

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(4)1289/15-16  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/ED

**Panel on Education**

**Minutes of special meeting**  
**held on Saturday, 18 June 2016, at 9:00 am**  
**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 WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH  
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, 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-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon NG Leung-sing, SBS, JP  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP  
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
- Members absent** : Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP  
Hon WONG Yuk-man  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon Dennis KWOK  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP

**Public Officers** : Agenda item I  
**attending**

Mr Eddie NG, SBS, JP  
Secretary for Education

Mr Kevin YEUNG, JP  
Under Secretary for Education

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

Dr Richard ARMOUR, JP  
Secretary-General  
University Grants Committee

**Attendance by** : Agenda item I  
**invitation**

Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union

Dr FUNG Wai-wah  
President

HKU Alumni Concern Group

Mr WONG Chun-sing  
Vice-Convenor

Civic Party

Mr CHENG Tat-hung  
Chairman of Young Civics

Lingnan Alumni Concern Group

Miss LEE Mei-ting  
Convenor

HKU Vigilance

Professor Timothy O'LEARY  
Convenor

The Chinese University of  
Hong Kong Employees General Union

Dr CHAN Yin-ha  
Vice President

Hong Kong Polytechnic University Staff Association

Dr Rodney CHU Wai-chi  
Chairman

Mr CHEUNG Chi-wai

Dr Annie CHAN Hau-nung

Dr LAU Sin-nga

Lingnan University Students' Union

Mr CHENG Pui-lun  
President

The Confederation of Tertiary Staff Unions

Ms YU Chau-ngor  
Chairperson

Dr WONG Wai-kwok

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University Students' Union

Mr Franco WONG Chak-hang  
President

HKUST Students' Union

Mr LAM Tsz-kon  
Vice-President (External)

Mr CHENG Sze-lut

CUHK Alumni Defend Institutional  
Autonomy Concern Group

Mr LAM Siu-pan  
Member

Academic Staff Association of  
the Hong Kong Institute of Education

Dr KWOK Ping-wai  
President

Hong Kong University Employees Union

Mr NG Kwok-yan  
Chairman

Staff Association of the  
Hong Kong Institute of Education

Mr CHENG Wing-on  
Chairperson

The Lion Rock Institute

Miss Katherine PEMBERTON  
Research Assistant

The Hong Kong Institute of Education Students' Union

Miss WONG Suet-kan  
External Secretary

Hong Kong Baptist University Faculty and Staff Union

Ms Pauline YEUNG  
Vice-Chairperson

Mr FUNG Jing-en

The Hong Kong University Students' Union

Miss Althea SUEN  
President

Scholars' Alliance for Academic Freedom

Dr Dora CHOI Po-king

Mr LAI Ming-chak

Sai Kung District Council Member

Provisional Executive Committee,

City University of Hong Kong Students' Union

Miss LAM Man-sze

Acting Current Affairs Secretary

Hong Kong Federation of Students

Mr CHAN Man-hei

Secretary General

Ms LEUNG Sze-wan

Unequal Grade Contribution

Mr LEUNG Hoi-fu

Lazy Deadline Fighter

Hong Kong Baptist University Students' Union

Mr Angus WONG Chun-hin

President

Labour Party

Mr MOK Hiu-fung

Representative

Academic Staff Association of the University of  
Hong Kong

---

Dr Roger WONG Hoi-fung

Executive Committee Member

Mr LO Wai-ming

**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. Issues related to the governance of University Grants Committee-funded institutions**

(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

LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(01) -- Paper provided by Hon IP Kin-yuen

LC Paper Nos. CB(4)1122/15-16(09), -- Written submissions from (13) to (16), CB(4)1128/15-16(03), deputations/individuals not and CB(4)1165/15-16(03) attending the meeting)

Members noted the submissions from deputations/individuals not attending the meeting.

Briefing by the Administration

2. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Secretary for Education ("SED") briefed members on the background of the University Grants Committee("UGC")'s report titled "Governance in UGC-funded Higher Education Institutions in Hong Kong" ("the Report") and the way forward.

