

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(4)1260/15-16  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/ED

**Panel on Education**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Monday, 9 May 2016, at 4:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon IP Kin-yuen (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH  
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon WONG Yuk-man  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok  
Hon Dennis KWOK  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP  
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP

**Members  
absent** : Hon NG Leung-sing, SBS, JP  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP

**Members  
attending** : Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

**Public Officers  
attending** : Agenda item III

Mr Eddie NG, SBS, JP  
Secretary for Education

Mr Brian LO, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Education (1)

Mr Carlson TONG, SBS, JP  
Chairman  
University Grants Committee

Dr Richard ARMOUR, JP  
Secretary-General  
University Grants Committee

Ms Sharon HO Ho-shuen  
Deputy Secretary- General (2)  
University Grants Committee

Agenda item IV

Mr Kevin YEUNG, JP  
Under Secretary for Education

Ms Pecvin YONG  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Further Education)  
Education Bureau

Dr Lawrence CHAN Wan-ching  
Deputy Executive Director (C)  
Vocational Training Council

Agenda item V

Education Bureau

Mr Kevin YEUNG, JP  
Under Secretary for Education

Mrs Elina CHAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary  
(Infrastructure & Research Support)

Mrs Gloria LI  
Principal Inspector (Special Education Support 1)

Social Welfare Department

Mr Peter NG Ka-him  
Assistant Director (Youth and Corrections)

**Attendance by Invitation** : Agenda item III

Hong Kong Baptist University

Professor Rick W K WONG  
Acting President and Vice-Chancellor

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Mr Eric S P NG  
Registrar & Secretary

Lingnan University

Professor Leonard CHENG Kwok-hon  
President

The Hong Kong Institute of Education

Professor LUI Tai-lok  
Vice President (Research and Development)

The University of Hong Kong

Professor Peter MATHIESON  
President and Vice Chancellor

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Ir Professor Alex WAI  
Vice President (Research Development)

City University of Hong Kong

Professor Arthur B ELLIS  
Provost

The Hong Kong University of Science & Technology

Professor SHYY Wei  
Executive Vice-President & Provost

Agenda item V

Tung Wan Mok Law Shui Wah School

Mr CHEUK Tak-kun  
Principal

Island Hostel

Mr CHAN Yiu-lun  
Superintendent

**Clerk in attendance** : Miss Polly YEUNG  
Chief Council Secretary (4)4

**Staff in attendance** : Mr KWONG Kam-fai  
Senior Council Secretary (4)4

Miss Mandy NG  
Council Secretary (4)4

Ms Sandy HAU  
Legislative Assistant (4)4

---

Action

**I. Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting**

Members noted that no information paper had been issued since the last meeting.

2. The Chairman recalled that at its meeting held on 11 April 2016, the Panel had unanimously passed a motion under the agenda item of "Staff establishment and salary structure in primary schools". He informed members that upon receipt of the Administration's written response dated 4 May 2016 to the motion, he had written to the Secretary for Education on 5 May 2016 expressing disappointment with the Administration's response. The Administration's response together with the Chairman's letter had been issued to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(4)951/15-16(01) and (02). The Chairman indicated that the Panel would continue to follow up the matter in due course.

*(Post-meeting note: A letter dated 27 May 2016 from the Secretary for Education in response to the Chairman's letter dated 5 May 2016 was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1055/15-16(01) on 30 May 2016.)*

**II. Items for discussion at the next meeting**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (Appendix I to LC Paper No.<br>CB(4)940/15-16 | -- List of outstanding items for<br>discussion |
| Appendix II to LC Paper No.<br>CB(4)940/15-16 | -- List of follow-up actions)                  |

3. The Chairman said that after reviewing the Panel's "List of outstanding items for discussion" with the assistance of the Secretariat, he found that the core issues related to certain proposed items had in fact been discussed on different occasions when the relevant subjects were deliberated by the Panel. He had therefore decided to trim and consolidate the items on the List. The updated version of the List had been issued to members vide Appendix I to LC Paper No. CB(4)940/15-16. The Chairman further said that if members had any view on the List, they could approach the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman or the Secretariat after the meeting.

Action

4. The Chairman informed members that the Administration had proposed to discuss the item of "Proposed Injection into the HKSAR Government Scholarship Fund" at the next regular meeting to be held on 13 June 2016 at 4:30 pm. He would include an item on issues related to the policy on self-financing post-secondary programmes on the agenda of the next regular meeting. The Chairman said that he would finalize with the Deputy Chairman the items to be discussed at the next regular meeting with reference to the Panel's "List of outstanding items for discussion", and members would be informed accordingly.

*(Post-meeting note: Upon finalization by the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman, the agenda for the meeting to be held on 13 June 2016 was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1049/15-16 on 27 May 2016.)*

5. The Chairman advised that the Legislative Council ("LegCo") and the Finance Committee ("FC") would need to deal with a substantial number of outstanding agenda items in the remaining legislative session before prorogation of the Council on 16 July 2016. To release meeting time for holding additional Council and FC meetings where necessary in early July 2016, he suggested that the Panel might consider rescheduling its meeting of 11 July 2016 to Saturday, 2 July 2016. Members raised no objection to the proposed arrangement. The Chairman further said that if necessary, the duration of the ensuing two Panel meetings in June and July 2016 would be extended to allow sufficient time to deal with the items on the agenda.

6. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that he had written to the Chairman to request the Administration to provide information on the schools participating in the Territory-wide System Assessment 2016 Tryout (Primary 3). The Chairman responded that the Administration had been requested to provide the relevant information in writing.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response to the issues raised in Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's letter was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1011/15-16(02) on 19 May 2016.)*

7. Dr Kenneth CHAN referred to his letter to the Chairman suggesting the Panel to receive views on issues related to the governance of University Grants Committee("UGC")-funded institutions. He urged the Chairman to arrange a public hearing as soon as possible. The Deputy Chairman said that he had received two submissions from Hong Kong Federation of Students ("HKFS") and Hong Kong University Students' Union ("HKUSU")

Action

just before the meeting requesting the Panel to arrange a public hearing so that students could voice their views on issues related to the governance of UGC-funded institutions. Mr WONG Yuk-man concurred that a public hearing should be arranged early. Dr Helena WONG said that the public hearing, if held, should also receive views from stakeholders on UGC's policy on funding allocation. Mr Albert HO suggested that the Panel should follow up with the Administration regarding a complaint alleging that an academic from the University of Hong Kong ("HKU") had published fabricated research findings in an academic journal. Given the serious nature of the complaint, Mr HO considered that the Panel should be informed of how the case had been handled by the institution concerned.

8. Mr Tommy CHEUNG considered that there was no urgency to arrange a public hearing to receive views on issues related to the governance of UGC-funded institutions within the next two months. For a meaningful discussion, both members and other stakeholders might need more time to study the report recently released by UGC. He also cautioned that the Panel might not be able to hold a meeting on 2 July 2016 as suggested by the Chairman if FC needed to hold an additional meeting in that morning.

9. The Chairman confirmed that earlier on, he had received written requests from some members and organizations that the Panel should hold a public hearing to receive views on issues related to the governance of UGC-funded institutions. However, he considered it more appropriate and timely to first exchange views with the eight UGC-funded institutions at this meeting. He would revisit the need to hold a public hearing with regard to the availability of meeting venue and the outcome of deliberations at this meeting. The Chairman also pointed out that should a public hearing be arranged, the focus would be on issues related to the governance of UGC-funded institutions.

*(Post-meeting note: With the concurrence of the Chairman, a special meeting would be held on 18 June 2016. Notice of meeting was issued to members vide LC Paper CB(4)975/15-16 on 11 May 2016.)*

**III. Issues related to the University Grants Committee("UGC")-funded sector in respect of -**

- (a) the policy on research funding from UGC and the Research Grants Council; and**
- (b) the report on Governance in UGC-funded Higher Education Institutions in Hong Kong**

Action

(LC Paper No. CB(4)940/15-16(01) -- Paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(4)791/15-16(01) -- Administration's paper on a report of the University Grants Committee on Governance in UGC-funded Higher Education Institutions in Hong Kong)

10. Members noted the submissions from HKFS and HKUSU, tabled at the meeting [subsequently issued vide LC Paper Nos. CB(4)965/15-16(03)-(04)].

11. The Chairman recapitulated that two issues related to the UGC-funded sector would be discussed under this item, namely the policy on research funding from the UGC and the Research Grants Council ("RGC") and the UGC's report titled "Governance in UGC-funded Higher Education Institutions in Hong Kong" ("the Report"). As a matter of background, the Chairman informed the meeting that in December 2013, the Education Bureau ("EDB") invited UGC to conduct a study on the governance of UGC-funded institutions. Upon completion of the study, UGC submitted the Report to EDB for consideration in September 2015 and subsequently released it on 30 March 2016.

Briefing by the Administration

12. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Secretary for Education ("SED") briefed members on the policy on research funding from UGC and RGC and the background relating to the Report.

13. Mr Carlson TONG, Chairman of UGC briefed members on the way forward, and said that UGC would set up a task force led by Sir Howard NEWBY to follow up the implementation of the Report's recommendations in consultation with the UGC-funded institutions. Regarding the research funding schemes administered by RGC, Mr TONG advised that UGC would conduct a review of RGC. The Phase 1 of the RGC Review would cover various issues such as the portfolio balance of RGC's research funding schemes, the RGC's structure and good practices in overseas research funding agencies.



Action

Oral presentation by UGC-funded institutions

14. The representatives from eight UGC-funded institutions presented their views which were summarized in the **Appendix**.

Initial response by the Administration

15. SED thanked the deputations for presenting their views. He said that in the 2014-2015 academic year, the research expenditure of UGC-funded institutions was equivalent to 0.37% of Hong Kong's Gross Domestic Product. He was aware of comments that the aforesaid expenditure on research compared less favourably than that of other jurisdictions. However, in clarification, SED said that research expenditure in other countries usually included the expenditure on research relating to defence activities.

Declaration of interest

16. The Chairman drew members' attention to Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure which provided that a Member shall not move any motion or amendment relating to a matter in which he had a pecuniary interest, whether direct or indirect, or speak on any such matter, except where he disclosed the nature of that interest. He reminded members to declare interests, if any, in the matter under discussion.

17. The Chairman declared that he was the Deputy Chairman of the Council and a member of the Court of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University ("HKPolyU"), an honorary member of the Court of Hong Kong Baptist University ("HKBU"), and also a member of the Presidential Advisory Group of The Hong Kong Institute of Education ("HKIED").

