

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(2)2620/05-06

Ref : CB2/PL/ED

Report of the Panel on Education for submission to the Legislative Council

Purpose

The report gives an account of the work of the Panel on Education during the 2005-2006 Legislative Council (LegCo) session. It will be tabled at the Council meeting on 12 July 2006 in accordance with Rule 77(14) of the Rules of Procedure of the Council.

The Panel

2. The Panel was formed by a resolution passed by the Council on 8 July 1998 and as amended on 20 December 2000 and 9 October 2002 for the purpose of monitoring and examining Government policies and issues of public concern relating to education matters. The terms of reference of the Panel are in **Appendix I**.

3. The Panel comprises 12 members, with Dr Hon YEUNG Sum and Hon Audrey EU elected as Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Panel respectively. The membership list of the Panel is in **Appendix II**.

Major work

New academic structure for senior secondary education and higher education

4. Following up discussion in the last session on the new academic structure for senior secondary education and higher education, the Panel discussed and received views from five educational organisations on the Consultation Document entitled “Action for the Future – Further Consultation on Career-oriented Studies and the New Senior Secondary Academic Structure for Special Schools”, which was published in January 2006. Members were supportive of the provision of three-year junior secondary and three-year senior secondary education for students with special educational needs, including students with intellectual disability (ID). Members noted that students who were physically disabled (PD) or hearing impaired (HI) would be provided

with 10 years of basic education, while ID students would be provided with nine years of basic education. Members queried the disparity of treatment, and considered that ID students should also be provided with 10 years of basic education.

5. The Administration explained that PD and HI students would follow the ordinary curriculum but ID students would be provided with individualised education programme tailored by teachers in special schools. Nevertheless, ID students who had to receive frequent therapies and prolonged hospitalisation that had significantly affected their schooling would be allowed to repeat the level of study in the ensuing school year.

6. Members supported that the same curriculum framework should be adopted for students learning in ordinary and special schools, with adaptation to suit students of different learning characteristics. Some members were concerned that the small size of schools and the small number of secondary classes in special schools would limit the choice and combination of new senior secondary subjects that could be offered in special schools. These members urged the Administration to encourage special schools to share resources with other special schools or ordinary schools in the vicinity to provide a wider range of new senior secondary courses.

7. The Administration responded that it would pilot the new senior secondary (ID) curriculum programmes in various types of special schools, and examine the delivery of the new academic structure and its impact on the operation of special schools during the transitional period leading up to 2009. The Committee on Special Educational Needs of the Curriculum Development Council was collaborating with local and international experts and frontline teachers to develop the various subject curriculum frameworks.

8. Members also noted that although \$115 million had been committed by the Administration for the transition period leading up to 2009 for the implementation of the new academic structure, the amount was not designated for special education. Some members expressed concern about adequacy of the resources for the purpose.

9. The Administration stressed that the appropriate level of resources for special schools with ID students would be determined when details of the new senior secondary (ID) curriculum, the learning outcomes and assessment standards had been worked out with the key stakeholders.

10. As the Consultation Document charted the way for special schools under the new academic structure, the Panel agreed that the subject should be followed up by the Subcommittee to Study Issues Relating to the Provision of Boarding Places, Senior Secondary Education and Employment Opportunities for Children with Special Educational Needs. The Administration undertook to provide the Panel with a progress report on the outcome of consultation.

Restructuring of classes of secondary schools

11. The Panel discussed and received views from 10 school councils and educational bodies on the Administration's proposals to restructure secondary school classes under the new academic structure. The Administration proposed that –

- (a) students could complete six years of secondary education in the same school. A limited student placement service would be provided for students who needed to change school when proceeding from Secondary Three (S3) to Senior Secondary One;
- (b) schools should operate at a scale that allowed for a broad and balanced curriculum. A school with 18 classes (three classes per level) would be considered marginally viable for that purpose. Schools with less than three S1 classes might continue to operate if they could assure the breadth and accessibility of curriculum choice through other means, such as merger or collaboration with another school; and
- (c) stock taking of the number of S1 students would be conducted in early December, and thereafter the same number of S2 and S3 classes would be maintained.

12. Some members expressed grave concern about the wide-ranging impact of the Administration's proposals, which would in effect lead to closure of a great number of secondary schools. These members pointed out that the surplus of secondary schools was attributed to the poor planning of the Administration, and the consequences should not be borne by schools. These members considered that to address the problem of declining student population, small class teaching should be implemented.

