

# 立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(4)863/17-18

(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/ED

## **Panel on Education**

### **Minutes of meeting**

**held on Friday, 1 December 2017 at 10:45 am  
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP (Chairman)  
Hon IP Kin-yuen (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai

**Members absent** : Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP

**Public Officers attending** : Agenda Item III

Mr Kevin YEUNG, JP  
Secretary for Education

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

Dr Richard ARMOUR, JP  
Secretary-General  
University Grants Committee Secretariat

Agenda item IV

Dr CHOI Yuk-lin, JP  
Under Secretary for Education

Mrs HONG CHAN Tsui-wah  
Deputy Secretary for Education (5)

**Clerk in attendance** : Ms Angel WONG  
Chief Council Secretary (4)4

**Staff in attendance** : Ms Mina CHAN  
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**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)179/17-18(01) -- Referral from Legislative Council ("LegCo") Members meeting with Sham Shui Po District Council members on 14 July 2017 on issues relating to sub-standard primary school premises

Action

- |                                 |    |  |
|---------------------------------|----|--|
| LC Paper No. CB(4)247/17-18(01) | -- | Administration's response dated 20 November 2017 to address the concerns raised by Hon Michael TIEN and Hon CHAN Chi-chuen about discussion on controversial topics in schools |
| LC Paper No. CB(4)299/17-18(01) | -- | Letter dated 3 November 2017 from Hon SHIU Ka-chun concerning the injection into the Research Endowment Fund   |
| LC Paper No. CB(4)299/17-18(02) | -- | Administration's written response dated 27 November 2017 to the letter dated 3 November 2017 from Hon SHIU Ka-chun concerning the injection into the Research Endowment Fund)  |

Members noted the above papers issued since the last meeting.

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

- |  |    |  |
|--|----|--|
| (Appendix I to LC Paper No. CB(4)287/17-18 | -- | List of outstanding items for discussion |
| Appendix II to LC Paper No. CB(4)287/17-18 | -- | List of follow-up actions)               |
2. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting on 5 January 2018 at 10:45am:
- (a) Redevelopment of Island School at 20 Borrett Road, Mid-Levels; and
  - (b) Implementation of Free Quality Kindergarten Education.
3. In view of the growing concerns over the prevalence of child sexual harassment, Ms Starry LEE urged for an early discussion of how schools could

Action

protect children from sexual harassment. The Chairman agreed to liaise with the Administration on the matter.

4. Mr HUI Chi-fung suggested the Administration to report the outcome of the review on the Basic Competency Assessment/Territory-wide System Assessment to the Panel in early 2018. The Chairman agreed to reflect Mr HUI's concern to the Administration.

**III. Hostel Development Fund for the University Grants Committee-funded Sector**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)287/17-18(01) -- Paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(4)287/17-18(02) -- Updated background brief entitled "Issues related to the provision of hostels for post-secondary students" prepared by LegCo Secretariat)

Briefing by the Administration

5. The Secretary for Education ("SED") briefed members on the Administration's proposal to set up a \$12 billion Hostel Development Fund ("HDF") as a one-off measure to provide funding for the University Grants Committee ("UGC")-funded universities to construct student hostels, details of which were set out in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(4)287/17-18(01)]. Subject to members' views, the Administration would liaise with the universities to work out the operational details of the proposal with a view to seeking funding approval from the Finance Committee ("FC") within the current legislative session.

6. Members noted the updated background brief prepared by LegCo Secretariat [LC Paper No. CB(4)287/17-18(02)].

Declaration of interest

7. 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. She reminded members to declare interests, if any, in the matter under discussion.

Action

8. Ms Starry LEE declared interest as a Court member of The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. Mr SHIU Ka-chun declared interest as a teaching staff of an university. Mr Tommy CHEUNG and Mr HO Kai-ming declared interest as Council members of The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Discussion

*Student hostel policy*

9. Mrs Regina IP and Ms Claudia MO noticed that student hostels had failed to be a channel to facilitate the integration of local and non-local students because many local students were reluctant to stay with mainland or overseas students. They urged the Administration to address the integration problem. Mr Tommy CHEUNG expressed support for increasing student hostel places and concurred that integration between local and non-local students should be promoted.