18. Dr Kenneth CHAN declared that he was an associate professor of the Department of Government and International Studies at HKBU. Dr Helena WONG declared that she was a lecturer of HKPolyU and a member of the Council of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Dr Fernando CHEUNG declared that he was a lecturer of HKPolyU. Dr Priscilla LEUNG declared that she was teaching at the School of Law of City University of Hong Kong ("CityU"). The Deputy Chairman declared that he was a member of the Court of HKU. Ms Starry LEE declared that she was a member of the Council of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

## Discussion

### *Allocation of research funding to UGC-funded institutions*

19. Dr Helena WONG expressed concern that the allocation of the Research Portion ("R-portion") under the Block Grant placed heavy emphasis on the institution's success in obtaining funding from RGC and its performance in the Research Assessment Exercise ("RAE"). She opined that grants obtained from other sources such as the Innovation and Technology Bureau ("ITB") should be given equal weighting as grants obtained from RGC. She considered that the existing policy on allocation of research funding had given rise to unfairness and should be reviewed. For example, only the publication of research reports in international academic journals was taken into account when considering the allocation of research funding. This would discourage academics from undertaking researches in local topics because such research findings might be of less appeal to renowned international journals for publication. Dr WONG also said that at present, universities attached great importance to research activities, at the expense of teaching. As a result, some academics who excelled in teaching but with relatively less research output might not be able to renew their appointment with the institution concerned. She considered that the Administration should understand the views of frontline academics on the policy of research funding.

20. Mr Carlson TONG said that the eight institutions differed in their areas of excellence. In 2014, RGC started work on a review with the original objective of examining its operation. After taking into consideration the concerns of the institutions, the scope was later expanded to cover the portfolio balance of its research funding schemes and its structure. UGC would conduct the review in two phases. Phase 1 would cover macro issues such as the portfolio balance of the RGC research funding schemes and good practice in overseas research funding agencies. Phase 2 would cover micro issues such as quality of the assessment and monitoring processes. In order to safeguard the independence and credibility of the Phase 1 Review, UGC set up the Task Force on the Review of the Research Grants Council (Phase 1) under the Research Group of UGC in late April 2016 to oversee the implementation of the Phase 1 Review. At present, it was in the process of identifying suitable Task Force members and consultant to support the Task Force. The Task Force would consult stakeholders in the review process.

21. Dr Kenneth CHAN said that the Administration should encourage collaboration among the eight UGC-funded institutions in conducting

Action

research. He was concerned that at present, the institutions had to compete for limited resources for their research activities. In his view, the Administration should increase the provision of resources for the entire UGC-funded sector. On the allocation of the R-portion under the Block Grant, Dr CHAN concurred that the success in obtaining funding from other sources, such as the Innovation and Technology Fund, should also be taken into account. To ensure fairness in the allocation of research funding, Mr WONG Yuk-man considered that a dedicated funding agency totally independent from the Government and the universities should be established.

22. Mr WONG Kwok-hing concurred with the views of HKIED that the allocation of research funding should take into account the differences among institutions in their scale of operation and their pace of development. Noting from some deputations that research funding placed more emphasis on academic research rather than applied research, Mr WONG enquired whether EDB/UGC would collaborate with ITB to provide more research funding for applied research.

23. In this connection, SED said that as announced in 2016 Policy Address, the Government would earmark \$2 billion to ITB to further encourage UGC-funded institutions to carry out more mid-stream applied research projects and the investment income generated from the allocation would be used to fund mid-stream research undertaken by the institutions. Mr Carlson TONG recognized that there were differences in strengths and development of the institutions. He added that the Task Force on the Review of the RGC (Phase 1) would consult the stakeholders with a view to increasing the effective and efficient use of RGC funding to meet the needs of the higher education sector.

24. Mr Albert HO said that according to recent media reports, an academic from HKU had allegedly falsified data in a published journal paper. As far as he was aware, HKU did not take any disciplinary action against the academic despite the finding that the data were not accurate. Arising from this incident, Mr HO said that consideration should be given to conducting an independent and credible investigation on the case and the setting up of a research integrity office so as to uphold the highest standard of professional conduct in research activities.

25. SED said that the UGC-funded institutions had the primary responsibility for prevention, detection and investigation of research misconduct. A Disciplinary Committee was set up under RGC to handle alleged misconduct cases. SED added that membership of the Disciplinary

Action

Committee of RGC comprised non-local experts and distinguished local persons outside the local academic sector. Regarding the case mentioned by Mr Albert HO, RGC had already followed up with the institution concerned. The Secretary-General ("SG")/UGC said that if the case involved RGC funded projects, the established mechanism would be activated.

*The Report*

26. Noting that the Report had been submitted to EDB by UGC in September 2015 but was only released in March 2016, the Deputy Chairman questioned why the Report had not been released earlier. He was aware of the concern of the tertiary education sector that if the recommendations in the Report were implemented, individual university councils might become overly involved in the daily operation and administration of the institutions. In this regard, the Deputy Chairman enquired about consultation, if any, with stakeholders before finalizing the recommendations in the Report.

27. In response, SED recapitulated that in December 2013, EDB invited UGC to conduct a study on the governance of UGC-funded institutions. The UGC submitted its report to EDB in September 2015. Having carefully studied the contents of the Report, the Administration accepted all of its recommendations, and the Report was subsequently released in March 2016. SED said that Sir Howard NEWBY, who was commissioned to conduct the study, had already consulted various institutions in the course of the study. Mr Carlson TONG also confirmed that UGC would set up a task force led by Sir Howard to follow up the implementation of the Report's recommendations in consultation with the UGC-funded institutions.

28. The Chairman welcomed the recommendations set out in the Report and highlighted that their effective implementation would be an important task in the years ahead. Ms Starry LEE sought the views of the institutions on the implementation of the recommendations of the Report.

29. In this regard, Prof Leonard CHENG of Lingnan University said that the institution welcomed the Report and looked forward to collaborating with UGC on the implementation of the recommendations. Meanwhile, in the face of increasingly complex socio-political circumstances, the institution had initiated a review of different kinds of risks related to reputation, finance, quality assurance and competition, and would actively identify and develop effective measures for managing risks.