13. The Administration explained that the decline in student population could not have been forecast accurately. The Administration considered it necessary to take account of the views of parents and students, and to protect the interests of students in proposing any education policy. The Administration anticipated balanced teacher supply and demand in the short-term. By 2011-12, a shortfall of more than 1 200 teachers was expected. Any change in policy which would have the effect of increasing the demand for teachers would exacerbate the shortfall. The Administration therefore considered it inappropriate at the present stage to make a policy decision concerning small class teaching. It had undertaken to review the class size after 2011-12 to alleviate the problem of teacher redundancy.

14. As regards members' concern about the impact of the proposals, the Administration pointed out that schools which had a good track record of student achievement but failed to recruit three classes of S1 students could apply for a special quality assurance review. If the review confirmed the provision of good quality education, the school could continue to participate in the Secondary School Placement Allocation for three consecutive years. The Administration would allocate three classes of S1 students with the provision of corresponding resources for the actual number of operating classes for the period. Moreover, although 40-student per class was adopted as the planning parameter, if a school would have redundant teachers as a result, 35-student per class would be adopted.

15. Some members remained of the view that as the impact of closure of primary schools was not over yet, it was inopportune to implement the proposed class restructuring of secondary schools from 2007-08 school year onwards. These members urged the Administration to withdraw the proposals and discuss further with the school sector.

Review of post-secondary education

16. Following the completion of the Phase I review of the post-secondary education sector by a Steering Committee appointed by the Government in January 2006, the Panel discussed the key findings and recommendations of the Steering Committee and received views from 20 student unions and educational groups.

17. Some members pointed out that according to the report of the review, there was a supply of around 50 000 post-secondary places. However, only 34 000 candidates attended the Hong Kong Advanced Level Examination in the 2005-06 academic year. These members were concerned about the over-supply of sub-degree places and the quality of sub-degree programmes.

18. The Administration responded that to meet the demands of a knowledge-based economy, the Administration considered it appropriate to provide a wide variety of post-secondary programmes and adopt the "lenient entry, stringent exit" principle so that more students could pursue post-secondary studies, but the exit standards were rigorously guarded to ensure the quality of sub-degree graduates. The Heads of Universities Committee had established the independent Joint Quality Review Committee (JQRC) in 2005 to upkeep and sustain the quality of University Grants Committee (UGC)-funded institutions' self-financing sub-degree programmes. JQRC would conduct on-site visits and observations on the operation of individual sub-degree programmes, and evaluation on their exit standards. JQRC would aim to establish a minimum exit standard for sub-degree programmes in Phase 2 of the review.

19. Members were concerned that the current provision of 840 articulation places in the second year and the third year of undergraduate programmes in UGC-funded institutions could hardly satisfy the need of sub-degree holders to pursue university education. They called on the Administration to increase the provision of first-year-first-degree places in UGC-funded institutions to meet the need of sub-degree holders in the long term.

20. The Administration responded that the provision of publicly-funded undergraduate places would depend on the availability of resources, and the prioritisation of education expenditure should be subject to a wider discussion. UGC was exploring the feasibility of increasing the number of articulation places in UGC-funded institutions by redeploying the savings generated from phasing out the taught post-graduate programmes. UGC would aim to double the provision of senior year articulation places from the next triennium, subject to availability of resources.

Education for children of ethnic minorities

21. Based on the information provided by applicants in the context of school places allocation, some 500 non-Chinese speaking (NCS) ethnic minority students are admitted into Primary One each year. Ethnic minority children refer to South Asian children, mainly Indian, Pakistan, and Nepalese, who are residing in Hong Kong. The Panel discussed with the Administration and 16 concern organisations, including the Equal Opportunities Commission, support measures provided to NCS students in schools.

22. Members supported the provision of integrated education for NCS students. As there were only seven primary schools and three secondary schools which traditionally admitted a large number of NCS students, members were concerned about the long travelling time for ethnic minority children to attend schools. Members considered it necessary to have more selected or voluntary schools in each of the five electoral constituencies for enrolment of NCS students. They sought the view of the Equal Opportunities Commission on whether this was permissible under the Disability Discrimination Ordinance.