10. SED advised that the Administration had been working closely with universities to foster integration between local and non-local students. Provision of more student hostel places would help promote cultural exchange and reduce the tension between local and non-local students arising from the shortage of hostel places.

11. Mr HO Kai-ming recalled that in the past, local undergraduates had been provided with hostel places for one year during the three-year period of studies. In his opinion, it was a retrogression if they were only provided with one-year hostel accommodation during the four-year period of studies. He urged the Administration to increase the number of hostel places so that all local students could stay in hostels for at least two years of their studies. SED clarified that it was by no means the Administration's intention to shorten the duration of hostel stay of students. Students were provided with hostel places for one year during their four-year period of studies simply because the undergraduate programme had been extended from three to four years under the new senior secondary academic structure. Furthermore, whether undergraduate students would be provided with hostel places for two years of their studies involved a further deliberation at the policy level, subject to availability of land.

12. Ms Starry LEE, Dr Helena WONG and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen were concerned whether all local undergraduates would be guaranteed hostel places for one year of studies with the setting up of HDF. Mr CHAN was particularly concerned that local students would not be guaranteed hostel places with the ever-increasing number of non-local students. Dr WONG said that the Democratic Party supported the Administration to provide funding for the UGC-funded universities to construct student hostels. However, she was worried that given present-day transport facilities in the territory, local undergraduates would not be provided with hostel places if universities accorded

Action

priority to the eligibility criterion of daily home-university travelling time exceeding four hours in the allocation of hostel places.

13. Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr HO Kai-ming concurred that the criterion of daily travelling time of four hours was stringent and outdated. Mr SHIU enquired about the justifications for setting the criterion. Dr CHEUNG considered it necessary to review the criterion. Mr HO considered that universities should take into account other factors, such as contributions in extra-curricular activities, in allocating hostel places to their students.

14. SED explained that hostel accommodation was not mandatory for students. Under the current hostel policy, apart from the undergraduates whose daily travelling time exceeding four hours, all research postgraduates and non-local students would be provided with hostel places. Moreover, all undergraduate students would have the opportunity to live in hostels for at least one year. It was on the basis of the foresaid criteria that the Administration had worked out the projected hostel shortfall. Hence, when the projected hostel shortfall was fully addressed under HDF, all undergraduate students should be provided with hostel places for one year of their studies. As regards the criterion of daily travelling time of four hours, SED advised that the criterion had been long adopted by the Administration in calculating the level of publicly-funded student hostel provision. He did not consider there was a need to make a change at the present stage. In fact, allocation of student hostel places to individual students was a matter within institutional autonomy. Each university had devised its own set of criteria and procedures for allocating hostel places to students according to their own circumstances. However, universities would be required to provide hostel places to students who spent more than four hours on transportation because excessive travelling would affect learning outcome.

15. Dr Helena WONG and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen were concerned whether the Administration would ensure universities' compliance with the aforesaid criteria in allocating hostel places to their students under HDF. Dr WONG suggested that following the introduction of HDF, EDB should report to the Panel in due course the position of each student hostel project, including the design of the project, the pledged number of hostel places to be delivered, estimated completion date, and the university's compliance with the allocation policy. SED advised that UGC would be responsible for monitoring universities' compliance with the hostel policy and EDB would take note of Dr WONG's view when submitting annual report on the progress of hostel development to the Panel after the introduction of HDF.