*Issues related to the governing legislation of UGC-funded institutions*

30. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that the student unions of several institutions had conducted a "referendum" earlier on. According to its results, there was a majority view in favour of a thorough review of the governing legislation of individual institutions. Besides, queries had been raised on the role of the Chief Executive ("CE") as the ex-officio Chancellor of institutions, the powers of CE/Chancellor in appointing members to university councils and the rights of student representatives in the councils. Dr CHEUNG referred to his past experience as a member of the Council of HKPolyU, and concurred with the need to review the governing ordinances in order to enhance institutional governance. He said that the Panel should arrange a public hearing to receive views from students who were the major stakeholders.

31. In this regard, SED said that there was no legal basis for the so-called "referendum" referred to by members and its results were not binding on the Administration.

32. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung considered it irrelevant to delve into the question of whether the so-called referendum had any legal basis. Instead, it was important that the Administration must not ignore the consensus which had emerged predominantly in support of a review of the existing governing legislation. Noting that the existing arrangement for CE to serve as Chancellor of institutions had originated from the colonial administration, Mr LEUNG opined that this practice should be discontinued.

33. Mr WONG Yuk-man considered that the incumbent CE had interfered in a wide range of affairs of UGC-funded institutions. He was gravely concerned about the governance of UGC-funded institutions, and stressed that students' views on governance-related issues should be gauged, given that university education should be implemented in the best interest of students.

34. Dr Kenneth CHAN opined that the appointment of members to governing bodies such as university councils should be made by individual institutions instead of by CE/Chancellor. He was concerned that the Administration might withdraw or reduce its funding support if an institution decided to proceed to amend its governing legislation to the effect that CE would no longer be its ex-officio Chancellor.

35. Ms Starry LEE said that the prevailing system under which CE served as the Chancellor of institutions should not be overhauled simply

Action

because the incumbent CE was unpopular. Dr Priscilla LEUNG recalled that some 10 years ago, a group of teaching staff of the School of Law of CityU had a dispute with the university. In the absence of an effective redress system to resolve complaints lodged by staff, the case dragged on for a long time and was escalated to the then CE who was also the Chancellor. Dr LEUNG said that if the governance structure of UGC-funded institutions was to be reviewed, consideration should be given to setting up a cross-institutional grievance-handling mechanism.

36. SED explained that according to the respective ordinances governing the UGC-funded institutions, CE was the Chancellor of these institutions to maintain the linkages between the Government and the institutions and to demonstrate the Government's support to the higher education sector. The prevailing system had been operating effectively over the years. All along, the appointment of members to the governing body of each institution had been made in accordance with the law and on a merit basis with reference to the experience and expertise of the appointees concerned. Pursuant to the recommendation of the UGC's Higher Education Review Report published in 2002, each UGC-funded institution had completed a review of its governance and management structure during the past 10 years. SED further said that the Report released in March 2016 had not dealt with issues related to CE's ex-officio role as Chancellor of UGC-funded institutions. Besides, individual institutions were at liberty to review their respective governing legislation and the existing system if they considered it necessary.

37. The Chairman noted that as stated in the Report, CE, in his role as Chancellor of the universities, appointed a significant proportion of Council members and traditionally, these appointments had often been regarded as a civic honour. These appointments had been made without a systematic consideration of the needs of the university to fill the requisite range of skills and expertise needed by the university council to discharge its responsibilities. In this regard, the Chairman enquired about the measures, if any, to be taken by the Administration to enhance the governance of institutions and the arrangement for appointment of members to the governing bodies of universities. The Deputy Chairman said that it was clear from the Report that the existing appointment system had limitations. A review was therefore needed.

38. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen referred to the submissions from HKFS and HKUSU provided by the Deputy Chairman and tabled at the meeting. These organizations urged for the abolition of CE's role as the ex-officio Chancellor of UGC-funded institutions and called for a review of CE's

Action

powers to appoint members of university councils. Mr CHAN referred to one of the recommendations of the Report to provide induction to members of university councils, and considered that this was in fact a remedial measure to mitigate the adverse effect of appointing council members without the requisite skills and expertise. He concurred with the need to review the governing legislation in respect of the role and powers of CE as the ex-officio Chancellor of institutions.

39. SED advised that under the respective governing legislation, CE/Chancellor was empowered to appoint a specified number of members to the Councils of individual UGC-funded institutions. All along, the appointments had been made on a merit basis with reference to the expertise and experience of the appointees concerned. This arrangement had been operating smoothly over the years. SED also highlighted that as stated in the Report, there was a need to understand and respect the particular circumstances, history and traditions of the university sector in Hong Kong. The Report did not focus on the authority which appointed council members. Instead, it recommended implementing a more systematic approach to enhance the identification of candidates.

*Conduct of business activities by UGC-funded institutions*

40. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung expressed concern about the establishment of offshore private companies by some UGC-funded institutions in territories like British Virgin Islands. He saw a need to enhance the transparency of business activities undertaken by UGC-funded institutions, and considered that they should not be allowed to set up offshore companies and avoid oversight by local regulators. Dr Kenneth CHAN enquired about the stance of the Administration regarding the setting up of offshore companies by UGC-funded institutions, and considered that the Administration should follow up related policy issues.

41. Dr Fernando CHEUNG queried why UGC-funded institutions would need to establish offshore companies, the cost of which was higher than that for setting up local companies. He stressed that UGC-funded institutions should be accountable to the public. The governance of UGC-funded institutions should be enhanced to ensure the transparency of their operations. In this connection, Dr CHEUNG recalled that he and Mr Kenneth LEUNG had written a letter to the Chairman on 6 May 2016 requesting UGC to provide relevant information regarding the setting up and operation of offshore companies in British Virgin Islands by HKPolyU. The Chairman responded that the said joint letter had already been forwarded to the Administration/UGC for written response.