23. According to the advice of the Equal Opportunities Commission, under the Disability Discrimination Ordinance, the Administration could adopt reasonable measures to address the needs of students with a disability in schools under certain circumstances. Given the small population of NCS students and their geographical distribution in Hong Kong, it would be justified to provide integrated education for NCS students in a number of voluntary schools selected on a regional basis, in the light of the need to centralise resources for the provision of better support to the schools.

24. In the view of the Administration, it would be more cost-effective and beneficial for NCS students to learn in selected or voluntary schools with a critical mass of NCS students. Given that there were less than 500 ethnic

minority children enrolled in Primary One in each school year, some 10 to 15 primary schools clustered on a regional basis would be sufficient.

25. Members were concerned about the difficulties encountered by NCS students in learning in schools adopting Chinese as the medium of instruction. Members noted the advice of the Equal Opportunities Commission that the provision of an alternative curriculum in Chinese Language for NCS students in schools would not constitute discrimination against children of ethnic minorities. They urged the Administration to provide an alternative curriculum in Chinese Language for NCS students in primary and secondary schools.

26. The Administration explained that at present, some 20% ethnic minority children had not attended pre-school education. Among those who had attended pre-school education, many were taught in English only. As a result, most ethnic minority students in primary schools had difficulty in studying Chinese Language and learning in Cantonese. The Administration considered it essential to encourage English kindergartens to reinforce teaching of Chinese language for NCS pupils.

27. Some members considered that The Institute of Vocational Education and tertiary educational institutions should consider exempting NCS students from the requirement of a qualification in Chinese Language for entrance to certain sub-degree or undergraduate programmes.

28. The Administration pointed out that starting from the 2007 Hong Kong Certificate of Education Examination (HKCEE), assessment of students' performance in Chinese Language and English Language would be made on the basis of standards-referencing. Candidates would be assessed on the basis of their abilities to speak and write Chinese at different competence levels. Ethnic minority students without the required qualification in Chinese Language but meeting other prescribed entrance requirements could be considered on individual merits for admission by universities. In 2005, the Vocational Training Council had planned to offer a range of programmes conducted in English for ethnic minority youths. However, a number of these programmes could not be run because of insufficient enrolment.

Review of the medium of instruction for secondary schools and secondary school places allocation

29. During the session, the Panel discussed the finalised recommendations of The Working Group on Review of Secondary School Places Allocation and Medium of Instruction for Secondary Schools of the Education Commission (the Working Group). Members considered that in general the Working Group had struck a balance among various interests in the community.

30. Members agreed to the recommendation of the Working Group to use the existing Pre-Secondary One Hong Kong Attainment Test (Pre-S1HKAT) as the scaling instrument for scaling primary schools' internal assessment results for banding purpose. They called on the Administration to monitor the situation to prevent schools from drilling their students for the Test.

31. The Chairman of the Working Group explained to the Panel that the Pre-S1HKAT was a curriculum-based and well-established assessment used by secondary schools. It would not entail additional workload for primary and secondary schools, and would obviate the need to introduce an extra assessment for students.

32. Members also supported that the present bifurcation approach, i.e. schools were bifurcating into those adopting English as the medium of instruction (EMI) and those adopting Chinese as the medium of instruction (CMI), should continue. Some members, however, were concerned about the English proficiency of students in CMI schools in the long run.

33. The Chairman of the Working Group pointed out that the Education Commission had recommended the introduction of a targeted English enhancement scheme for CMI schools by way of injection into the Language Fund. Under the scheme, schools would be required to enter into a "performance contract" with the Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB) to achieve specific targets in enhancement of the English proficiency of their students. Schools would be expected to improve deployment of English Language teachers, develop a collaborative and reflective teaching culture, implement measures to cater for student diversity, and adopt a whole-school approach in enhancing the language proficiency of students.

34. Some members were concerned about the input and output performance targets to be specified in the performance contracts. These members pointed out that since CMI schools would have a large enrolment of band three students, it might not be easy for them to achieve the performance targets, such as a certain percentage of students obtaining a pass or credit in HKCEE English Language. They suggested that the Administration should not withdraw the funding support in case the schools failed to meet the targets.

35. The Administration responded that EMB would agree with the participating CMI schools on their input and output performance targets, taking into account the school's existing status. About \$500,000 a year was budgeted for each CMI school under the Scheme. Any unspent fund would be returned to the Language Fund.

36. The Panel supported the injection of \$1.1 billion into the Language Fund, of which \$845 million was earmarked for enhancing English proficiency of students in CMI schools.