*Monitoring of student hostel projects*

16. While supporting the idea of expediting student hostel development to address the shortfall, the Deputy Chairman, Ms Tanya CHAN, Ms Starry LEE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr LEUNG Chi-cheung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and

Action

Dr Fernando CHEUNG had reservations about the Administration's proposal to seek funding from FC for the setting up of HDF, instead of individual hostel project. Some members were worried that if individual hostel project was no longer required to obtain funding approval from FC, the monitoring role of LegCo would be undermined and a bad precedent would be set in monitoring public works projects. As public money was involved, they considered it necessary for the Administration to put in place measures under HDF to ensure proper monitoring by LegCo. The Deputy Chairman considered that funding approval for individual hostel project should be sought from FC even after the introduction of HDF. Ms CHAN suggested the Administration to consider seeking funding from FC for several projects in a bundle or by phases, say, every two to three years, under HDF. This would shorten the time for funding approval, while at the same time not compromising the monitoring role of LegCo. Mr LEUNG did not agree if the Administration turned HDF into a long-term measure, and suggested that LegCo should be consulted on the design of individual hostel projects even funding approval for HDF had been sought from FC. Dr CHEUNG considered it more appropriate for the Administration to follow the established practice that projects exceeding the financial ceiling of \$30 million should be submitted to FC for funding approval on a project basis.

17. SED explained that HDF was a one-off measure to provide funding for the universities to construct student hostels to address the projected shortfall of around 13 600 student hostel places once and for all. The Administration did not envisage any need to construct additional student hostels unless there was a substantive change in student places and/or student hostel policy. Hence, HDF would not become a long-term mechanism. Under the proposed funding mechanism, a lump-sum grant calculated based on the unit subsidy rate would be provided for the universities upfront before the universities proceeded with detailed design work. Subsequent vetting of the detailed design by government departments was not necessary. However, universities had to ensure that the projects would comply with statutory requirements and necessary approval from relevant authorities should be sought. As the hostel shortfall of the universities had been projected and suitable sites had been earmarked for construction, these projects could be taken forward once the funding was available. He therefore did not see the need to seek funding from FC by phases.

18. Mr Tommy CHEUNG said that as LegCo had been slow in the progress of approving funding proposals recently, the Liberal Party was supportive of the Administration's proposal to set up HDF as a one-off measure to speed up hostel development so as to address the hostel shortfall.

19. Mr LEUNG Chi-cheung referred to the vetting mechanism in paragraph 11(c) of the Administration's paper, and sought further elaboration on the role of Architectural Services Department ("ASD") under HDF. SED explained that in considering whether to approve grants under HDF to the universities concerned, EDB would seek ASD's comments on, among others, applications for enhanced

Action

unit subsidy rate, which was adopted in calculating a higher construction cost for student hostel projects with development constraints, such as steep topography or complicated geological condition.

*Development of student hostels*

20. The Deputy Chairman pointed out that the serious hostel shortfall was not attributed by LegCo's slow progress of approving funding proposals. In fact, the Administration's submission of funding proposals of student hostels had been decreasing over the past years. Moreover, due to the Administration's internal problems, some proposed hostel projects which had gone through the necessary planning and approval processes long ago had not yet been taken forward. The hostel project of City University of Hong Kong ("CityU") at Whitehead, Ma On Shan was an example. However, the Administration had recently informed CityU of the proposed development of a new joint student hostel project near its campus. In his view, this would inevitably cause undue delay in the construction of student hostels. He asked whether the Administration would work closely with the universities to improve the planning and development of hostel projects. Echoing the Deputy Chairman's views, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung enquired about the reasons for the decreasing number of funding proposal submitted by the Administration and the effectiveness of HDF in addressing the hostel shortfall.

21. SED clarified that the establishment of HDF aimed at speeding up the construction of student hostel projects through simpler vetting and approval procedures to meet the hostel shortfall. As regards the location of student hostels, SED explained that due to scarce land resources, it was inevitable that some hostels were not adjacent to the campuses. That said, the Administration had explored the feasibility of developing joint hostels to address the hostel shortfall. The Chairman advised that the Administration should step up its efforts in exploring suitable sites within or near the campuses for hostel development.

22. Ms Starry LEE, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr HUI Chi-fung asked how much time could be shortened to make up the projected hostel shortfall through the setting up of HDF. Dr Helena WONG enquired about the timetable for meeting the shortfall.

