

有關削減教育經費之我見

本人絕對贊成削款，教育雖為一項投資，但亦不能盲目擺放資源。現時大學缺乏意識去減支出，本人更要求審計署提交報告，查明有關非教學撥款之用途。

本人不会出席 1/12 會議。

黃衛民上

There will be no hope if the education is not good in Hong Kong. The funds should be deducted but in a minimum extent. I think most likely the civil servants' payroll should be cut in the same proportion as the funds for various departments. Otherwise it doesn't make sense and nobody will agree to it.

This message and any attachment are confidential and may be privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please telephone or email the sender and delete this message and any attachment from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you must not copy this message or attachment or disclose the contents to any other person.

For further information about Richards Butler please see our website at <http://www.richardsbutler.com.hk> or refer to any Richards Butler office.

大學浪費不改 反削資難服眾

11月 21日 星期五 02:50 更新

【明報專訊】浸會大學校長吳清輝和嶺南大學校長陳坤耀評論大學削減資助風波時，不約而同地提到可能要加學費，以抵消政府撥款減少的影響，但教統局已即時表明暫時不考慮加學費。學費問題可以從長計議，反而當前大學管理封閉落伍、透明度低、長期嚴重浪費，這些才是迫切問題。立法會帳目委員會（以下簡稱帳委會）日前提出嚴厲批評，大學若不盡快根除陋習，反對削資的言論就顯得軟弱無力，難以得到公眾支持。

立法會帳目委員會在過去半年召開了13次會議和3次公開聆訊，仔細研究了審計署長今年4月底就大學行政及財務管理提交的衡工量值報告，聽取了八家大學管理層和教職員代表的解釋和反駁，也考慮了教育資助委員會及教統局的意見，得出如下結論：

- 政府帳目委員會曾於1998年促請當局採取行動，改善大學高級教職員宿舍的空置問題，但部分院校的空置率不但未見改善，反而惡化了；
- 部分院校容許高級教職員既享受租屋或買屋津貼，又入住宿舍，毋須繳回差額，令這些教職員享有額外的房屋福利；
- 雖然初級員工並不享有入住宿舍的房屋福利，但院校卻基於運作需要提供大量初級員工宿舍，部分宿舍空置率偏高；
- 理工和浸會兩家大學的學生宿舍空置率分別高達36.4%和17.3%，造成巨額宿費損失；
- 雖然院校外判服務可節省巨額款項，但一些院校（例如科大和港大）外判步伐緩慢，保留人數甚多的內部員工隊伍，負責物業管理；
- 與其他英語國家大學教研人員的平均薪酬相比，本港大學教研人員的平均薪酬似乎普遍偏高；
- 雖然院校獲撥巨額公帑，但高級職員的薪酬是否公開，並無指引；
- 理大從其非政府經費中撥出每月約177,000元的現金津貼予校長（潘宗光），使其薪酬總額高於財務委員會通過的薪酬款額，更是八大校長之冠，而事前並未尋求校董會批准，可能違反了法例規定；
- 部分院校職員享有比相類職級公務員優厚的假期福利。為應付職員享有過多假期，部分院校實施假期兌現計劃，造成沉重的財政負擔。

以上這些只是帳委會報告羅列的部分結論，報告對大學的管治模式，包括校董出席率偏低、缺乏內部審計、沒有策略計劃或周年工作計劃、向公眾披露院校表現資料不足等，都提出了批評和建議，顯示八所大學的行政管理還未達到先進國家應有的標準。

反對政府削減大學資助的大學生，無疑滿腔熱情，但未知曾否看過上述帳委會報告？慷慨激昂地反對削資的大學管理層和教職員，可曾撫心自問：大學真的再沒有節約的空間？減少大學經費是否必然會影響教育質素？導致學費增加？

我們絕對有理由要求大學師生們，先向納稅人解釋如何處理帳委會指出的浪費問題，否則反對削資的行動，難以得到社會大眾的同情與支持。

SIU Wai-chen

IT IS FINE TO PARE THE FUNDING TO UNIVERSITIES WHEN MONEY IS NOT PROPERLY HANDLED BY THE PRINCIPALS/MANAGEMENT, PARTICULARLY POON CHUNG KWONG.