Tuition fees

37. The Panel discussed the policy for determining tuition fees for undergraduate programmes. Members noted with concern that although the tuition fees for undergraduate programmes had been frozen at the 1997-98 level, the current tuition fees had exceeded 18% of the total recurrent costs. They sought clarification from the Administration on whether the policy of recovering 18% of the total recurrent costs for degree programmes in UGC-funded institution, as decided by the then Governor in Council in 1991, was still in force.

38. The Administration explained that the 18% cost recovery rate was set in 1991 when there was no other substantial cash injection into the UGC sector. The cash injections were not reflected in the student unit costs and cost recovery rates. If all the Government's funding support for the UGC sector was taken into account, the tuition fees paid by undergraduates would be less than 18% of the costs. The Administration stressed that the policy regarding the 18% cost recovery target for degree courses was still in force.

39. Members were of the view that if costs other than the recurrent costs were included in the calculation of the cost recovery rate, the policy had been changed. The Administration should follow the necessary procedures for proposing any change to the cost recovery rate. Members requested the Administration to provide written information to clarify its policy and calculations on the cost recovery rate for degree programmes in UGC-funded institutions.

Kindergarten subsidy and fee remission

40. Upon harmonisation of the pre-primary services, the ambit of the former Kindergarten Fee Remission Scheme was expanded from the 2005-06 school year to cover all eligible children, including those originally covered by the Child Care Centre Fee Assistance Scheme. The Kindergarten Fee Remission Scheme was renamed as the Kindergarten and Child Care Centre Fee Remission Scheme (KCCCFRS). The Panel met with 22 pre-primary education bodies and concern organisations to discuss the effects of the change of the financial assistance scheme. These organisations called on removal of the social needs test for entitlement to full-day fee remission under KCCCFRS.

41. Members pointed out that when they discussed the eligibility criteria for the KCCCFRS in the last session, they supported the social needs criterion on the condition that the Administration would explore any possible measures to support the low-income applicant families that would be affected by the change of the financial assistance scheme.

42. The Administration reiterated its undertaking that no recipients of the Child Care Centre Fee Assistance Scheme and the Kindergarten Fee Remission Scheme receiving subsidies under the respective schemes in 2004-05 would be worse off. The no-worse off principle had been applied to these applicants until their children concerned proceeded to primary schools. In the Administration's view, there was no educational basis to support whole-day pre-primary schooling. The social needs test had thus been used by the Social Welfare Department in assessing the eligibility of applicants for the Child Care Centre Fee Assistance Scheme since the early 1980s. EMB was prepared to review the social needs criterion in the light of changing social circumstances.

43. The Panel requested the Administration to remove the social needs test and revert to the Panel on its decision before the end of the session so that any revised criteria could be applied to the new academic year. The Administration subsequently informed the Panel that as a comprehensive review on pre-primary education was underway, the Administration considered it more appropriate to consider removal of the social needs test in the context of the review, and hence could not make a decision before the new academic year.

44. The Panel expressed dissatisfaction at the response of the Administration and decided to seek the views of the organisations which had attended the Panel meeting on ways to follow up the subject.

Student financial assistance and loan schemes

45. The Panel examined the Administration's proposal to dispose of the Government's non-means tested student loan portfolio, and outsource the funding and administration of these loan schemes to the private sector. These schemes included the Non-means Tested Loan Scheme and the Non-means Tested Loan Scheme for Post-secondary Students. Fourteen student associations and educational organisations attended the Panel meeting to express views. All these organisations opposed the Administration's proposal.

46. Members queried the justifications for taking forward the proposal. They pointed out that the proposal, if implemented, would only bring about an annual saving of \$7 million. Given that the Government had already achieved fiscal surplus, members did not see the need for the proposal. Moreover, the administrative costs for monitoring the administration of the loan schemes might well exceed the estimated saving to be achieved by the Student Financial Assistance Agency.

47. The Administration explained that about \$1.1 billion would be required under the Loan Fund to meet the net payment requirements in 2005-06. This level of funding roughly represented a 40% increase over the net payment of some \$800 million in 2003-04. In anticipation of the surging demand for loans under the two schemes, the Administration considered that there was a

case to invite financial institutions in the private sector to participate in funding these student loan schemes to help ensure funding sustainability in the long term. The proposal was also in line with the “Big Market, Small Government” principle.