23. SED explained that it was difficult to estimate the amount of time that could be shortened through HDF. However, it was expected that the projected shortfall of around 13 600 student hostel places could be met within ten years with the establishment of HDF. Also, HDF would provide universities with certainty on the availability of funding from the Government which will facilitate enlisting of private donation for early implementation of hostel projects.



Action

24. Mrs Regina IP noted with concern that some student hostels were luxurious with sea-facing gymnasium and restaurants offering different cuisines. She was worried that such comfortable hostel life might make students difficult to adjust to the way of life after graduation. SED advised that the Administration would monitor the development of publicly-funded student hostel projects as per prescribed standards. For 100% privately-funded hostels, their layout and design were a matter of agreement between the donor and the university concerned.

25. While welcoming the Administration's proposal to provide funding for universities to construct student hostels, Mr CHAN Han-pan urged the Administration to help universities identify suitable sites near the campus or along the railway lines for hostel developments and to develop joint hostels. He further suggested the Administration to draw reference from the proposed "InnoCell" project adjacent to the Hong Kong Science Park to provide innovative hostel accommodation which would be conducive to students' personal growth and life planning. SED pointed out that suitable sites earmarked for student hostel development had been listed in Annex B to the Administration's paper. Upon completion of these hostel projects, the projected hostel shortfall would be met. Furthermore, the proposed HDF would allow greater flexibility for universities to exercise creativity in architectural design of the hostel buildings.

26. Mr SHIU Ka-chun expressed concern about the high construction cost of student hostels. SED advised that the Administration would work out the unit subsidy rate with the universities concerned expeditiously, and submit detailed proposals to FC for funding approval. He added that the unit subsidy rate would be higher for difficult sites with development constraints, such as complicated geological condition.

27. Noting that universities had to bear at least 25% of the construction cost of student hostels and future maintenance costs, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was worried that universities might pass on these costs to students through hostel fee increase, and in the end, needy students could not afford hostel accommodation. He enquired whether EDB would monitor the level of hostel fees. SED explained that student hostels were operated on a self-financing basis, through charges levied on hostel places and determined by universities themselves. There were channels for students to express their views when university proposed an adjustment in hostel fees. Currently, the lodging fee of student hostel ranged from \$5,000 to \$8,000 per semester. For needy undergraduates, they could apply to the Community Care Fund for hostel subsidy up to a maximum of about \$9,000 per year to meet their hostel expenses.

28. Dr Fernando CHEUNG noted that the number of hostel places of Lingnan University and The Education University of Hong Kong had not been increased in the last three academic years. He enquired whether it was because these two

Action

universities had difficulties in securing private funding to meet 25% of the construction cost. SED advised that these two universities did not suffer a shortfall in hostel places and thus were not covered under HDF.

29. Dr Helena WONG enquired about the reasons for the serious hostel shortfall of CityU and The Hong Kong Polytechnic University. Deputy Secretary for Education (1) explained that, comparatively speaking, universities located in the urban areas would encounter greater difficulties in identifying suitable sites for hostel development. Besides, the differences in hostel shortfall of universities could be related to their distinctive student intake.

Motion

30. The Chairman referred members to the following motion and its amendment:

*Motion moved by Mrs Regina IP:*

"本會促請教育局需先詳細交代如何促進校園內不同群體學生於學習生活及交流上融合才再爭取本會支持一筆過撥款 120 億元。"

(Translation)

"This Panel urges the Education Bureau to first give a detailed account of how it will promote the integration among different groups of students on campus in their studies and exchange activities before seeking again this Panel's support for the provision of a one-off grant of \$12 billion."

*Amendment motion moved by Ms Claudia MO:*

"本會促請教育局需先詳細交代如何促進本地大學校園內本地生及大陸生群體於學習生活及交流上融合才再爭取本會支持一筆過撥款 120 億元。"

(Translation)

"This Panel urges the Education Bureau to first give a detailed account of how it will promote the integration of local and Mainland student communities on local university campuses in their studies and exchange activities before seeking again this Panel's support for the provision of a one-off grant of \$12 billion."

Action

31. The Chairman put to vote the amendment motion moved by Ms Claudia MO. Six members voted for and seven members voted against the amendment motion, and two members abstained. The Chairman declared that the amendment motion was negated.