Oral presentation by deputations/individuals

3. A total of 35 deputations/individuals presented their views. Their major concerns were summarized in the **Appendix**.

Initial response by the Administration

4. SED thanked the deputations for presenting their views. He advised that according to the respective ordinances governing the UGC-funded institutions, the Chief Executive ("CE") was the ex-officio 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 without compromising institutional autonomy and academic freedom. 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, the operation of individual institutions and the development of the higher education sector. In accordance with the relevant statutory provisions, some candidates had to be recommended by the university councils and then appointed by the CE/Chancellor. SED further highlighted that council members did not receive remuneration and had to work for the interest of the institution they served. As he was aware, some council members participated actively in fund-raising activities and some offered opportunities of internship and practical training to students.

5. The Secretary-General("SG")/UGC advised that the Research Grants Council ("RGC") was following up a case of research misconduct involving an academic from the University of Hong Kong ("HKU"). The case would be handled by the relevant Disciplinary Committee of RGC which had already received a report from HKU.

Declaration of interest

6. 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.

7. 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 Education University of Hong Kong ("EdUHK").

8. The Deputy Chairman declared that he was a member of the Court of HKU. Mr Abraham SHEK declared that he was a member of the Council and a representative of Legislative Council ("LegCo") sitting on the Court of HKU. He was also a member of the Court of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. Dr Priscilla LEUNG declared that she was a teaching staff member of the School of Law of City University of Hong Kong ("CityU"). Dr Kenneth CHAN declared that he was a teaching staff member at HKBU and an alumnus of The Chinese University of Hong Kong ("CUHK"). Dr Fernando CHEUNG declared that he was a lecturer of HKPolyU. Dr Helena WONG declared that she was a lecturer of HKPolyU and a representative of LegCo sitting on the Council of CUHK.

## Discussion

### *Role and powers of CE as Chancellor of institutions*

9. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that the "referendum" conducted by the staff unions and concern groups of UGC-funded institutions had urged for the abolition of CE's role as the ex-officio Chancellor of UGC-funded institutions and for a review of CE's powers to appoint members to university councils. He considered that the incumbent CE should not exercise his powers as the ex-officio Chancellor to the fullest extent .

10. SED advised that CE/Chancellor could appoint a specified number of members to the council of each institution in accordance with the relevant provisions under the governing legislation. For example, the Council of EdUHK should consist of at least one but not more than three public officers appointed by CE. However, only one public officer from the Education Bureau ("EDB") had in fact been appointed to the Council of EdUHK.

11. Mr CHENG Wing-on of the Staff Association of the Hong Kong Institute of Education sought explanation on why public officers should be appointed to the Council of EdUHK. In this regard, SED explained that it was necessary for EDB to be represented on the Council of EdUHK because EDB was a major employer of teachers and was also responsible for overseeing the professional standards for the teaching profession.

12. The Deputy Chairman recalled that quite a number of appointments made by CE were controversial, such as the recent appointment of Mr LEE



Kwan-ho as a council member of CUHK. He enquired whether CE had, before making the appointments, sought advice from EDB on the selection of candidates as university council members. Ms Cyd HO said that the Administration should explain the prevailing procedures for appointment of members to university councils.

13. SED stressed that it was not appropriate for him to comment on individual appointments to university councils. However, he said that collecting views from stakeholders and communicating with CE were part of his work. CE and EDB exchanged views on a wide range of matters. However, he would not discuss about these internal deliberations in detail.

14. 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. Traditionally, these appointments had often been regarded as a civic honour, and were 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. The Chairman was concerned that the prevailing system might be problematic if some individuals without the requisite skills and expertise had been appointed to university councils. The Deputy Chairman was of the view that the appointment of members to their governing bodies should be made by individual institutions instead of by CE/Chancellor.

15. On the parts of the Report referred to by members, SED said that they should not be interpreted out of context. He informed members that according to the feedback collected in the course of Sir Howard NEWBY's study, some appointees considered it a civic honour to be able to serve the institutions and the community. Some council members who were experts in certain disciplines also hoped to contribute to nurturing talents for the society. There was wide support, especially from lay members of councils, for a systematic approach to the induction, training and continuing professional development of all members of councils. SED further said that if necessary, arrangements could be made for Panel members to meet and exchange views with Sir Howard on the background leading to his observations and recommendations.

