

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(4)889/19-20  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/ED

**Panel on Education**

**Minutes of special meeting**  
**held on Monday, 25 May 2020 at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon IP Kin-yuen (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, SBS, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan, JP  
Hon CHAN Chun-ying, JP  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP

Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH, JP  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS  
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

**Members attending** : Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, GBS, JP  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu

**Members absent** : Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon HO Kai-ming

**Public Officers attending** : Agenda item III  
  
Mr Kevin YEUNG, JP  
Secretary for Education  
  
Mrs Ingrid YEUNG, JP  
Permanent Secretary for Education  
  
Mrs HONG CHAN Tsui-wah  
Deputy Secretary for Education (5)  
  
Dr Gloria CHAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Curriculum Development)  
Education Bureau  
  
Dr SO Kwok-sang  
Secretary General  
Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority

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

**Staff in attendance** : Miss Mandy NG  
Senior Council Secretary (4)4

Ms Rachel WONG  
Council Secretary (4)4

Ms Sandy HAU  
Legislative Assistant (4)4

---

Action

**I. Mechanism of question setting of the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination**

- (LC Paper No. CB(4)607/19-20(01) -- Paper provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(4)607/19-20(02) -- Letter dated 20 May 2020 from Hon Elizabeth QUAT
- LC Paper No. CB(4)607/19-20(03) -- Letter dated 20 May 2020 from Hon IP Kin-yuen
- LC Paper No. CB(4)582/19-20(01) -- Letter dated 15 May 2020 from Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan
- LC Paper No. CB(4)582/19-20(02) -- Letter dated 15 May 2020 from Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
- LC Paper No. CB(4)582/19-20(03) -- Joint letter dated 15 May 2020 from 13 Members)

The Deputy Chairman advised that the above letters [LC Paper Nos. CB(4)607/19-20(02)-(03) and CB(4)582/19-20(01)-(03)] had been circulated to members before the meeting.

*(The Chairman took the chair.)*

Briefing by the Administration

2. The Secretary for Education ("SED") briefed members on the views of the Education Bureau ("EDB") on Question 2(c) of the History 1 examination paper in the 2020 Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination ("HKDSE"), which was a compulsory question. The Secretary General, Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority ("SG/HKEAA") then briefed members on the question-setting mechanism of HKEAA. Details of the briefings were set out in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(4)607/19-20(01)].

## Discussion

### *Design and marking scheme of Question 2(c) of History Paper 1*

3. Mr Vincent CHENG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr Tony TSE, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Holden CHOW pointed out that the Japanese invasion of China had caused millions of deaths in China. There was definitely no room for discussion in Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 in the 2020 HKDSE as what Japan did to China between 1900 and 1945 was "all harm and no good". The question had presented a wrong set of values about Sino-Japanese history during the specific period. Mr TSE considered that the question concerned would seriously hurt the feelings and dignity of the Chinese people who suffered great pain during the Japanese invasion of China. Mr CHOW and Ms Elizabeth QUAT expressed some candidates' concern that they were distressed by the question concerned which required them to comment on the historical events from the perspective of "good".

4. Ms Claudia MO, Ms Tanya CHAN and Dr KWOK Ka-ki pointed out that according to MAO Zedong, the Japanese invasion played a role in the making of modern China. They questioned why EDB and HKEAA had regarded Question 2(c) which stated that "Japan did more good than harm to China in the period 1900-1945" as problematic.

5. On the two pieces of information attached to Question 2(c) of History Paper 1, Mr Vincent CHENG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Ms Elizabeth QUAT, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, and Mr Tony TSE remarked that the historical materials quoted in Question 2(c) were one-sided, leading and biased, focusing only on Japan's assistance to China. The history of the Japanese invasion of China, Japanese interference in the affairs of China, etc. between 1900 and 1945 were overlooked in the sources provided. It was highly possible that candidates would be misled into making wrong interpretations, resulting in an incorrect understanding of the historical events concerned. Mr TSE highlighted that the information provided in the question was misleading as it only covered a short period out of the 45-year period which candidates were asked to address. Ms QUAT said that some parents and candidates had complained to her about the leading examination question concerned.

6. Mr CHAN Chun-ying enquired why Question 2(c) only asked candidates to address the period 1900-1945, given that the Sino-Japanese relations had a long history. He then pointed out that Source D of the question which was related to the loan of the Mitsui Company was incomplete, without setting out all loan conditions. It was also impossible for candidates to judge whether the proposed interest rate was reasonable at that time. Candidates would easily be misled into thinking that it was good for Japan to make the loan to China. He also considered that candidates might have difficulties in comprehending

Action

Sources C and D which were in Classical Chinese. He questioned whether HKEAA had over-estimated the ability of candidates.