32. The Chairman then put to vote the motion moved by Mrs Regina IP. Nine members voted for the motion, no member voted against it and five members abstained. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried. Some members requested the Administration to provide a written response to the motion before submitting the funding proposal to FC.

*Summing up*

33. The Chairman reminded the Administration to give due consideration to members' concerns about the monitoring of hostel development projects under HDF. The Deputy Chairman considered that the Administration's paper to be submitted to FC should fully address members' concerns about the monitoring of individual hostel project under the proposed lump sum funding arrangement, the need to conduct a comprehensive review on the student hostel policy and the promotion of integration among students through hostel accommodation.

34. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that some members objected to the submission of the funding proposal to FC before the Administration had provided a detailed account of how it would promote the integration among different groups of students on campus in their studies and exchange activities.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's detailed account was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)517/17-18(01) on 22 January 2018.)*

**V. Implementation of whole-day schooling/homework policy and School-based After-school Learning and Support Programmes**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)287/17-18(03) -- Paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(4)302/17-18(01) -- Submission from 香港革新教育家長同盟)

Briefing by the Administration

35. At the invitation of the Chairman, Under Secretary for Education ("US(Ed)") briefed members on the implementation of whole-day primary schooling, school homework policy and School-based After-school Learning

Action

and Support Programmes, details of which were set out in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(4)287/17-18(03)].

Extension of meeting

36. The Chairman noted that quite a number of members raised their hands to ask questions on the agenda item. To allow sufficient time for discussion, she announced that the meeting would be extended by 15 minutes to 1:00 pm. She also informed members that if the discussion could not finish by that time, discussion on this agenda item would be continued at the next regular meeting in January 2018. Members noted and raised no objection.

Discussion

*Whole-day primary schooling*

37. Mr Michael TIEN questioned the findings of the thematic household survey as mentioned in paragraph 5 of the Administration's paper that whole-day primary schooling was widely recognized by the community. He pointed out that not all whole-day primary schools achieved the goal of creating a better learning environment for students. Some parents had relayed to him that some schools had neither homework policy nor tutorial periods for students to complete their homework under teachers' guidance. Furthermore, teachers would not adjust homework amount to ensure a balance of homework among different subjects. He requested the Administration to visit these schools with a view to facilitating them to implement whole-day schooling effectively. US(Ed) explained that the purpose of whole-day primary schooling was to create a favourable learning environment conducive to students' whole-person development. Whole-day primary schools might flexibly plan their curriculum in the light of school-based circumstances. The Education Bureau ("EDB") would provide professional advice and support on school practices through different channels, including school inspections, to facilitate schools' self-improvement and continuous development. EDB would follow up with Mr TIEN on the schools concerned.

*Homework policy*

38. Ms Claudia MO asked whether the Administration would consider drawing up new homework guidelines setting out the homework time ceiling of 30 minutes for lower primary students and 60 minutes for upper primary students so as to alleviate students' schoolwork stress. US(Ed) responded that EDB issued updated homework guidelines to schools from time to time, emphasizing the importance of striking a balance between the quality and quantity of homework. Through regular visits, EDB urged schools to formulate appropriate school-based homework policies and gained an understanding of such policies. Given the diverse learning needs and abilities of students, setting

Action

a daily maximum amount of homework load or time on an across-the-board basis was not conducive to catering for the needs of less able students and developing the potential of gifted students.

39. Mr Wilson OR questioned about the effectiveness of school-based homework policy in easing students' heavy homework load because there were cases where students of whole-day schools still had to do homework until bedtime. As EDB considered it unprofessional to set a daily maximum amount of homework load on an across-the-board basis, he enquired about the concrete measures to be taken by the Administration to lessen the amount of homework, such as strictly requiring schools to assign appropriate homework amount to students. US(Ed) reiterated that given the different learning abilities and needs of students, it was undesirable and unprofessional to set a daily maximum amount of homework load or time simply by an administrative instruction. EDB's guidelines had set out clearly that schools should formulate a school-based homework policy in the light of learning diversity among students, timely explain to parents the school homework policy, consult parents for their views and upload the policy onto their websites. If students have problems with or feel stressed about their homework, parents should discuss with the teachers to find a solution. EDB would take appropriate follow-up actions whenever necessary.