Action

42. SED said that the three institutions which had established offshore companies had already clarified publicly their offshore business activities. He highlighted that on one hand, UGC-funded institutions enjoyed a high degree of institutional autonomy under their respective governing legislation. On the other hand, it was necessary for them to uphold transparency of operations and accountability to the public.

*Summing up*

43. In conclusion, the Chairman thanked the eight UGC-funded institutions for attending the meeting and sharing their views. On members' request for holding a public hearing to receive views on issues related to governance of UGC-funded institutions, the Chairman said that he would finalize the arrangement after the meeting with the assistance of the Secretariat.

*(Post-meeting note: The notice of special meeting to be held on 18 June 2016 was issued to members vide LC Paper CB(4)975/15-16 on 11 May 2016. A general notice was posted on the LegCo website to invite views from the public.)*

#### **IV. Subsidising Students of Professional Part-time Programmes**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)930/15-16(01) -- Paper provided by the Administration)

Briefing by the Administration

44. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Under Secretary for Education ("US(Ed)") briefed members on the Government's proposal to implement a pilot scheme to provide tuition fee subsidy for three cohorts of students admitted to designated professional part-time programmes offered by the Vocational Training Council ("VTC"), details of which were set out in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(4)930/15-16(01)]. Subject to the Panel's views, the Administration planned to submit the proposal to FC for funding approval in June 2016.

Discussion

*Scope and target recipients of the pilot scheme*

45. Dr Kenneth CHAN welcomed the launch of the pilot scheme as it



Action

could encourage working adults to pursue higher qualifications which could enhance their upward mobility. He enquired on the basis for making the estimate of 5 600 target recipients as stated in the Administration's paper and the ways to promote the pilot scheme.

46. In reply, US(Ed) advised that the pilot scheme would provide tuition fee subsidy for three cohorts of students admitted to designated professional part-time programmes offered by VTC starting from the 2016-2017 academic year. After taking into account the existing number of students of these programmes and the anticipated increase in intake with the implementation of the pilot scheme, the Administration estimated that approximately 1 700, 1 900 and 2 000 students newly admitted into the eligible programmes in the 2016-2017, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 academic years respectively would benefit under the pilot scheme. The Administration might consider extending the pilot scheme in case there were unexpended funds after implementation for three academic years. VTC would launch publicity measures to promote the pilot scheme to its prospective students.

47. Mr WONG Kwok-hing expressed support for the pilot scheme. He noticed from the list of eligible programmes offered by VTC that some technical training for the construction industry such as welding were not included under the pilot scheme. He enquired whether the Administration would consider expanding the scope of the pilot scheme to cover more programmes offered by other institutions.

48. US(Ed) advised that VTC had been invited to implement the pilot scheme as it was the major vocational and professional education and training provider in the territory. On the suggestion to expand the scope of the pilot scheme, US(Ed) reiterated that the pilot scheme would be subject to review after implementation for three cohorts. The Deputy Executive Director (C), VTC said that designated part-time professional programmes offered by VTC under the pilot scheme were in the disciplines of construction, engineering and technology. In 2015, the average employment rate of full-time graduates of these programmes was 93% and their average monthly salary was about HK\$13,800.

49. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that the construction sector welcomed the pilot scheme, which was conducive to nurturing talents for the sector. However, he was concerned that construction workers might not have the time to pursue continuing education. He added that many construction workers were worried that the filibustering which took place in the Legislative Council would delay funding approval for capital works

Action

projects and jeopardize their employment opportunities.

50. In response, US(Ed) remarked that the part-time mode of study of the professional programmes offered by VTC under the pilot scheme would allow working adults to receive education and training while in employment. Classes of these programmes were usually held on weekends or after office hours.

*Funding and reimbursement arrangement under the pilot scheme*

51. The Chairman supported the pilot scheme, which could encourage continuing education among working adults and help unleash their potentials. Noting that there was no pre-set quota for individual programmes under the pilot scheme, he questioned why refund of tuition fees would be granted on a first-come-first-served basis. He sought clarification on the arrangement of tuition fee reimbursement under the pilot scheme.

52. In this connection, US(Ed) explained that under the pilot scheme, successful applicants would be refunded 60% of the tuition fees of eligible programmes, subject to a maximum of HK\$45,000 per person. Applicants might apply for fee refund for not more than two programmes. While there was no pre-set quota for individual programmes, the number of recipients under the pilot scheme would be subject to the amount of funds as approved by FC (i.e. HK\$200 million).

53. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che was concerned that if there was overwhelming response from the first two cohorts of students, then, the pilot scheme might run out of funds for the last cohort. He therefore considered it necessary for the Administration to conduct a mid-term review on the pilot scheme. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung opined that the Administration should take steps to ensure that sufficient funds would be available for the implementation of the pilot scheme.

54. US(Ed) advised that having regard to the anticipated number of students, the pilot scheme would incur a non-recurrent expenditure of HK\$200 million for three cohorts of students. A review on the effectiveness of the pilot scheme would be conducted in due course by collecting data such as the number of applications and completion rate as well as feedback from relevant parties. If necessary, the Administration would consider seeking additional funding from FC.

Action

*Summing up*

55. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that the Panel supported the Administration's submission of the proposal to FC for funding approval.