BUT THE MOST IMPORTANT IS TO RECTIFY THE REMUNERATION/SALARY OF HK CIVIL SERVANTS. THEY GET THE CRAZY FATTY BENEFITS(HIGHEST PAY IN THE WORLD WITH ALL SORTS OF ALLOWANCES, ADVANTAGES).

LAM CHENG YUET OR RECENTLY REQUESTED POOR PEOPLE TO SACRIFICE. SHE SAID THEY ARE ACQUIRED ADVANTAGES. BUT THE BIGGEST ACQUIRED ADVANTAGERS ARE THOSE HIGH PAID CIVIL SERVANTS. WILL THEY SACRIFICE? SO MANY PEOPLE URGE THEM BE FAIR, EVENTUALLY CIVIL SERVANTS FOUGHT TO STREET AND ONLY CUT 3% + 3% WHILE MANY EMPLOYEES HAVE BEEN CUT SEVERELY.

BESIDES MONTHLY INCOME, CIVIL SERVANTS ENJOY GOOD WORKING HOURS, MANY SORTS OF ALLOWANCES, BENEFITS, RETIRE FUND, LIFE PAY SALARY AFTER RETIREMENT THAT PRIVATE CO. EMPLOYEES NEVER IMAGINE.

WHAT A SOCIETY HERE WE LIVE. IT IS SO UNFAIR. WHY CANNOT AMEND THE BASIC LAW TO TAILOR FIT FOR CIVIL SERVANTS' REMUNERATIONS.

I SUGGEST TO CUT AROUND 25% TO 30% BY EXCEPT THOSE EARN LESS THAN 15,000.-/MONTH). BECAUSE THOSE HIGH PAID CIVIL SERVANTS ARE THE BIGGEST ACQUIRED ADVANTAGERS, THEY FINALLY WILL AGREE AND COMPROSE TO REDUCE RATHER THAN BURST OUT.

I HOPE ALL MUST STUDY SERIOUSLY AND SPEAK OUT FOR HONG KONG. VERY FEW COUNCILLORS AND PRESS ARE DARE TO CRITICIZE IMPLICITLY. ARE THEY AFRAID OF CIVIL SERVANTS' POWER ?

Dear Members of the Education Panel of the Legislative Council,

The South China Morning Post reported on 22 November 2003 that the legislature's education panel has called on the public to express views on the planned education budget cuts. I hereby submit my personal views. I do not intend to make verbal representations at the panel's meeting to be held on December 1.

Hong Kong should place a high value on education and see it as an investment for the future. Although Hong Kong is facing difficult financial times, I would prefer that the budget for education NOT be cut at all. Since this is highly unrealistic given the current economic climate, I would suggest that more funds be allocated to primary and secondary schools than to tertiary institutions.

Students enrolled in tertiary institutions in Hong Kong are a privileged lot. They, especially those who enroll in professional programs like law and medicine, are likely to gain the most economically from their education. On the other hand, the many students who are not able to continue their education past Form 5 in Hong Kong will not enjoy the same advantages that only higher education can bring unless they go abroad (something that most Hong Kong students cannot afford.) Hence, I feel that students in tertiary institutions in Hong Kong should be willing to contribute a greater amount to the costs of their education, i.e they should be willing to accept an increase in their school fees.

My support of higher fees for tertiary education is nothing new in other countries. I was educated in the United States. My primary and secondary education was obtained through the public (free) school system and then I attended a private university largely on merit scholarships. I was admitted to medical school. My parents were not wealthy. I knew they had to work hard to support my brother and sister too, so I took out loans and part-time jobs to pay for my medical school fees and expenses. Many of my classmates came from privileged backgrounds (parents were doctors or lawyers) and they were lucky that their parents could pay for all their expenses. It took me a long time to pay off my debts, even though the special loans available to students like me had relatively low interest rates and deferment plans. To tell you the truth, I would have accepted regular commercial interest rates if necessary because it had always been my dream to be a doctor and I viewed the money spent on my education as an investment. Perhaps the government should consider introducing a student loan program for tertiary education.