40. Mr HUI Chi-fung said that there had been wide public concerns over students being stressed by excessive amount of homework. Students did not have time for rest and leisure and lost interest in learning. These were signs showing that the school-based homework policy was ineffective and whole-day primary schooling had deviated from its intended objective of providing an environment conducive to an all-round and balanced education for students. He asked how EDB could ensure schools' adherence to its guidelines when assigning homework to students. Moreover, Mr HUI pointed out that there was a lack of transparency in the release of information on homework policies of individual schools for parents' reference. US(Ed) stressed that EDB attached great importance to the problem of homework pressure. EDB would look into the matter seriously and address the problem in a professional manner. As regards the availability of information on school homework policy, US(Ed) advised that some schools had uploaded such information onto their websites to inform parents of the specific requirements of their homework policies. EDB would make greater efforts to enhance the effectiveness and transparency of the school-based homework policy.

41. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan said that although the findings of the questionnaire surveys commissioned by EDB in 2015 and 2016 did not mention about heavy homework load, some schools had in reality assigned excessive homework to students which would hamper students' physical and psychological development. EDB should seriously address the problem of heavy homework load and should not only rely on school-based homework policy. He enquired

Action

how the problem could be identified and followed up under the existing policy and mechanism. Deputy Secretary for Education (5) advised that schools were encouraged to maintain close communication with parents on homework matters. If complaints from parents about homework arrangements of individual schools were not handled satisfactorily by the schools, EDB would take appropriate follow-up actions accordingly following the prevailing mechanism. In her view, the crux of the problem was the assessment culture and more efforts should be put in to change the culture. EDB had issued guidelines setting out clearly that schools should adopt diversified modes of assessment and homework based on students' abilities and learning needs. However, it would take some time for schools to bring about a positive change to the assessment culture. We would communicate with school principals and provide teachers with training to enable them to master the skills for assigning homework and conducting assessment. Therefore, EDB considered it not feasible to set a specific amount of homework for students across the board.

42. Mr SHIU Ka-chun sought explanation on the Administration's view that setting a daily maximum amount of homework load was "unprofessional". He further indicated that he would move a motion urging EDB to impose maximum hours of homework, restrict schools to assign same amount of homework on Fridays and other days and require schools to arrange at least one vacation homework-free. US(Ed) explained that setting a daily maximum amount of homework load was disrespectful to the professionalism of teachers. Teachers should be able to exercise their professional knowledge to assign appropriate amount of homework according to students' needs.

43. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that excessive amount of homework had taken a toll on children's rest and playtime. Community groups had all along demanded a cap on the amount of homework set for students. Pointing out that EDB had issued guidelines setting out the suggested lesson time allocation, he did not see why EDB considered it unprofessional to set a maximum amount of homework load and time. Dr CHEUNG expressed a strong view for a review of the education system so as to foster multiple developments of students.

44. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that an in-depth study conducted by a non-governmental organization ("NGO") between March and June 2017, with more than 1 000 students in Primary 3 to 6 being interviewed, found that about 13.2% of respondents suffered from depression and 9.7% displayed symptoms of severe depression. The three most common sources of stress for students were excessive homework, selection of secondary schools and unsatisfactory academic performance. To his understanding, the Department of Health ("DH") also arranged schoolchildren enrolling in the Student Health Service ("SHS") Programme to attend health assessment sessions (including psychological health assessment). He asked whether the assessment results of SHS Programme were similar to the findings of the aforesaid survey and whether DH would make the results public. He further suggested the Administration to make proactive

Action

efforts to regularly conduct surveys to assess primary students' psychological health, and take into account the findings when reviewing the effectiveness of whole-day schooling and homework policy. US(Ed) responded that EDB would give due consideration to EDB's survey findings making reference to other relevant surveys, and take follow-up actions when necessary. Homework should have a positive value as it could help students understand their own progress and demonstrate achievements. As such, recognition and encouraging feedback should be given to students in the process.