**V. Capital Works Projects for Schools**

- (a) 3353EP – A 30-classroom primary school at Site KT2b, Development at Anderson Road, Kwun Tong

(LC Paper No. CB(4)940/15-16(02) -- Paper provided by the Administration)

- (b) 3109ET – A school for social development for boys in Area 2B, Tuen Mun

(LC Paper No. CB(4)940/15-16(03) -- Paper provided by the Administration)

LC Paper No. CB(4)940/15-16(04) -- Submission dated 20 April 2016 from Yan Oi Tong Chan Wong Suk Fong Memorial Secondary School  
*(Restricted to members only)*

LC Paper No. CB(4)940/15-16(05) -- Administration's written response dated 4 May 2016 to the submission dated 20 April 2016 from Yan Oi Tong Chan Wong Suk Fong Memorial Secondary School

LC Paper No. CB(4)940/15-16(06) -- Submission dated 29 April 2016 from Yan Oi Tong Chan Wong Suk Fong Memorial Secondary School

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(4)950/15-16(01) -- Joint letter dated 4 May 2016 from staff of the Yan Oi Tong Chan Wong Suk Fong Memorial Secondary School  
*(Restricted to members only)*
- LC Paper No. CB(4)950/15-16(02) -- Joint letter from members of Tuen Mun District Council  
*(Restricted to members only)*
- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(01) -- Joint letter dated 5 May 2016 from members of Tuen Mun District Council
- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(02) -- Joint letter dated 5 May 2016 from 18 school principals
- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(03) -- Submission dated 5 May 2016 from Fukien Secondary School Affiliated School
- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(04) -- Submission dated 5 May 2016 from 一名屯門小學校長
- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(05) -- Submission dated 6 May 2016 from Mr POON Wing-pong
- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(06) -- Submission dated 6 May 2016 from 一名小學校長
- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(07) -- Submission dated 5 May 2016 from Hong Kong Social Workers' General Union

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(08) -- Submission dated 5 May 2016 from Ms AU Wing-yan  
(*Restricted to members only*)
- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(09) -- Submission dated 6 May 2016 from Hong Kong Social Workers Association
- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(10) -- Submission dated 5 May 2016 from a member of the public
- LC Paper No. CB(4)955/15-16(11) -- Submission dated 6 May 2016 from Tuen Mun District Council members from the Democratic Party)

56. Regarding the proposal under agenda item V(b) to construct a school for social development ("SSD") for boys in Area 2B, Tuen Mun for the reprovisioning of Tung Wan Mok Law Shui Wah School-cum-Island Hostel ("the School"), the Chairman informed members that in addition to the submissions listed above, the Secretariat had received more than 30 submissions which were tabled at the meeting [subsequently issued vide LC Paper Nos. CB(4)968/15-16(01)-(22)]. Most of these submissions expressed support for the reprovisioning of the School while some raised objection.

57. The Chairman said that to enable members to better understand the views of relevant stakeholders, he had invited both the School and the Yan Oi Tong Chan Wong Suk Fong Memorial Secondary School ("the YOT Secondary School") to attend the meeting. The YOT Secondary School subsequently informed him that as it had already issued a press statement explaining its stance, it would not attend the meeting. The said statement was tabled at the meeting [subsequently issued vide LC Paper No. CB(4)968/15-16(01)].

58. Members agreed with the Chairman's suggestion to extend the meeting beyond the appointed meeting time at 7:30 pm so as to allow

Action

sufficient time to complete discussion of this agenda item.

Briefing by the Administration

59. At the invitation of the Chairman, US(Ed) briefed members on the proposal to build a primary school at the Development at Anderson Road of Kwun Tong for the reprovisioning of SKH St John's Primary School, which was currently accommodated in a school premises in Kwun Tong built according to past planning standards, as set out in LC Paper No. CB(4)940/15-16(02). He also briefed members on the proposal to construct a SSD for boys-cum-residential home in Area 2B in Tuen Mun for the reprovisioning of the School, which was currently accommodated in a school premises on Lantau Island built in 1960, as set out in LC Paper No. CB(4)940/15-16(03). Members noted that the Administration planned to submit the funding proposals to the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") and the FC for approval in June 2016.

Reprovisioning of Tung Wan Mok Law Shui Wah School-cum-Island Hostel

60. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr CHEUK Tak-kun, Principal of Tung Wan Mok Law Shui Wah School informed members that the facilities of the School were outdated. Its remote location far away from the Tung Chung town centre had made it difficult for students to make use of community facilities and take part in learning activities outside school, and for parents to participate in home-school activities. Medical services for students were also not easily available. It was therefore necessary to expedite the reprovisioning of the School to improve its teaching and learning environment.

*Project design of the School and supply of SSD places*

61. Ms Cyd HO recalled that she had visited an SSD some years ago and found that the living environment of the residential portion was not satisfactory and there was a lack of privacy. She referred to the Direct Investigation Report issued by the Office of the Ombudsman in 2012 on Special Education Services for Students with Moderate to Severe Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties and expressed concern about the shortfall in SSD places and the long waiting time for admission to SSD. She opined that the Administration should increase the provision of SSD places and provide appropriate assistance to SSD students to re-integrate into mainstream schools.

Action

62. Dr KWOK Ka-ki indicated his support for the reprovisioning of the School. He said that SSDs played an important role in providing service and support for students with emotional and behavioural problems. He was concerned that students attending mainstream schools who were still waiting for admission to SSD might not be able to receive appropriate support in their existing schools.

63. US(Ed) advised that to help meet the projected shortage of SSD places, the reprovisioning of the School at Area 2B, Tuen Mun would increase the current provision by some 120 primary and secondary school places and 81 residential home places. "Family home" was the design concept of the residential portion of the School. There would be eight "family homes" each accommodating 18 boarders in their bedrooms. Such a design would provide students with a better living environment while protecting their privacy.