16. At the invitation of the Chairman, Dr CHAN Yin-ha of The Chinese University of Hong Kong Employees General Union and Mr CHENG Pui-lun of Lingnan University Students' Union said that the tertiary education sector was gravely concerned about political interference into university affairs through CE's appointment of members to university councils. It would be difficult to uphold institutional autonomy under the prevailing system when

CE was the ex-officio Chancellor of universities vested with specified powers. Professor Timothy O'LEARY of HKU Vigilance reiterated the deputation's concern that the current system was not conducive to keeping politics at arm's length from university governance.

17. Mr LAM Siu-pan of CUHK Alumni Defend Institutional Autonomy Concern Group and Mr LEUNG Hoi-fu of Unequal Grade Contribution queried that the appointment of university council members by CE had been made out of cronyism without due regard to the suitability of the candidates. Mr CHENG Sze-lut expressed serious doubt about the suitability of the appointees to serve as university council members. Mr CHEUNG Chi-wai said that the Administration's explanation could not address deputations' concerns about excessive power being vested with CE as Chancellor of institutions.

18. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that the existing statutory system might have been acceptable when past Governors and former CEs only performed ceremonial roles as Chancellor of institutions. However, he shared the concern of deputations that academic freedom and institutional autonomy were at risk due to CE's involvement in the affairs of the institutions.

19. Dr Helena WONG and Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that the terms of reference of Sir Howard's study was too restrictive. They noted with grave concern that the Report had not examined the critical question of whether CE should continue to be the ex-officio Chancellor of UGC-funded institutions and the scope of his powers as Chancellor.

20. SED reiterated that CE had all along been exercising his powers as Chancellor of institutions in accordance with the respective governing legislation. Appointment of members to the governing bodies of each institution had been made by CE in accordance with the law and on a merit basis. Allegations that CE had interfered into the affairs of universities were unfounded.

#### *Governance of institutions*

21. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung stated that he did not agree with SED's view that the prevailing system had been operating effectively over the years. Dr Helena WONG enquired whether consideration would be given to conducting another review on the existing statutory system.

22. Dr Fernando CHEUNG stressed the need to enhance transparency of the business activities undertaken by UGC-funded institutions. He concurred that

university councils should not be overly involved in the daily operation and administration of universities. Dr CHEUNG considered that the Report might have over-emphasized the importance of corporate governance, at the expense of institutional autonomy and academic freedom. He further said that the Administration should take measures to enhance the governance of institutions with reference to the "referendum" conducted by the staff organizations of the UGC-funded institutions earlier on.

23. Regarding the review on governance of institutions, SED advised that with the completion of the structural reviews conducted by each UGC-funded institution pursuant to the recommendation of the UGC's Higher Education Review Report published in 2002, the Administration considered that it was a suitable time to conduct a further study that would focus on governance practices, in particular good practices and how to better equip council members for their duties. Hence, at the request of EDB, UGC had commissioned Sir Howard to conduct the current study.

24. The Chairman enquired how the Administration could ascertain that the prevailing system had been operating effectively and whether there were ways to further improve its effectiveness. He also sought information on EDB's role in implementing the recommendations of the Report.

25. SED explained that all along, the eight UGC-funded institutions had operated in accordance with their respective governing legislation which specified their powers and responsibilities. They also enjoyed academic freedom and considerable institutional autonomy. UGC had 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. The Administration would provide appropriate support in implementing the recommendations of the Report.

26. In response to the Deputy Chairman's enquiry about Sir Howard's views, if any, on the composition of university councils, SG/UGC said that structure and composition of university councils were outside the terms of reference of the study conducted by Sir Howard.