7. Dr Priscilla LEUNG considered data-response questions not appropriate for Liberal Studies ("LS") and History subjects. She advised that according to students, they could easily tackle data-response questions by simply copying the information provided in the questions. As the information attached to Question 2(c) was one-sided, most candidates would definitely be misled that Japan had done some good to China in the period 1900-1945.

8. Ms Claudia MO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr KWONG Chun-yu, Dr Helena WONG, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr Fernando CHEUNG pointed out that Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 was an open-ended question, the format of which had been widely adopted in public examinations. The question types of "more good than harm" and vice versa were also commonly used in the school sector for the purpose of nurturing students' critical thinking. In answering the question, candidates should draw on the knowledge they had learnt and make reference to the sources provided to argue one way or the other. Dr WONG relayed some candidates' feedback that Question 2(c) was appropriate.

9. SED advised that EDB in principle did not object to adopting open-ended questions in examinations. However, not all topics were suitable as open-ended questions, or suitable for using "more good than harm" as the analysis dimension in a question. Question 2(c) by design had serious faults. Permanent Secretary for Education ("PS(Ed)") supplemented that the tremendous harm Japan inflicted on China during 1900-1945 was crystal clear and beyond dispute. It was impossible to make a meaningful comparison between the atrocities of Japanese invasion of China and any so-called benefits generated in that period. Therefore, the design of the examination question concerned was grossly inappropriate.

10. Deputy Secretary for Education (5) ("DS(Ed)5") explained that the major topics featured in the curriculum and textbooks were all related to the Japanese invasion of China. Given that Source D was incomplete in presenting the true nature of the historical event, students might have difficulties in understanding the complexity behind the deal concerned in the source. Moreover, teachers would rarely touch upon the economic invasion as quoted in the sources as the emphasis of the curriculum was not on economic invasion. The question concerned was not compatible with the History curriculum objectives and the information provided in the question did not fall within the level of understanding of the students. Hence, the information would easily lead the candidates into forming a biased or even wrong understanding of the events concerned. Under History education, it was important to educate students of positive values and common historical perspectives, and this was clearly stated as an objective of the History Curriculum and Assessment Guide (Secondary 4-6) ("History C&A

Action

Guide"). As the question concerned had serious faults in design, it could not come up with a reliable marking scheme to differentiate students' abilities.

11. Ms Tanya CHAN advised that according to the History curriculum for Secondary 4 to 6, the Japanese invasion of China was not the only focus. Instead, students were required to have a holistic understanding about modernization and transformation of China. The Deputy Chairman pointed out that the themes of the History curriculum for Secondary 4 to 6 were to provide students with the opportunities to acquire an overview of political, social, economic and cultural conditions of Japan in the early 20th century and the rise of militarism and its consequences. Hence, to his understanding, economic invasion of Japan should have been covered in the curriculum.

12. Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan asked how Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 would be graded, such as whether grades would be given by counting the number of points about the good done by the Japanese against the harm done by the Japanese. SG/HKEAA advised that the question was designed to assess the candidates' ability to interpret and evaluate historical events about Sino-Japanese relations in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. As candidates should effectively use both the sources provided and their own knowledge to answer the question, they were also expected to point out the mass casualties caused by the Japanese invasion between the 1930s and 1940s. Emphasis in the marking would be on assessing the quality of thinking and the historical skills displayed by the candidates, rather than factual recall or the ability to write at length.

13. Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Holden CHOW requested HKEAA to release the marking scheme of Question 2(c) of History Paper 1. In their view, the marking scheme which specified the requirements of individual questions, mark allocation and range of acceptable responses could indicate how candidates were expected to use the information provided in the question. In other words, the marking scheme could reveal the process of setting the question and the expected standard of performance.

14. SG/HKEAA undertook to seek the approval of the HKEAA Council for releasing the marking scheme of Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 and advised that the marking scheme of an open-ended question, like Question 2(c), was only prepared for markers as an important reference and should not be regarded as a model answer. During the standardization and marking processes, revisions would be made to the marking scheme if necessary. Markers would then be briefed on the assessment objectives and requirements of individual questions in the markers' meeting to ensure parity of marking among different markers. Teachers and other readers who were not involved in the marking process should

Action

interpret the contents of the marking scheme with caution.

*(Post-meeting note: The marking scheme of Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)819/19-20(01) on 16 July 2020.)*

*Invalidation of Question 2(c) of History Paper 1*

15. In view of the serious design faults of Question 2(c) of History Paper 1, Mr Vincent CHENG, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Tony TSE and Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan supported HKEAA's final decision to invalidate Question 2(c) of History Paper 1. Mr LEUNG and Mr TSE appreciated that EDB had made prompt response in the incident. Ms QUAT and Mr CHEUNG pointed out that should the question not be invalidated, students would study the examination question concerned as past paper in the coming years and argued for the good that the Japanese had done to China.

16. Mr Vincent CHENG and Ms Elizabeth QUAT said that candidates were innocent as Question 2(c) had to be invalidated owing to the design faults. Ms QUAT asked how the candidates' HKDSE results would be affected.

17. SG/HKEAA advised that the HKEAA Council had considered various mark adjustment proposals for affected candidates. After due deliberation, two methods would be used to impute two scores associated with the invalidated question. In gist, one score was imputed based on the candidates' performance in Question 2(a) and (b) of Paper 1, on the basis that these two other questions also assessed the candidates' knowledge of the same historical topic as in Question 2(c). Then, a second score was imputed based on the candidates' performance in Questions 1(c), 3(c) and 4(c) of Paper 1, on the basis that these three other questions also assessed the same abilities as in Question 2(c). In the best interests of the candidates, they would receive a higher of the two imputed scores as the final adjusted score for Question 2(c).

18. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung noted from SG/HKEAA that around seven to eight examination personnel were involved in the question-setting process of Question 2(c) of History Paper 1. As HKEAA had mechanisms in place at various stages of question setting to ensure the quality of examination questions, he considered that EDB should not challenge the professionalism of HKEAA and request HKEAA to invalidate Question 2(c). Mr WU Chi-wai and Dr Helena WONG considered that EDB/HKEAA had invalidated Question 2(c) without reasonable justification. The question was set in accordance with the History C&A Guide and the Assessment Framework.

19. SG/HKEAA responded that after considering the professional views on examination and assessment, the curriculum, and the interests of candidates, the

Action

HKEAA Council came to the view that the design of this question had deviated from the learning and assessment objectives as set out in the History C&A Guide. The reference materials provided in the question were merely excerpts from the original sources, and the language used in the question was imbalanced. These could lead candidates into making a superficial or one-sided interpretation and answer within the limited examination time given. The Council therefore decided to invalidate Question 2(c) of History Paper 1.

20. Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr SHIU Ka-chun pointed out that there were similar open-ended questions in the public examinations conducted by HKEAA in the past which were not invalidated. For instance, Mr KWOK quoted an examination question "in what ways do you think a Nazi leader could be regarded as a hero" in 1997 which in his view was also beyond the pale. They enquired about the criteria for invalidating Question 2(c) of History Paper 1. Mr SHIU Ka-chun enquired about the number of candidates taken the History examination this year and the number of open-ended questions with an argument for "more good than harm to China" or vice versa in HKDSE History and Chinese History examination papers in the past decade.

21. DS(Ed)5 mentioned that all examination and assessment organizations including HKEAA had established a set of question-setting principles and guidelines in relation to sensitive subject matters which should be observed. According to HKEAA, Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 had not observed the question-setting principles and guidelines in relation to sensitive subject matters. During the period, Japan had been trying to invade China from different fronts. It was not appropriate for the sources to lead candidates to discuss about the "good". Further, taking the question "in what ways do you think a Nazi leader could be regarded as a hero" as an example, such question would likely trigger controversies if asked in an examination in Germany. In response to the example of the 1997 question set by HKEAA, PS(Ed) supplemented that the question on Nazi rules was a question in 1997. The set of principles and guidelines might not be the same back then.

22. Prof Joseph LEE opined that from the assessment point of view, an examination question should be invalidated if it misled candidates to give answers differed from the marking scheme. He enquired whether the candidates' answers had demonstrated that they had been misled by the question concerned to develop a wrong understanding of the historical events. Mr Tommy CHEUNG enquired whether the markers' meeting had been convened for the invalidated question.