*Concerns about possible impact of the reprovisioning on the local community*

64. Mr Michael TIEN recognized the role and functions played by SSDs. He referred to the concerns about the possible impact of the School on the local community, and enquired whether the other six SSDs were located adjacent to mainstream schools. He was concerned whether the future operation of the School would have any impact on the traffic flow in the neighbourhood of Area 2B, Tuen Mun. Mr TIEN also sought information on whether in the past, the operation of any SSD had caused disturbances to its neighbouring community.

65. US(Ed) advised that all along, SSDs had never been purposely located away from densely populated areas. At present, with the exception of the School which was located on Lantau Island, the other six SSDs were close to residential areas and mainstream schools. US(Ed) further said that all the seven SSDs across the territory were able to integrate into and maintain a cordial relationship with the local community. Their operation had not posed any problems to the local community.

66. Mr CHEUK Tak-kun said that since the majority of students at the School were boarding students, they would not need to commute between their home and school on a daily basis. As for day students, school bus service would be provided between the School and the nearby MTR station.

67. Noting the explanation from the Administration and the School, Mr Michael TIEN said that he saw no reason for not supporting the proposed

Action

reprovisioning of the School. He said that Members of New People's Party ("NPP") supported the work of SSDs and the proposed reprovisioning of the School.

*Public education on the work of schools for social development*

68. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che noted that most of the submissions received by the Panel were in support of the reprovisioning of the School. He noted that the four submissions from the YOT Secondary School had referred to a document issued by EDB (i.e. "Mode of Service Provision for Students with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties – A Conceptual Framework") which gave a very negative description of SSD students and associated these students with unruly behaviour ranging from playing truant, triad involvement to drug abuse. To avoid misunderstanding and any labelling effect on SSD students, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che urged EDB to update the document in question as soon as possible and to step up public education so that the community would have a better understanding of the work of SSDs. Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr Frederick FUNG, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and the Deputy Chairman concurred that EDB should take immediate action to update the document so as to avoid misinterpretation and misunderstanding.

69. US(Ed) explained that the document in question had been prepared as a general guide for reference by schools in referring students with emotional and behavioural problems to SSDs. In the light of members' concern about the content of the document, EDB would seriously consider the need for updating it. US(Ed) further said that public education would be strengthened to facilitate better understanding and acceptance of students with special needs.

70. Some members, including Mr CHEUNG kwok-che, Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr Frederick FUNG expressed their dismay at the submissions from YOT Secondary School which objected to the reprovisioning of the School to Area 2B, Tuen Mun and which appeared to be biased against SSD students.

71. Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Dr Kenneth CHAN recalled that several years ago, there had been strong opposition in the local community against the proposed relocation of Christian Zheng Sheng College to Mui Wo. They considered that the community should be more considerate towards students with special needs. Dr Kenneth CHAN said that Members of the Civic Party supported the reprovisioning of the School. Dr Priscilla LEUNG indicated support for the reprovisioning of the School and saw no reason why SSDs should be located far away from densely populated areas.



Action

She was of the view that EDB should step up public education and communication with other schools in the vicinity of the School.

72. The Deputy Chairman was gravely concerned that there was opposition from the education sector against the reprovisioning of the School. Nevertheless, he was pleased to note that a number of school principals from mainstream schools had expressed support for the proposed reprovisioning. He considered that EDB should promote better understanding of the work of SSDs among mainstream schools, and would look forward to a cordial relationship between the YOT Secondary School and the School in future.

73. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that Members of the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions ("HKFTU") had all along supported the work of schools which catered for students with special needs. Being a member of the Eastern District Council, Mr WONG shared his past experience in supporting a special school project in North Point. He also informed members that in March 2016, Miss Alice MAK and Miss CHAN Yuen-han, both Members of HKFTU, had met with representatives of the School and supported its reprovisioning to Tuen Mun. He stressed the importance of public education so that the community would be more forthcoming in supporting students with special needs. Mr WONG said that Members of HKFTU would support the reprovisioning project at PWSC and FC. Noting the heavy agenda of their forthcoming meetings, he was gravely concerned that this proposal might not be approved before the expiry of the current term. In this regard, US(Ed) said that the Administration planned to submit the proposal to PWSC on 1 June 2016.

*Public consultation on the proposed reprovisioning*

74. Noting that Mr Michael TIEN and Mr WONG Kwok-hing had expressed support for the reprovisioning of the School at the meeting, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung queried that their latest stance was in sharp contrast to the opposition shown by some members of Tuen Mun District Council ("TMDC") from NPP and HKFTU earlier on. In reply to Mr LEUNG's enquiry on whether Members of HKFTU had visited and met with representatives from the School, Mr CHEUK Tak-kun confirmed that a member of TMDC from HKFTU had visited the School during its open day. Representatives of the School had met with Miss Alice MAK and Miss CHAN Yuen-han at their offices in the Legislative Council Complex.

75. Mr Frederick FUNG said that the principle of "education for all" should be upheld and the community should offer more care and support for

Action

students of SSDs. He regretted to note that the YOT Secondary School and some TMDC members from HKFTU and NPP had opposed the reprovisioning of the School. In this regard, Mr FUNG enquired whether TMDC members from HKFTU and NPP had attended relevant meetings when EDB consulted TMDC, and whether any of them had objected to the proposed reprovisioning. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen sought further explanation from EDB about public consultation on the proposed reprovisioning of the School.