27. Professor Timothy O'LEARY of HKU Vigilance reiterated the deputation's concern about the lack of transparency in the operation of university councils. Mr CHENG Sze-lut said that publicly-funded institutions should be accountable to the public and the operation of university councils should be more transparent. Dr Rodney CHU Wai-chi of Hong Kong Polytechnic University Staff Association queried the need to maintain confidentiality on the deliberations of university councils. On the composition

of governing councils, Dr CHU was concerned that as the current proportion of lay members appointed by CE/Chancellor far outnumbered university members, such an arrangement was not conducive to upholding the core values and mission of the institution.

28. Dr Priscilla LEUNG recalled that some 10 year 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 had dragged on for a long time. Dr LEUNG said that as the operation of UGC-funded institutions was outside the ambit of the Ombudsman, consideration should be given to setting up a cross-institutional grievance-handling mechanism.

29. SED recapped that 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 in the past 10 years. Separately, institutions had established grievance-handling and appeal mechanisms which were tailored to the particular circumstances of each institution.

#### *The Report*

30. The Deputy Chairman concurred with some depositions that the Report had raised some issues of concerns. However, its recommendations had not addressed these issues. He queried the usefulness of discussing the Report at this juncture as the Administration had already accepted the recommendations without conducting any public consultation.

31. Noting that the Report had been submitted to EDB by UGC in September 2015 but was only released in March 2016, the Deputy Chairman and Dr Helena WONG queried whether the Administration had, during the interim period, made revisions to the original version prepared by Sir Howard. In response, SG/UGC advised that minor editorial and typographical changes had been suggested by the UGC Secretariat and these minor improvements were agreed by Sir Howard for the purpose of publication of the Report. He assured members that the findings, assessment and recommendations in the Report were as Sir Howard had drafted them. Dr Helena WONG requested UGC to provide the Panel with a copy of the draft provided by Sir Howard to UGC.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1242/15-16(01) on 14 July 2016.)*

*Issues related to the role and functions of UGC*

32. Mr Abraham SHEK said that the terms of reference of the study conducted by Sir Howard was rather restrictive. Since UGC was responsible for the allocation of funding to individual institutions, Mr SHEK asked whether the Administration would review UGC's role and functions in the higher education sector in the light of developments in recent year. For instance, reference could be made to the role and operation of the Higher Education Funding Council for England. Dr Helena WONG and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung shared the view that the role and functions of UGC in the higher education sector should be reviewed.

33. On the allocation of public funding to institutions by UGC, Dr Rodney CHU Wai-chi of Hong Kong Polytechnic University Staff Association said that at present, each UGC-funded institution was required to set aside a certain percentage of its first-year-first-degree places for re-distribution among the institutions on a competitive basis. He was concerned that as the amount of block grants allocated to some institutions might be reduced as a result of the reduction in student number targets under this competitive mechanism, the development of the institution might be hampered.

34. SED advised that individual institutions enjoyed autonomy in their operation and UGC played a pivotal role in facilitating the development of the publicly-funded higher education sector in Hong Kong. The Administration and UGC were prepared to listen to the institutions' views on the prevailing policy and funding mechanism. He also informed members that as advised by Professor CHENG Kai-ming, some overseas jurisdictions had made reference to the higher education system of Hong Kong when mapping out the future development of their tertiary education sector.

35. Referring to recent reports on alleged research misconduct, Dr Kenneth CHAN enquired about the existing policy and mechanism of UGC in handling alleged misconduct in research activities undertaken by UGC-funded institutions.

36. SG/UGC advised that individual institutions should uphold the highest standard of professional conduct in research activities. As UGC and RGC were responsible for disbursing funding to universities and monitoring its use, alleged cases that involved RGC-funded research would be dealt with by the Disciplinary Committee of RGC. Membership of the Disciplinary Committee comprised international experts who had no vested interest on the local tertiary education sector.

37. Dr Roger WONG Hoi-fung of the Academic Staff Association of the University of Hong Kong expressed concern about the transparency of the work of the Disciplinary Committee and its membership. In this regard, SG/UGC advised that certain confidentiality, such as personal particulars, had to be maintained when considering disciplinary issues.