45. Mr Michael TIEN said that the findings of EDB's questionnaire surveys that "the time spent daily on homework by students varied from less than 0.5 hours to over 3 hours even under similar homework arrangements for students of the same grade in the same school" had revealed students' individual differences in learning. The Administration should allocate more resources to help less able students and review the education goals at kindergarten and lower primary schooling stages with the aim of developing students' interest in learning in the long run. US(Ed) advised that the Administration had been devoting considerable resources to cater for students' learning diversity. To effectively support students in learning, teachers, schools and parents had to work together to foster a close home-school partnership.

46. The Chairman urged the Administration to consider implementing "zero homework" policy by requiring schools to arrange time within lessons as far as possible for students to complete their homework under teachers' guidance so that students could have spare time to participate in extra-curricular activities conducive to balanced and healthy development.

*(At about 12:50 pm, with the consent of all members present, the Chairman further extended the meeting for 15 minutes to 1:15 pm and announced that the discussion on this agenda item would be continued at the next regular meeting in January 2018. As such, the five motions proposed under this item (wording of the motions in **Appendices I to V respectively**) would be dealt with at that meeting.)*

**V. Any other business**

47. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:15 pm.

**教育事務委員會**  
**Panel on Education**

在2017年12月1日的會議上  
就議程項目"小學全日制／家課政策及校本課後學習及支援計劃的推行"  
提出的議案

**Motion proposed under the agenda item**  
**"Implementation of whole-day schooling/homework policy and School-based**  
**After-school Learning and Support Programmes"**  
**at the meeting on 1 December 2017**

**議案措辭**

《香港教育制度改革建議》鼓勵學校訂立明確的政策和採取適切的措施，照顧學生的多元能力和不同學習需要。現時部份學校的家課政策未能有效照顧不同學生的學習差異，而不少家長亦不懂得如何照顧孩子的學習需要。就此，本委員會促請政府當局，就學校和家長處理學習差異的責任，對雙方作出具體指引，以免雙方無所適從。

(田北辰議員動議)

**Wording of the Motion**

(Translation)

The Reform Proposals for the Education System in Hong Kong encourages schools to formulate clear policies and adopt appropriate measures to develop students' multiple abilities and meet their diverse needs. The existing homework policies of some schools fail to cater for learning diversity among different students in an effective way, and quite a lot of parents do not know how to fulfill the learning needs of their children. In this connection, this Panel urges the Administration to draw up concrete guidelines on the responsibilities of schools and parents in handling learning diversity, so that the two parties will not be thrown into confusion.

(Moved by Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun)



**教育事務委員會**  
**Panel on Education**

**在2017年12月1日的會議上**  
**就議程項目"小學全日制／家課政策及校本課後學習及支援計劃的推行"**  
**提出的議案**

**Motion proposed under the agenda item**  
**"Implementation of whole-day schooling/homework policy and School-based**  
**After-school Learning and Support Programmes"**  
**at the meeting on 1 December 2017**

**議案措辭**

本會促請政府正視小學生及家長的家課壓力問題，及研究於局方向學校發出的指引中制定更具體及合理的家課量指標，及確保學校跟隨於校內的休息時間指引。

(許智峯議員動議)

**Wording of the Motion**

(Translation)

This Panel urges the Government to face up to the problem of homework pressure on primary students and their parents, study the formulation of a more specific and reasonable indicator for homework load in the guidelines issued by the Education Bureau to schools, and ensure that schools will follow the guidelines on rest time in schools.