76. In response, US(Ed) advised that EDB officers had consulted the Social Services Committee of TMDC on 8 March 2016. As members of the Committee had not taken a vote on the proposed reprovisioning, it was not feasible to provide information on the stance of individual members. Meanwhile, EDB had visited some schools in Tuen Mun to understand their views on the proposed reprovisioning of the School. To enable members of TMDC to acquire first-hand understanding of the operation of SSDs, EDB had arranged visits to the School and another SSD in Kwun Tong. US(Ed) said that the Administration was aware of concerns about the proposed reprovisioning of the School. However, he reiterated that based on the experience of the other SSDs located in urban areas, the operation of the School would unlikely cause any problems to its neighbouring community.

77. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung highlighted that SSDs played an important role in providing support to students with emotional and behavioural difficulties so that they could resume education in ordinary schools as soon as possible. He remarked that the reprovisioning of the School to Tuen Mun would help meet the demand for SSD places and services in the New Territories region. As there were criticisms about insufficient public consultation, Mr LEUNG considered that EDB should take action to address the concerns of the local community. Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered it necessary for the Administration to maintain communication with the YOT Secondary School to alleviate its concerns about the impact of the School on the local community.

78. US(Ed) confirmed that both mainstream schools and SSDs were part of the education system. EDB would spare no effort to maintain close communication with different stakeholders and provide the School with appropriate support in the reprovisioning project.

79. The Chairman said that some public sector schools, such as SSDs and schools accommodated in matchbox-style sub-standard premises, faced considerable difficulties in their daily operation and should be provided

Action

with additional support and resources. He also appreciated that individual schools would raise concerns if they considered that the well-being of the schools and their students was at stake. The Chairman therefore opined that EDB should try to understand and effectively address the concerns of the YOT Secondary School about the proposed reprovisioning.

80. US(Ed) said that the Administration understood the concerns of the YOT Secondary School although it did not agree with the stance of the school. The Administration had also maintained communication with the YOT Secondary School and explained the implementation of the proposed reprovisioning with a view to alleviating its concerns.

Reprovisioning of SKH St John's Primary School

81. The Deputy Chairman expressed support for the reprovisioning of SKH St John's Primary School which was operating in matchbox-style premises. He urged the Administration to expedite the reprovisioning/redevelopment of other schools operating in matchbox-style premises. Mr WONG Kwok-hing also indicated support for the proposed reprovisioning.

82. The Chairman pointed out that Ping Shek Estate Catholic Primary School, which was adjacent to SKH St John's Primary School, was also accommodated in match-box style premises. He urged EDB to expedite the reprovisioning of schools operating in matchbox-style or other sub-standard premises. If it was impracticable to reprovision such schools in the near future, the Administration should explore short-term measures to improve their teaching and learning environment. In this connection, the Chairman recapped that subsequent to the Panel's visit to matchbox-style primary schools on 26 April 2016, he would convene a tripartite meeting in the following week to provide a discussion forum for the Administration, the school sector and members of the Panel to exchange views on relevant issues.

Summing up

83. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that the Panel supported the Administration's submission of the two reprovisioning proposals to PWSC.

Action

**VI. Any other business**

84. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 8:10 pm.

Council Business Division 4  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
19 July 2016

**Panel on Education  
Meeting on Monday, 9 May 2016, at 4:30 pm**

**Agenda item III: Issues related to the University Grants Committee("UGC")-funded sector in respect of –**

- (a) the policy on research funding from UGC and the Research Grants Council; and**
- (b) the report on Governance in UGC-funded Higher Education Institutions in Hong Kong**

**Summary of views and concerns expressed by UGC-funded institutions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name of deputation</b>	<b>Major views and concerns</b>
1.	Hong Kong Baptist University	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(4)940/15-16(07)</a> ]
2.	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	<p>The institution welcomed UGC's report on governance of UGC-funded institutions. It had already taken measures consistent with the report's recommendations, such as providing induction programme for new Council members and involving the Council in the strategic planning process.</p> <p>On allocation of the Research Portion ("R-portion") under the Block Grant, the institution opined that consideration should be given to the success in obtaining funding from sources other than the Research Grants Council ("RGC") and the Government. There should be greater transparency on how the results of the Research Assessment Exercise ("RAE") 2014 were used in the allocation of research funding for the 2016-2017 to 2018-2019 triennium.</p>
3.	Lingnan University	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(4)965/15-16(01)</a> ]
4.	The Hong Kong Institute of Education	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(4)974/15-16(01)</a> ]
5.	The University of Hong Kong	<p>The institution would work with UGC in implementing the recommendations of the UGC's report on governance of UGC-funded institutions. It had also established a panel comprising external experts to review the governance of the institution.</p> <p>The institution welcomed conducting the RGC Review. On allocation of R-portion under the Block Grant, UGC should also take into account the success of institutions in obtaining funding from other sources such as the Innovation and Technology Fund and the schemes administered by the Food and Health Bureau.</p>
6.	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(4)965/15-16(02)</a> ]

No.	Name of deputation	Major views and concerns
7.	City University of Hong Kong	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. <a href="#">CB(4)940/15-16(08)</a> ]
8.	The Hong Kong University of Science & Technology	<p>The institution welcomed UGC's report on governance of UGC-funded institutions. The Council had already begun a review on the governance of the institution.</p> <p>The institution supported the principle of allocating the R-portion under the Block Grant on a more competitive basis. It opined that institutions' performance in the RGC grants over the past few years, rather than that of the immediate past year, should be taken into account in the competitive allocation of the R-portion. Consideration should also be given to allocating additional funding to institutions for collaboration projects with institutions outside Hong Kong.</p>

Council Business Division 4  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
19 July 2016