38. Dr Kenneth CHAN noted that the submission from the Academic Staff Association of the University of Hong Kong [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(12)] had raised various concerns about the mechanism in handling alleged misconduct in research activities. He requested the Administration/UGC to provide a written response to the issues raised by the deputation with reference to its submission.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1242/15-16(01) on 14 July 2016.)*

### Motion

39. The Chairman said that he had received the wording of a motion proposed to be moved by Dr Helena WONG -

"本委員會促請第六屆立法會教育事務委員會跟進今天會議的討論，邀請 Sir Howard NEWBY 就教資會資助高等教育院校的管治向委員會提交深入的跟進報告，回應各持份者對香港各大學管治的憂慮和訴求。"

(translation)

"That this Panel urges the Panel on Education of the Sixth Legislative Council to follow up the discussion at today's meeting, to invite Sir Howard NEWBY to provide to the Panel an in-depth follow-up report on governance in UGC-funded higher education institutions so as to address the worries and demands of different stakeholders about the governance in universities in Hong Kong."

40. The Chairman remarked that it might not be appropriate for the Panel to urge the Panel of the next term of LegCo to take certain action. Moreover, the motion would not have any binding effect on the following term of LegCo even if it was passed. Notwithstanding the Chairman's remarks, Dr Helena WONG considered it necessary for her to move the motion, as the Panel would not be able to pursue this matter further within the remainder of this term.

41. Ms Cyd HO suggested that instead of moving a motion, Dr WONG might consider recording her view and request in the Report of the Panel for submission to the Council. In this regard, Dr Helena WONG said that dealing with her motion at the meeting and taking on board Ms HO's suggestion were not mutually exclusive. Hence, she would not withdraw her motion.

42. On the instruction of the Chairman, the wording of the motion was tabled. At the invitation of the Chairman, SED said that the Administration would continue to communicate with LegCo and stakeholders regarding their concerns about university governance.

43. Noting that a quorum was not present at the material time and there might not be sufficient time to take a vote on her motion, Dr Helena WONG said that she would not move her motion. Instead, she requested that the wording of her motion be recorded in the minutes of meeting, as well as in the Panel's report for submission to the Council. The Chairman acceded to Dr WONG's request and members raised no objection.

44. In conclusion, the Chairman thanked the deputations for attending the meeting and sharing their views with the Panel.

## **II. Any other business**

45. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:35 pm.

## Appendix

### Panel on Education

Special meeting on Saturday, 18 June 2016, at 9:00 am

#### Meeting to receive views on issues related to the governance of University Grants Committee-funded institutions

#### Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations/individuals

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission/Major views and concerns
1.	Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(02)]
2.	HKU Alumni Concern Group	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1165/15-16(01)]
3.	Civic Party	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1128/15-16(01)]
4.	Lingnan Alumni Concern Group	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1165/15-16(02)]
5.	HKU Vigilance	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(03)]
6.	The Chinese University of Hong Kong Employees General Union	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(04)]
7.	Hong Kong Polytechnic University Staff Association	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1142/15-16(01)]
8.	Mr CHEUNG Chi-wai	He expressed concern about the power of the Chief Executive ("CE") to appoint council members of University Grants Committee("UGC")-funded institutions. Through his appointment of council members, CE could influence the decision-making process of the institutions. He urged the Administration to review the prevailing arrangement of CE being the ex-officio Chancellor of universities.
9.	Dr Annie CHAN Hau-nung	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1128/15-16(02)]
10.	Dr LAU Sin-nga	She was of the view that the Report of UGC on Governance in UGC-funded Higher Education Institutions in Hong Kong ("the Report") had inappropriately applied the concept of corporate governance to university governance. She disagreed that universities should pursue efficiency as the key element of good governance. She doubted whether the recommendations of the Report could improve university governance.



No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission/Major views and concerns
11.	Lingnan University Students' Union	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1142/15-16(02)]
12.	The Confederation of Tertiary Staff Unions	The deputation was of the view that the Report had not addressed the underlying problem relating to the composition of the governing bodies. It considered that university councils were dominated by members appointed by CE, and that public accountability and transparency of university councils should be further enhanced.
13.	Dr WONG Wai-kwok	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(05)]
14.	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University Students' Union	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1132/15-16(01)]
15.	HKUST Students' Union	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1132/15-16(02)]
16.	Mr CHENG Sze-lut	While the council was the highest governing body of a university, many council members appointed by CE often lacked the requisite expertise to discharge their duties. However, the Report did not review the power of CE to appoint council members in his capacity as the ex-officio Chancellor. The recommendations of the Report failed to address issues related to the composition of university councils.
17.	CUHK Alumni Defend Institutional Autonomy Concern Group	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1125/15-16(01)]
18.	Academic Staff Association of the Hong Kong Institute of Education	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1132/15-16(03)]
19.	Hong Kong University Employees Union	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(06)]
20.	Staff Association of the Hong Kong Institute of Education	According to the Education University of Hong Kong Ordinance, CE could appoint more than half of the council members of the University as well as the chairman and deputy chairman of its council. CE could also give direction to the University with respect to the exercise of its power and the achievement of its objects. The deputation was of the view that the Ordinance had conferred too much power on CE.
21.	The Lion Rock Institute	The deputation noted that the average student unit cost of an undergraduate place in UGC-funded institutions was around HK\$250,000. It opined that the Administration should provide a subsidy of this amount to eligible students for pursuing

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission/Major views and concerns
		university education locally or overseas. It urged the Administration to review the existing funding mechanism for higher education.
22.	The Hong Kong Institute of Education Students' Union	The deputation referred to the strong calls in the higher education sector to abolish the prevailing arrangement of CE being the ex-officio Chancellor of universities. It urged the Administration to amend the existing governing legislation, in particular the provisions on the role and power of the Chancellor. It also called for reviewing the composition of university councils.
23.	Hong Kong Baptist University Faculty and Staff Union	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(07)]
24.	Mr FUNG Jing-en	The composition of university councils should reflect a balanced representation of different stakeholders. However, at present, a considerable number of council members were appointed by CE. He urged the Administration to abolish the power of CE to appoint council members in his capacity as ex-officio Chancellor. To enhance public accountability and transparency of university councils, the minutes of meetings should be made available to the public.
25.	The Hong Kong University Students' Union	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(08)]
26.	Scholars' Alliance for Academic Freedom	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1132/15-16(04)]
27.	Mr LAI Ming-chak	In his view, the appointments to university councils were political favours offered by CE. In discharging their duties and making decisions, these appointed members might be subject to the influence of CE. To prevent political interference into university affairs, he urged the Administration to abolish the existing statutory arrangement that CE was the ex-officio Chancellor of universities and vested with the power to appoint council members.
28.	Provisional Executive Committee, City University of Hong Kong Students' Union	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(10)]
29.	Hong Kong Federation of Students	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1128/15-16(04)]
30.	Ms LEUNG Sze-wan	One of the key challenges faced by local universities was the commercialization of their research and development activities. She suggested that training could be offered to council members so as to enhance their understanding in the latest developments

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission/Major views and concerns
		in technology and knowledge transfer. She also hoped that there could be more collaboration in teaching and research activities among different faculties of an institution.
31.	Unequal Grade Contribution	The deputation objected to the implementation of the "Belt & Road" Scholarship Scheme. As there were insufficient publicly-funded undergraduate places for local students, the Administration should not use public money to subsidize foreign students to pursue university education in Hong Kong.
32.	Hong Kong Baptist University Students' Union	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(11)]
33.	Labour Party	The deputation expressed concern about the institutional autonomy and academic freedom of local universities, as a considerable number of university council members were appointed by CE under the existing system. It opined that the proportion of internal members, such as student and staff representatives, should be increased in university councils. It also called for abolishing the role and power of CE in his capacity as the ex-officio Chancellor of universities.
34.	Academic Staff Association of the University of Hong Kong	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1122/15-16(12)]
35.	Mr LO Wai-ming	Presentation of views as detailed in the submission [LC Paper No. CB(4)1132/15-16(05)]