(Moved by Hon HUI Chi-fung)

**教育事務委員會**  
**Panel on Education**

在2017年12月1日的會議上  
就議程項目"小學全日制／家課政策及校本課後學習及支援計劃的推行"  
提出的議案

Motion proposed under the agenda item  
"Implementation of whole-day schooling/homework policy and School-based  
After-school Learning and Support Programmes"  
at the meeting on 1 December 2017

**議案措辭**

鑒於本港近年發生多宗學童因為學習壓力而輕生的不幸事件，有父母亦反映香港學童的功課量太多，每日放學後要耗用大量時間才能完成，導致缺乏合理的遊戲時間；更有甚者，部份學童連休息和睡眠的時間亦不足夠。

就此，本委員會促請政府盡快全面審視現行本港教育制度下的中／小學學童功課量；同時率先在全港小一至小三級別推行自願參加性質的"回家零功課"研究計劃，要求參與計劃的學校讓學童在上課時間內完成全部功課，回家後不用再埋頭苦幹，以減輕學童壓力。

(柯創盛議員動議，張國鈞議員附議)

**Wording of the Motion**

(Translation)

A spate of unfortunate incidents of students committing suicide due to study pressure has occurred in Hong Kong in recent years. Some parents have also relayed that the homework load of Hong Kong students is too heavy. Every day, students have to devote a lot of time to finish their homework after school. Consequently, they lack a reasonable amount of time to play. Moreover, some students do not even have enough time to rest and sleep.

In this connection, this Panel urges the Government to expeditiously conduct a comprehensive review of the homework load of primary/secondary students under the existing education system of Hong Kong. In parallel, the Government should take the lead to implement in

Primary One to Primary Three classes over the territory a voluntary "zero homework" study programme by requesting participating schools to let students finish all their homework during school hours, so as to alleviate the pressure on students as they no longer need to work strenuously at home after school.

(Moved by Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing and seconded by Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan )

**教育事務委員會**  
**Panel on Education**

在2017年12月1日的會議上  
就議程項目"小學全日制／家課政策及校本課後學習及支援計劃的推行"  
提出的議案

**Motion proposed under the agenda item**  
**"Implementation of whole-day schooling/homework policy and School-based**  
**After-school Learning and Support Programmes"**  
**at the meeting on 1 December 2017**

**議案措辭**

本會促請教育局需重訂"功課指引"，並積極考慮制訂：

- (1) 最高功課時間；
- (2) 限制學校於星期五給予學生的功課量應與平日上課日子一樣；  
及
- (3) 學校需釋出最少一個長假期不給予任何功課，讓學生擁有  
"真假期"。

(邵家臻議員動議)

**Wording of the Motion**

(Translation)

This Panel urges the Education Bureau to revise the "homework guidelines" and actively consider :

- (1) setting maximum homework time;
- (2) requiring schools to assign same amount of homework on Fridays and other school days;
- (3) requiring schools to arrange at least one long vacation homework-free so as to allow students to have a "genuine vacation".

(Moved by Hon SHIU Ka-chun)

**教育事務委員會**  
**Panel on Education**

**在2017年12月1日的會議上**  
**就議程項目"小學全日制／家課政策及校本課後學習及支援計劃的推行"**  
**提出的議案**

**Motion proposed under the agenda item**  
**"Implementation of whole-day schooling/homework policy and School-based**  
**After-school Learning and Support Programmes"**  
**at the meeting on 1 December 2017**

**議案措辭**

有國際研究顯示，全球46個國家及地區中，香港的功課時間第二高，研究亦發現，功課時間愈短，學生閱讀能力愈高。近年有很多學生及兒童亦表示功課壓力過重，應予以限制。本委員會促請教育局應為全港幼兒及小學生訂下最高功課量和時間的上限指引，並主動監察此等指引是否得以落實，還兒童健康成長的空間。

(張超雄議員動議)

**Wording of the Motion**

(Translation)

According to an international study covering 46 countries and regions, Hong Kong school children spend the second-longest time on homework. The study also found that students who spend less time doing homework are better readers. In recent years, many students and children have also indicated that their homework burden is excessively heavy and the amount of homework should be limited. This Panel urges the Education Bureau to formulate guidelines to cap the homework load and homework hours of small children and primary students of Hong Kong as well as to actively monitor the implementation of such guidelines, so as to give back to children a healthy environment to grow up.

(Moved by Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung)