such as British Association of Teachers of the Deaf (Scotland), Afasic groups, Autistic Society groups, Scottish Association of Sign Language Interpreters, Scottish Tutors of Lipreading etc. These groups are in themselves often financially at risk.
The move to mainstream of the vast majority of children with special educational needs highlights the difficulties of responding effectively to the needs of the few who cannot benefit from mainstream provision. It is the contention of Donaldson’s College that the nationally inspired presumption of mainstreaming simultaneously places on government two responsibilities.

1. to provide for the geographically scattered small numbers of children who are not mainstreamed and to provide, at a cost which local authorities can meet or at no cost to local authorities, well resourced highly specialised schools which give the children a different route to their entitlement to inclusion.

2. during a period of 5-10 years, whilst the short, medium and long term efficacy of mainstreaming is being evaluated to maintain centres of expertise. These can be used by local authorities as they develop more local expertise and represent a core of special schools, should time prove that mainstreaming is not as suitable for as many children as we are currently hoping it will be. The nation must not lose its national centres of expertise and then face “re-inventing the wheel” a few years from now.

It is Donaldson’s College’s belief that each of the 7 schools should be evaluated independently for how they

1. enable their pupils to claim their entitlement to our inclusive Scotland

2. perform their function as a national centre of expertise.

Funding

The financial planning for meeting the needs of severe low incidence disabled children has, due to the low numbers, inherent problems for both local authorities and schools.

1. by definition, the needs of the children are extreme and hence staff intensive

2. our fees for next year with the grant are likely to be £12,623 per day pupil and £20,205 for a residential pupil. Without the grant, they would rise to £31,562 and £50,512 respectively. It is, therefore, obvious that one child relocating out of Scotland or leaving for mainstream means a cut in staffing.

Whilst accepting financial prudence, such massive impact is well nigh impossible to manage on a local authority-funded basis. Equally, for a local authority there are huge difficulties if a family of say three deaf children moves into their area and the authority is suddenly faced with a bill for £150,000. The vagaries of this are best deal with within a national context.
Five models of funding are possible.

1. **Total National Funding**

   This would remove the postcode lottery factor and enable decisions to be made on an educational need basis, not a financial or political basis. It would necessitate a nationally devised admission procedure and regular audit and inspection by HMI or another nationally appointed body. SEED could then influence related functions such as research and national staff training.

2. **The Status Quo**

   This gives the schools a balance of funding – up to 60% almost irrespective of pupil numbers and the remainder taken as subsidised fees from local authorities. If this is to continue, the ‘national’ responsibilities require to be agreed, monitored and evaluated.

3. **All National Government Funding Withdrawn**

   It is our belief that such a move would, in the first instance lead to the shutdown of non-statutory services. It would be unacceptable to use funding provided for one child for the provision of services that he/she was not accessing. We further believe that local authorities could not afford to keep children at Donaldson’s, or other GASS schools and that there would therefore be increased conflict with parents. As pupil numbers decreased the cost for pupils would rise hence setting off a self-perpetuating problem. It is unlikely that we could survive that situation.

4. **National Government Funding Phased Out Over A Five Year Period**

   This is a less damaging option for Donaldson’s College and local authorities as it gives an identified time scale for both Schools and Local Authorities to financially plan appropriately. It would also permit a medium term evaluation of mainstreaming.

5. **Statutory Education, fully Locally Funded • National Non-Statutory Functions Nationally Funded • Safety Net for Population Fluctuations**

   This would involve an assessment of the current or future role of each school in contributing to research, staff training or specialist communication such as BSL. The part of the schools’ budgets concerned with an agreed list of national functions would have to be identified. The schools would then have to be accountable for the effective use of these resources. The nation would also be supporting some continuity of staffing through temporary pupil number fluctuations and hence ensuring a predictable budget. This would increase accountability and make the system more transparent.
Conclusion

A 5 year phasing from No 2 – No 5 would be Donaldson’s College preferred option. This would

- enable deaf and severely speech and language disordered children to access inclusion within a supportive community

- protect the expertise there is currently held within Donaldson’s College so that it can be used in the future.
Scottish Parliament
East Park’s Submission to Education, Culture & Sport Committee
27 March 2001

The Board and Managers of East Park are grateful to the Committee for this opportunity to discuss the future of the grant-aided schools.

Introduction and outline of recent developments
East Park has broadly been in favour of the recommendation of the Riddell Report that funding for grant-aided schools should transfer to local authorities provided that the timescales were extended and that proper transitional arrangements were in place.

Since responding to that Report and the Scottish Executive Response in September 1999, East Park has continued to reshape its services in close consultation with social work, education and health services in the West of Scotland. This involves:

- Developing new units in the community for the long term care of children. The first two are due to open this year.
- Making radical changes to the use of existing accommodation to improve the quality of life for children
- Increasing day school placements for children within travelling distance of their home
- Providing respite care and family support services
- Training staff in the education and care of children with autism
- Providing post education services – called Workmates - based on individual need
- Continuing to provide for children with multiple complex needs, always including significant learning difficulties but who additionally require for example nursing care, health services or specialist attention.

After a long period of declining numbers and some critical inspection reports, the response from local authorities and health services to these developments has been extremely positive:

- The referral rate for long-term children has increased and there is a small waiting list for admission.
- Referral for school places has increased so that by August 2001 numbers should have almost doubled over the year.
- Inspection reports are excellent.
- East Park’s non-registered services provided (i.e. home support and Workmates) have been included in the Provider list by Glasgow City.
- Parents show increased confidence in the services provided by East Park which allow a wide range of education, health and social care needs to be met within a coordinated service.
Increasing levels of need

- East Park currently supports children with the highest support needs. Probably due to advances in medical science children who might previously have died either in the womb or soon after birth are surviving longer, but with multiple disabilities and complex health needs. In past years many children in East Park had disabilities which were less complex e.g. Down’s Syndrome.

- Statistics indicate a growing number of children being diagnosed as being on the Autistic Spectrum. There are insufficient appropriate places with the relevant expertise to support them and in response to the growing demand, East Park has registered with the National Autistic Society’s Autism Accreditation Programme so that we can increase our understanding and develop appropriate strategies and programmes for children with both learning difficulties and Autism

Social Inclusion

East Park supports the principle of social inclusion and the policy of supporting children in their own homes. Referrals (and admissions) come from all parts of Scotland but our aim is to provide mainly local services so that children can be supported to the optimum within their own families and communities. Services such as family support, respite care and supportive day school can prevent or postpone the need for full time care away from home. However, despite maximum support services, a small number of children need long term care and/or education away from home. East Park seeks to facilitate maximum family involvement by keeping them as close geographically as possible, and in ‘family style’ houses in the community.

Similarly, to promote social inclusion, we work hard, in co-operation with local mainstream schools, to support children on a part-time basis in those schools. We also have arrangements in place for some children in East Park to spend regular time in local schools. East Park by providing specialist services for a small number of children, supplements the services provided by the Local Authorities. Some of these children might otherwise find it difficult to access appropriate services to which they are entitled. For example:

- One pupil who, before coming to East Park had been refused entry to several Local Authority special schools
- Pupils whose health needs are such that they require constant medical supervision

Funding Issues

Despite the demonstration of confidence by all in the services now being offered by East Park, significant difficulties still remain, particularly over funding arrangements:

- Children at East Park all have high support needs and to meet their needs and registration standards, require high staffing levels both daily for care, nursing and education and specialist provision for medical, physiotherapy and other needs. East Park has been unable to obtain health funding for nursing care and other health needs.

- East Park requires a specialist skill mix and expertise in a number of important areas, as well as a higher than average staff/pupil ratio and specialised equipment and adaptations to meet the needs of the children. This equipment is often only relevant to one child, and by its nature is extremely expensive
• Higher registration standards also require capital investment. The Scottish Executive grant has generously made a significant capital contribution to the first new house (a voluntary trust is meeting most of the remainder)

• An issue already raised and being studied within the Scottish Executive is the problem of providing nursing care within small units in the community. The model of care we have proposed and which is agreed by all is that the team leader in each unit should be a qualified and practising nurse supported by staff with a range of qualifications and training. She would not however, be present at all times and this causes difficulties in terms of health registration standards. The cost of continuous nursing cover in each house for 4 – 5 children would be prohibitive.

• Funding of grant-aided schools by the Scottish Executive has allowed financing to cross the administrative boundaries of health, social work services and education. Despite much goodwill, at local level there are no comparable cross boundary funding arrangements in place for children.

• East Park is of the view that mechanisms need to be found to facilitate the funding across Scotland of children whose exceptional needs require expensive provision away from home. An imaginative option might be a national system of bursaries to provide top up funding makes it very difficult for families to provide effectively.

**Recommendations on possible ways forward**

East Park acknowledges the need for funding changes and a move towards mainstreaming as a general principle, but we would urge caution with regard to the nature and pace of those changes. It is our opinion that schools are not yet equipped or ready to support pupils with the complex disabilities we have described in this paper, and will require significant input of both finance and expertise if true inclusion is to be effected.

The following courses of action may be a possible way forward to the mutual benefit of local authorities, the grant-aided schools and most importantly to the children whom we support.

• A national strategy should be formulated to ensure that available finance is used more effectively to provide services for children with complex needs.

• A firm decision should be made about the length of time grant-aided schools will continue to be supported centrally, giving adequate time for a transition period which will allow changes to take place.
Written Submission to Education, Culture and Sport Committee of the Scottish Parliament on the SEN Inquiry Report

Capability Scotland is Scotland’s largest disability organisation. We employ 1300 people in supporting children and adults who have been born with, or have acquired, a physical and/or a learning disability.

Capability Scotland is about turning disability into ability. We focus on what people can do, not what they can’t. No matter at what stage a person becomes disabled there are opportunities to learn, adapt and gain new skills. Capability Scotland provides a broad range of quality services for over 2000 disabled children and adults in Scotland. Each year we also provide information and advice to another 4000 people through Advice Service Capability Scotland (ASCS) on a wide range of issues. Our services aim to be person centred and promote social inclusion.

We are also committed to working, in partnership, to promote the rights and aspirations of disabled people and their carers. We campaign for equal rights for children and adults with disabilities so that they might live their lives to the full.

At Capability Scotland we see the child first in developing our broad range of children and young people’s services. Our range of services include education, early years, pre-school and out of school services, residential respite and community support to children and young people with a broad range of needs, particularly those with complex needs.
Capability Scotland operates two schools which are currently grant-aided, namely Stanmore House school in Lanark and Corseford School in Kilbarchan, Renfrewshire.

Stanmore House school has 70 pupils, 45 are male and 25 female. 43 are day pupils while 27 are residential pupils. Students at Stanmore are aged between 3 and 18 years old and come from 14 local authority areas in Scotland. The school is funded mainly through a combination of Executive grant (48% of total funding and fee income from local authorities. The Scottish Executive has also funded 60% of the capital costs of improvements to residential accommodation with an additional capital grant of £36,297 paid in 2000-01 for upgrading of accommodation.

Corseford School has 60 pupils, 36 are male and 24 are female. 36 are day pupils and 14 are residential pupils. Students are aged between 3 and 18 years old and come from 14 local authority areas in Scotland. The school is funded through a combination of Scottish Executive grant (52% of total funding), fee income from local authorities and fund raising effort within Capability Scotland. The Scottish Executive also provided a capital grant of £38,600 in 2000/01 for equipment for new residential facilities.

There are 3 recommendations in the Committee’s report about which Capability Scotland seeks clarification.

**Recommendation XIV:**
Capability Scotland welcomes the general thrust of this recommendation and would advise that we are actively engaged in partnership working with local authorities to improve opportunities for inclusion for students in mainstream education and in the wider community. However, it is not clear what elements will be considered in justifying exception from mainstream - will the criteria be educational only or will social care and health needs also be allowed to feature? We also consider it vital for guidance to be given to local authorities on what is meant by mainstream education and what outcomes local authorities will be expected to achieve for children with disabilities. Moreover, there are other practical issues to be resolved. Teacher training, the status of special needs assistants, the inaccessibility of many school buildings - all are referred to elsewhere in the committee’s report. Capability Scotland
supports the related recommendations and suggests that progress needs to be made in these areas as a first step. It would also be helpful if there was a national strategy to inform the development of mainstream education and to map the changes and developments which need to take place to turn the presumption to mainstream from an aspiration to a reality. Such a strategy would acknowledge the continuing role of special education, particularly in the education of children with severe low incidence disabilities. Capability Scotland would welcome further examination of these issues by the committee.

**Recommendation XV:**
Capability Scotland agrees that such an objective is wholly desirable. However, there are again practical issues which require to be resolved. There is a risk that children with disabilities could find themselves spending their school day in transit. Transporting children with disabilities often requires specialist transport and can take considerable time. Social care and health needs must also be taken into account with consequent financial considerations. Such split placements are unlikely to happen on single campus sites, except in the minority of cases. There would therefore be a need to duplicate funding, resourcing and provision which many local authorities might be unwilling or unable to support. Best practice which is currently operating in remote areas like Isle of Bute should be used to inform the development of split placements and outreach elsewhere through the national strategy. Again, Capability Scotland would welcome the committee playing a role in further developing this recommendation.

**Recommendation XVI:**
The committee appears to have accepted the Riddell Committee recommendation that Executive financial support should be re-allocated from grant-aided schools to local authorities. The Executive in its response to Riddell outlined a 3 year transitional period for this shift. The committee appears to have gone further in recommending an overseeing role for COSLA to ensure that children’s needs are being met. Capability Scotland is not hostile to these views and accepts that the status quo is not desirable. As attitudes to disability change, so should society’s response to disability issues. However, we have very real concerns about what is being proposed.
Three years is not long enough to make the transition nor to evaluate the success of mainstream education provision. The removal of grant aid could result in a loss of places with insufficient equivalent provision in mainstream schools to accommodate all children.

There is also a real risk that financial considerations become the guiding factor rather than what is in an individual child’s best interests. A longer transition period would mean that checks could be put in place to ensure this does not happen in the long term.

COSLA has no statutory powers in this regard. Indeed, COSLA currently agrees with and advises local authorities the rate of annual increase for fees and charges. There is a risk of a conflict of interest if COSLA is to fulfil both roles.

Capability Scotland already faces difficulty in negotiating with local authorities for increases in fees at Stanmore and Corseford schools. In 2000/01, COSLA advised local authorities to restrict fee increases to no more than the rate of wage inflation, namely 2.5%. It is not clear what advice is being given for 2001/02. Yet, Stanmore school’s budget is increasing in the coming year by 33% to accommodate necessary changes caused by legislative developments. We therefore find ourselves negotiating with individual authorities on increased charges while local authorities seek to restrict increases on the grounds that they are bound by the COSLA agreement. We are concerned that this situation would worsen if grant aid is removed and fees which cover full cost charges are the total responsibility of local authorities. It is not a situation we consider to be in the best interests of children with disabilities.

The Scottish Executive’s proposals for transitional arrangements will not address one of the issues raised in the Riddell report namely that many local authorities currently do not use the grant-aided schools and so they have less money to spend on meeting the educational needs of children in their areas. The transitional proposals would transfer funding to local authorities on the basis of current numbers of pupils at the grant-aided schools. It means that those local authorities currently losing out would continue to lose out. It means that they would be no better placed to develop provision to meet the needs of children with disabilities in their area until the end of the three year period. Then, money will be re-allocated on the basis of numbers of children of school age in the authority area. This suggests that money will be taken away from local authorities and re-distributed. This would place the future of schools like Stanmore and Corseford in a very precarious position. More importantly, it runs
the risk of not satisfying the intention of taking into account the best interests of children with disabilities.

Finally, this recommendation refers to schools with a national role, but there is no definition of what constitutes a national role. Capability Scotland believes that defining a national role is a crucial first step. We would welcome the opportunity to share our knowledge and expertise built up over many years in developing this role and indeed, in developing a national strategy for future special educational provision. Capability Scotland would also welcome further examination by the committee of this recommendation, the recommendations contained in the Riddell report, the Executive’s response as well as the current situation regarding payment of fees by local authorities.
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