

"camson tang"

2006/11/09 AM 10:05

Below is the views from Students' representative (廈門大學 Jointly held with Open University of Hong Kong), **Mr Choi Wai Kwong** who consolidates them for your discussion of 中醫註冊 - Part-time degree qualification on 13th Nov 2006.

I forward it to your Council for the captioned subject.

camson tang

CC to 暨大同學/Hong Kong College of Technology

Choi Wai Kwong

We have been the students of the part-time degree course in Chinese Medicine, which has been jointly running by the Open University of Hong Kong and University of Xiamen“廈門大學” before or in September of 2002. (Before offering the course to us, OU had asked The Board of Chinese Medicine Council of Hong Kong (CMC)the qualification to sit the licensing examination. The answer is : A Bachelor degree in Chinese Medicine and no more (The summary of communications on this issue between OU and CMC is attached for your reference).

CMC never said that the part-time course Chinese Medicine would not be accepted by the council before September in 2002. However, in September of 2002 the Board had announced that Chinese Medicine students who had enrolled in part-time degree courses in Chinese Medicine offered by three local universities, namely the University of Hong Kong, the Chinese University of Hong Kong and Hong Kong Baptist University in or before 2002 and completed such courses satisfactorily might undertake the licensing examination. After that, the board also announced that the part-time degree course in Chinese Medicine offered by other institutions other than the three local universities could not enter the licensing examination.

We have to spend more than five years and \$200,000 to complete the course and we will be in return of nothing. We are put into a whirlpool by CMC's misleading.

Therefore, we all blame the CMC denying our justice that only approve students who have enrolled in part-time degree courses in Chinese Medicine offered by the three universities in or before 2002 but not for some Hong Kong students who have equivalent criterions in other courses which conducted in Hong Kong to undertake the licensing examination. On the other hand, the CMC did not make any prior and clear notices to declare the qualification and recognized courses of the CMP licensing examination in 2002 that made confusion, and exploited the rights of students of part-time degree course in the relevant institution to be applicants of undertaking the licensing examination, who awfully wanted to be Chinese medicine practitioners and serve for the society. The council, in addition, had dereliction of her duty to follow this event, and did not offer any channels for those kinds of students to achieve their goals.

"camson tang"

2006/11/09 AM 10:40

CC to 暨大同學

Please forward my view to 衛生事務委員會 for discussion.

The unacceptable requirement for 中醫註冊 : "Part-time or Distance Learning courses will not be accepted" not only violates the Chinese Medicine Ordinance under which the Chinese Medicine Council is established and delegated authority of administration and scrutiny of the Chinese medicine profession but also acts against the international academic tertiary rules of practice.

I never heard of the qualification of "Part-time or Distance Learning courses will not be accepted" as the equivalents of the full time learning qualifications. There are many offshore Universities in the world, including United Kingdom, USA, Australia which are offering the Part-time or Distance Learning degree level and post-graduate level courses in Hong Kong. The Off-campus graduates obtain the same academic standard / qualifications as the full time graduates do, as advocated by many off-shore universities, taking for an example: The University of London offers external degrees of Law and Economics. The graduates under Law discipline are also recognised in Hong Kong and the Law Society of Hong Kong.

As far as I am concerned, for a professional body to assess the academic qualification for a candidate for registration purposes, she usually asks if the academic degree is recognised in the related profession in the country the qualification obtained. If it is affirmative, then it is recognised as the equivalent standard. This practice is universally carried out when assessing the applicants who register as a member of a professional body, taking for an instance, the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants, which is also set up under the Professional Accountants Ordinance.

The same way of practice currently applies to many professional bodies in the world. Then why the Chinese Medicine Council of Hong Kong has acted against the international way of practice.

To conclude straight, the Chinese Medicine Council of Hong Kong not only violates the Chinese Medicine Ordinance but also the way of practice is not up to standard.

I understand that Chinese Medicine Council has done great effort to set up the registration procedures but please widen and be open in treating the status of "REAL" equivalents.

Is Hong Kong Still FAIR and EQUITABLE?

Camson Tang

"camson tang"

2006/11/09 PM 12:57

CC to 廈門大學同學

Please forward my view to 衛生事務委員會 for discussion.

As the coming meeting concerning the arrangement in helping the non-degree holders of listed Chinese Medicine Practitioners to get registered, I consider that this suggestion is totally absurd.

The Chinese Medicine Council Hong Kong advocates that the assessment of 中醫註冊 must be done both in perspectives of academic degree and written examinations. Both of them are essential components to grant the 中醫註冊.

It is very clear that holders of medicine degree no matter what of the learning modes, either full time or part-time learning are preferred to that of non-degree holders. Isn't it?

The agenda V. 中醫註冊, in the coming meeting of 衛生事務委員會 held on 13th Nov 2006, summoned by EMB and attended by Mr Patrick Nip, the Deputy Secy (Health) comprehensively demonstrates that relevant government Bureau / Official in Charge may conduct whatever they want. This totally displays the AUTHORITATIVE TOP TO BOTTOM management style.

Is the AUTHORITATIVE style of management suitable for Hong Kong at present?

Is Hong Kong Still FAIR and EQUITABLE?

Camson Tang