48. Members considered that the adverse impact of the proposal would outweigh the benefits to be achieved. Members were gravely concerned about the collection of outstanding debts after outsourcing the loan schemes. They pointed out that unlike the Government, the private sector would appoint agencies to collect outstanding debts by improper means.

49. According to the Administration, it would carefully select the successful provider which should be a reputable financial institution in Hong Kong. The successful provider would have to follow the existing procedures for collection of outstanding loans set by the Student Financial Assistance Agency as specified in the tender document. According to the Code of Banking Practice, financial institutions should prohibit their debt collection agencies from collecting debts by harassment or improper means. Loan borrowers might also apply for deferment of loan repayment in accordance with the existing procedures.

50. The Panel did not accept the Administration’s explanations. The Panel passed a motion opposing the proposal and urging the Administration to complete expeditiously the overall review of all student loan schemes for the purpose of providing assistance to the needy students.

51. As regards the financial assistance schemes for post-secondary students, members welcomed the Administration’s proposal to bring the means-tested grant under the Financial Assistance Scheme for Post-secondary Students on par with that of the Local Student Finance Scheme with effect from the 2006-07 academic year. Members noted the view of many student organisations that the Financial Assistance Scheme for Post-secondary Students should be merged with the Local Student Finance Scheme to remove disparity of treatment to students of accredited post-secondary programmes and students of publicly-funded programmes in the provision of financial assistance.

Remuneration system in UGC-funded institutions after deregulation of university salaries

52. The Panel followed up the review exercises undertaken by UGC-funded institutions subsequent to the deregulation of salary scales in July 2003. A total of 24 staff associations and organisations concerned attended the Panel meeting to express views on the impact of deregulation of university salaries.

53. Members supported that UGC-funded institutions should enjoy a high degree of autonomy in deployment of resources and staff management. They considered it important to ensure that deregulation of university salary scales should not have adverse impact on academic freedom.

54. UGC pointed out that implementation of reasonable changes in pay and remuneration systems in UGC-funded institutions should not have any bearing on academic freedom. There was also no evidence to substantiate that deregulation of university salaries had negative impact on the ability of institutions to attract quality academics.

55. Some members noted with concern the disputes between staff and management in UGC-funded institutions on remuneration packages following deregulation of university salaries. These members were of the view that there should be fairness, openness and transparency in institutional governance of UGC-funded institutions. They considered that UGC should review the governance and staff administration matters in UGC-funded institutions, in particular the operation and effectiveness of the existing grievances and appeal mechanism.

56. UGC stressed that UGC-funded institutions were autonomous entities governed by their respective statutes and councils, and were subject to public scrutiny in respect of the quality of their teaching and research activities as well as in resources management. In line with the principle of institutional autonomy, UGC considered it inappropriate to interfere with the internal administration and staff management issues in individual institutions.

57. The Panel passed a motion urging the Government to expeditiously conduct an independent review of the governance of universities, and to formulate a policy which aimed to enhance transparency of the university governance and safeguard academic freedom.

Modernisation and development of Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority's examination systems

58. During the session, the Panel held three meetings to discuss the modernisation and development of the examination systems of Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority (HKEAA). The Administration proposed various measures to modernise the examination support systems. These included modernisation and development of HKEAA's infrastructure; introduction of centralised onscreen marking; establishment of onscreen marking centres at convenient locations; and implementation of measures to enhance the security and supervision of public examination operation. The proposed measures necessitated a capital grant of about \$155.33 million to HKEAA.

59. Members examined in depth issues relating to the introduction of centralised onscreen marking, including the need for onscreen marking; reliability of digital scanning and onscreen marking; impact on candidates and teachers; and cost and schedule of implementation.

60. Members noted that HKEAA would implement the first phase of centralised onscreen marking for the HKCEE Chinese Language and English Language in 2007. HKEAA's plan was to provide four centralised onscreen marking centres, respectively on Hong Kong Island, the New Territories, Kowloon West and Kowloon East. Two vacated school premises in Kowloon West and the New Territories had been identified for conversion into centralised onscreen marking centres. As no appropriate vacant school premises or other suitable surplus government accommodation could be found for setting up immediately an onscreen marking centre on the Hong Kong Island, members supported the proposal of leasing commercial premises for the purpose for four years. Members sought information on the long term plan for setting up onscreen marking centres.

61. The Administration explained that the long-term accommodation plan for HKEAA was to find suitable premises as HKEAA's headquarters which would consolidate its existing scattered offices, and would free up its current offices in Southorn Centre and San Po Kong for conversion into a permanent Hong Kong Island onscreen marking centre and a Kowloon East onscreen marking centre respectively by 2010.

62. Members were concerned that despite the implementation of various measures to modernise the HKEAA's examination systems, blunders were unveiled in public examinations each year. The latest incident was alleged cheating in HKCEE English Language (Syllabus B) Paper. Members queried the rationale for quoting the source of questions and providing the relevant website address in the examination paper, which had facilitated candidates to access the website for the correct answers.

63. HKEAA explained that in recognition of the need to respect copyright works, HKEAA had adopted the practice to quote the source of materials in examination papers for the past six years. HKEAA had conducted detailed analysis on all 506 reports received about the alleged cheating. Based on the information gathered, HKEAA concluded that there was likely a single case of mobile phone access from Hong Kong to the website concerned, while the examination was in progress. HKEAA was conducting further investigation into the case to establish whether the person was a candidate. HKEAA affirmed that there was no need for re-sit of the examination, or cancellation of the marking of any part of the examination paper.

64. As regards members' concern about the need to prevent recurrence of similar incidents, HKEAA informed members that it would review the administrative feasibility and implications of banning telecommunications

devices in examination venues in consultation with the school sector; study the use of telecommunication detection devices to enhance invigilation; change the format of acknowledgment of the sources of materials quoted in examinations; and examine the need to amend the relevant legislation.

Review of the School Building Programme

65. The Administration briefed the Panel on its proposed adjustments to the 39 allocated projects under the School Building Programme after consultation with the School Sponsoring Bodies (SSBs). The Administration proposed to proceed with 22 projects, further review four projects and drop 13 projects.

66. Members noted that the Administration had not specified the school projects under the different categories in its discussion paper to the Panel. They were concerned whether the SSBs/schools were satisfied with the proposed adjustments.

67. The Administration explained that it had consulted the affected SSBs/schools on the proposed adjustments to the School Building Programme. The SSBs in connection with the four projects pending further review and the 13 projects to be dropped had expressed agreement to the proposed adjustments. The SSBs had requested the Administration not to disclose their names in the discussion paper in order to avoid unnecessary impact on student enrolment.

68. Members pointed out that the community had queried the need to construct new school premises, given the under-enrolment and closure of existing schools in recent years. They requested the Administration to provide detailed information on the use/intended use of the premises of vacated schools.

69. The Administration explained that most of the vacated school premises were formerly rural schools in remote locations. Many SSBs, including SSBs of international schools, had requested the allocation of vacated school premises in urban areas for various educational purposes. The Administration would publish those locations to be re-allocated for education and manpower related purposes and invite applications for these premises at a later stage.

Other issues

70. The Panel received a briefing from the Secretary for Education and Manpower on the Chief Executive's Policy Address 2005. The Panel had also discussed a number of financial proposals, including improvements to the remuneration package for the Native-speaking English Teachers Scheme; special provision of Capacity Enhancement Grant to relieve teachers' workload; implementation of asbestos management plans on the premises of aided schools; and the Third Matching Grant Scheme for UGC-funded institutions.

Meetings held

71. During the period between October 2005 and June 2006, the Panel held a total of 12 meetings.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
11 July 2006

Appendix I

Panel on Education

Terms of Reference

1. To monitor and examine Government policies and issues of public concern relating to education matters.
2. To provide a forum for the exchange and dissemination of views on the above policy matters.
3. To receive briefings and to formulate views on any major legislative or financial proposals in respect of the above policy area prior to their formal introduction to the Council or Finance Committee.
4. To monitor and examine, to the extent it considers necessary, the above policy matters referred to it by a member of the Panel or by the House Committee.
5. To make reports to the Council or to the House Committee as required by the Rules of Procedure.

Appendix II

Panel on Education

Membership list for 2005-2006 session

Chairman	Dr Hon YEUNG Sum
Deputy Chairman	Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Members	Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yee, GBS, JP Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP Hon MA Lik, GBS, JP Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, SBS, JP Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
	(Total : 11 Members)
Clerk	Miss Odelia LEUNG
Legal Adviser	Ms Bernice WONG Sze-man