By maintaining or increasing funding to primary and secondary schools, in theory higher educational standards of the general public would be achieved. (Of course the answer to solving the problem of education in Hong Kong is more complicated than just put in more money, but I would leave the other issues like teacher quality, class size, curriculum, etc. to experts.) Higher standards of primary and secondary schools would not only enhance the quality of students entering local tertiary institutions, but would also make Hong Kong students more competitive for placement in schools overseas (including China). Whether educated locally or abroad, these graduates would make a positive contribution to Hong Kong society. By improving the standards (particularly in the teaching of English and Putonghua) of primary and secondary schools, even those who leave school after Form 5 would be better equipped to deal with an increasingly competitive environment.

Thank you for soliciting the opinion of the public on this matter. I look forward to hearing the panel's views.

Sincerely,

Gloria Kim Pei, M.D. (UCLA, USA)

各位官員：

你們好！本人從新聞上得知有關削減大學資源的報告，先分享一下，這些事實吧！

教統局已即時表明暫時不考慮加學費。學費問題可以從長計議，反而當前大學的種種的浪費資源和問題，有望盡快解決，現列出如下：-

1. 大學管理封閉落伍、透明度低
2. 大學長期嚴重浪費
3. 學生宿舍的空置問題惡化
4. 教職員額外享有房屋的福利
5. 教職員薪酬普遍偏高
6. 教職員優厚的假期福利

●政府帳目委員會曾於1998年促請當局採取行動，改善大學高級教職員宿舍的空置問題，但部分院校的空置率不但未見改善，反而惡化了；

●部分院校容許高級教職員既享受租屋或買屋津貼，又入住宿舍，毋須繳回差額，令這些教職員享有額外的房屋福利；

●雖然初級員工並不享有入住宿舍的房屋福利，但院校卻基於運作需要提供大量初級員工宿舍，部分宿舍空置率偏高；

●理工和浸會兩家大學的學生宿舍空置率分別高達36.4%和17.3%，造成巨額宿費損失；

●雖然院校外判服務可節省巨額款項，但一些院校（例如科大和港大）外判步伐緩慢，保留人數甚多的內部員工隊伍，負責物業管理；

●與其他英語國家大學教研人員的平均薪酬相比，本港大學教研人員的平均薪酬似乎普遍偏高；

●雖然院校獲撥巨額公帑，但高級職員的薪酬是否公開，並無指引；

●理大從其非政府經費中撥出每月約177,000元的現金津貼予校長（潘宗光），使其薪酬總額高於財務委員會通過的薪酬款額，更是八大校長之冠，而事前並未尋求校董會批准，可能違反了法例規定；

●部分院校職員享有比相類職級公務員優厚的假期福利。為應付職員享有過多假期，部分院校實施假期兌現計劃，造成沉重的財政負擔。

以上這些只是帳委會報告羅列的部分結論，報告對大學的管治模式，
包括：-

1. 校董出席率偏低
2. 缺乏內部審計
3. 沒有策略計劃或周年工作計劃
4. 向公眾披露院校表現資料不足

這些意見都提出了批評和建議，顯示八所大學的行政管理還未達到先進國家應有的標準。

此外，反對政府削減大學資助的大學生，無疑滿腔熱情，
但未知曾否看過上述帳委會報告？

至於，慷慨激昂地反對削資的大學管理層和教職員，可曾撫心自問：

1. 大學真的再沒有節約的空間？
2. 減少大學經費是否必然會影響教育質素？
3. 導致學費增加？

我們絕對有理由要求大學師生們，先向納稅人解釋：

如何處理帳委會指出多項的浪費問題？

以上種種提出的嚴厲批評，八所大學若不盡快根除陋習，就算是反對削資的言論，就顯得軟弱無力，將會難以得到社會大眾的同情與支持。