23. SG/HKEAA responded that when the HKEAA Council discussed whether Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 should be invalidated, the examination scripts were not marked. To facilitate professional discussion of the HKEAA Council, HKEAA had conducted an initial review on the examination scripts of



Action

Question 2(c). It was found that 57.1% of candidates answered that "Japan did more harm than good" to China, 38% agreed that "Japan did more good than harm", and 4.9% did not take a stance. Given that 38% of candidates answered "Japan did more good than harm", HKEAA believed that candidates might have been misled by the question to reach a biased conclusion. The HKEAA Council therefore decided not to proceed to mark the scripts as it would be difficult to formulate an accurate marking scheme when the question was set inappropriately. Also, it would be unfair to candidates as the question was misleading. As the HKEAA Council decided not to proceed the marking work of the examination question concerned, the markers' meeting had yet been convened.

24. Ms Elizabeth QUAT and Ms YUNG Hoi-yan considered that the question concerned was obviously misleading as 38% of the candidates were misled to reach a biased conclusion. Given that a majority of candidates answered "Japan did more harm than good", Mr KWONG Chun-yu, the Deputy Chairman and Dr KWOK Ka-ki queried the need to invalidate the question. Dr Helena WONG considered that the candidates' performance had clearly demonstrated that Question 2(c) was a good examination question for identifying top performing candidates who could correctly evaluate historical events.

25. Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr KWONG Chun-yu, Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that EDB had failed to protect the candidates' interests. Invalidation of the question concerned would cause unfairness to the candidates. Mr WU said that the reputation and international recognition of HKDSE would be negatively impacted if the question was invalidated. Mr HUI, Mr KWONG and Dr KWOK requested EDB to apologize to all affected candidates.

26. Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr KWONG Chun-yu, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, the Deputy Chairman, Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Dr KWOK Ka-ki noted that the Chief Executive ("CE") had publicly expressed views on the question concerned before HKEAA decided to invalidate it. They considered that CE and EDB should not intervene academic freedom by putting pressure on HKEAA to invalidate Question 2(c). It was a clear reflection that EDB had put politics before professionalism.

27. SED stressed that CE had not been involved in the incident. The decision to invalidate the examination question concerned was purely professional without any political considerations. According to the educational experts in EDB, Question 2(c) by design had serious faults. From the assessment point of view, for a question with serious faults in design, there could not be a reliable, objective marking scheme to differentiate students. EDB therefore requested HKEAA to invalidate the question concerned in the interests of students. The HKEAA Council, after due deliberation, also came to the view that

Action

the design of the question concerned was inappropriate and decided to invalidate it. The question concerned was invalidated to safeguard the education profession and address the public concern.

*Question-setting mechanism of the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority*

28. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Ms Elizabeth QUAT, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr Holden CHOW pointed out that Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 had revealed loopholes in the current question-setting mechanism of HKEAA. EDB/HKEAA should conduct a comprehensive review of the mechanism to ensure the quality of HKDSE examination papers and to prevent recurrence of similar incidents in the future. Ms QUAT asked when and how the question-setting mechanism would be reviewed. Dr LEUNG urged EDB/HKEAA to complete the review in three months and undertake improvement measures promptly. Ms YUNG considered that EDB/HKEAA should take forward the review in an open and transparent manner.

29. SED advised that EDB would conduct detailed investigation as to why a problematic examination question appeared in this year's History paper despite HKEAA had put in place quality assurance measures for HKDSE. EDB would also review the existing mechanism to fulfil its monitoring role in the conduct of HKDSE, with a view to ensuring the sustained quality of HKDSE and examination questions.

30. DS(Ed)5 supplemented that the HKEAA Council had agreed to cooperate with EDB to review the question setting and moderation mechanism of HKDSE. EDB would set up a task force with representatives from the education sector and HKEAA. EDB had requested HKEAA to conduct an internal investigation on the incident, review the question setting and moderation mechanism and whether the mechanism had been prudently complied with in the question setting and moderation of the History examination paper. An internal investigation report had to be submitted to the task force in late June for review and follow-up. Subject to the preliminary findings of HKEAA's investigation, the task force would complete its review and propose improvement measures as soon as possible.

31. Mr Vincent CHENG noted that a moderation committee was set up for each of the 24 Category A subjects of HKDSE to develop examination questions and marking scheme. He was concerned whether there were loopholes with the Moderation Committee ("MC") of the History subject. He asked who would make the final decision on the appointment of MC members and whether EDB had deployed any staff members to join the History MC. In his view, it was necessary for EDB to review the operation of MCs of all subjects to address the inadequacies in the established mechanisms of HKEAA and deploy its staff

Action

member(s) to join MCs of different subjects in order to enhance its monitoring role.

32. SED advised that HKEAA took full responsibility for the work of MCs. As the work of MCs was highly confidential, EDB had no knowledge of the relevant duties (including the list of MC members). SG/HKEAA explained that the nominations for MC of each subject were assessed by the General Manager - Assessment Development in the past. Starting from this year, the nominations had been assessed by both the General Manager - Assessment Development and the Director - Public Examinations, and approval of SG/HKEAA would be sought under special circumstances. HKEAA would cooperate with EDB to review the question setting and moderation mechanism including the mechanism for appointing MC members.

33. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan noted that EDB had nominated a staff member to join MC of the History subject in 2019 but so far no member was invited. She enquired why HKEAA did not accept the nomination. SG/HKEAA advised that the major considerations in selection of MC members included their subject knowledge and expertise, as well as their relevant experience in teaching and assessment. In recent years, there had been a rise in the number of EDB staff members invited by HKEAA to join MCs.

*(At about 4:25 pm, the Chairman informed members that the meeting would be extended for 15 minutes to 4:45 pm.)*

*Professional conduct of examination personnel*

34. Ms Elizabeth QUAT considered that some HKEAA staff members and teachers who set Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 had made use of HKDSE for disseminating their political stance, constituting a breach of professional conduct. Ms YUNG Hoi-yan enquired who should be held accountable for the incident. Mr Holden CHOW requested HKEAA to announce the number of teachers involved in setting the problematic examination question and the penalty system to be adopted.

35. Mr SHIU Ka-chun considered that the setting of Question 2(c) of the History Paper 1 had nothing to do with the professional conduct of individual staff members of HKEAA. HKEAA should stand forward to defend the professionalism of its staff. Dr Helena WONG and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen shared similar view.

36. Mr HUI Chi-fung asked whether HKEAA had invalidated the examination question concerned on account of Ms Elizabeth QUAT's view that some HKEAA staff members had committed professional misconduct and whether the two HKEAA staff members concerned were resigned voluntarily or unwillingly.

Action

37. SG/HKEAA advised that the HKEAA Council had decided to invalidate Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 after giving due consideration to the professional views on examination and assessment, the curriculum, and the interests of candidates. Regarding the two staff members concerned, HKEAA would not comment on personnel matters within HKEAA.

38. Noting that a HKEAA staff member responsible for setting Question 2(c) of History Paper 1 had disseminated radical political ideas on different occasions, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan cast doubt on whether the staff member was qualified for setting questions for HKDSE. She strongly urged HKEAA to step up efforts in upholding a high standard of professional conduct.

39. Mr Holden CHOW expressed concern about remarks made by a senior staff of HKEAA to glorify the history of the Japanese invasion of China. He considered that the senior staff should be penalized for his conduct if he was involved in the setting of the problematic examination question.

*(At about 4:39 pm, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that the meeting would be further extended beyond 4:45 pm to allow sufficient time for discussion.)*

40. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan pointed out that according to a media report, a senior manager of assessment development of HKEAA had in his official capacity introduced to some students and parents the assessment requirements of LS subject at a seminar organized by the Civic Party and Demosistō just two weeks before HKDSE in 2017. As the senior manager concerned was involved in setting the questions of LS subject in HKDSE, he considered that the senior manager's participation in such seminar was inappropriate and would cause unfairness to other candidates. HKEAA should seriously follow up on the incident and give a reasonable explanation to the public.

41. SG/HKEAA advised that he did not know about the incident mentioned by Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan. In fact, managers of HKEAA would hold events on a regular basis to enhance public understanding of the assessment requirements of HKDSE. Concerning staff conduct, all HKEAA employees were bound by HKEAA's relevant regulations, procedures, rules and policies when performing their duties. HKEAA had a mechanism to follow up staff discipline issues. It would follow up the incident fairly and impartially having regard to the relevant facts and the Employee Code of Conduct and regulations. An employee who was found to have committed negligence when performing his/her duties or compromised professional ethics, integrity and professionalism would be subject to disciplinary actions in accordance with the gravity of the case and the responsibility to be borne.

Action

Motions

42. The Chairman referred members to the three motions tabled at the meeting. The first motion was proposed by Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and seconded by Ms Elizabeth QUAT. The second one was proposed by Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and seconded by Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung. The third one was proposed by Dr Fernando CHEUNG. (Wording of motions at **Appendices I to III**).

43. The Chairman put to vote Ms YUNG Hoi-yan's motion. At Ms YUNG's request, the Chairman directed that the voting bell be rung for five minutes to notify members of the voting. The following 19 members voted for the motion:

Ms Starry LEE, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Ms Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Dr Junius HO, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr LAU Kwok-fan, Mr Vincent CHENG, Mr Tony TSE and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan.

The following 14 members voted against:

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr Charles MOK, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Dennis KWOK, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai.

No member abstained. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

44. The Chairman put to vote Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan's motion. The following 19 members voted for the motion:

Ms Starry LEE, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Ms Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Dr Junius HO, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr LAU Kwok-fan, Mr Vincent CHENG, Mr Tony TSE and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan.

The following 14 members voted against:

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr Charles MOK, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Dennis KWOK, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr CHU Hoi-dick,

Action

Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai.

No member abstained. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

45. The Chairman put to vote Dr Fernando CHEUNG's motion. The following 14 members voted for the motion:

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Prof Joseph LEE, Ms Claudia MO, Mr Charles MOK, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Dennis KWOK, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Dr CHENG Chung-tai.

The following 18 members voted against:

Ms Starry LEE, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Ms Alice MAK, Ms Elizabeth QUAT, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Ir Dr LO Wai-kiwok, Mr Jimmy NG, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr Wilson OR, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, Mr LAU Kwok-fan, Mr Vincent CHENG, Mr Tony TSE and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan.

Dr Junius HO abstained. The Chairman declared that the motion was not carried.

**II. Any other business**

46. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:56 pm.

教育事務委員會  
Panel on Education

在 2020 年 5 月 25 日的特別會議上  
就議程項目 "香港中學文憑考試的擬題機制" 通過的議案  
Motion passed under the agenda item  
"Mechanism of question setting of the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary  
Education Examination" at the special meeting on 25 May 2020

**議案措辭**

就本年度香港中學文憑試歷史科卷一必答題要求考生就「1900-45 年間，日本為中國帶來的利多於弊」的論點表達意見，題目並同時提供了兩段偏頗的資料供考生參考作答，內容皆為日本人在 20 世紀初如何協助中國發展，但對於往後日本冷血侵略中國的史實卻欠奉，有刻意引導考生錯誤理解當年中日關係之嫌，題目本身極不恰當和有欠教育專業。對於香港考試及評核局（考評局）委員會最終決定取消這條必答題，本事務委員會表示支持。

另外，就考評局內負責擬訂歷史科試卷的審題委員會成員將個人政治見解帶入文憑試題目中，刻意扭曲史實誤導考生，嚴重傷害了日本侵華戰爭中受到莫大苦難的國民的感情和尊嚴，本事務委員會深表憤慨，敦促教育局及考評局必須嚴肅調查事件，嚴懲以至解僱所有涉事成員，並改善現時文憑試擬題和審題的監督機制，避免同類事件再發生。

(容海恩議員動議，葛珮帆議員和議)

## **Wording of the Motion**

(Translation)

A compulsory question in History Paper 1 of this year's Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination ("HKDSE") required candidates to give their standpoints on "Japan did more good than harm to China in the period 1900-1945". The question also provided two paragraphs of biased information for reference of candidates in answering the question. Such information was all about how Japanese helped China develop during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, without mentioning the historical facts of the subsequent ruthless Japanese invasion of China. This has aroused suspicion that candidates were deliberately guided to misunderstand the Sino-Japanese relations back then. The question itself was grossly inappropriate and lacked educational professionalism. This Panel supports the final decision of the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority ("HKEAA") to invalidate the compulsory question.

In addition, those moderation committee members in HKEAA who were responsible for setting the History examination paper had infused their personal political views into the HKDSE question to deliberately mislead candidates by distorting historical facts, and thus seriously hurt the feelings and dignity of the Chinese people who suffered great pain during the Japanese invasion of China. In this connection, this Panel expresses grave anger and urges that the Education Bureau and HKEAA must conduct a serious investigation into this incident, impose severe punishments on and even dismiss all the members involved, and improve the existing monitoring mechanism for the setting and moderating of HKDSE questions, so as to avoid the recurrence of similar incidents.

(Moved by Hon YUNG Hoi-yan and seconded by Hon Elizabeth QUAT)



教育事務委員會  
Panel on Education

在 2020 年 5 月 25 日的特別會議上  
就議程項目"香港中學文憑考試的擬題機制"通過的議案  
Motion passed under the agenda item  
"Mechanism of question setting of the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary  
Education Examination" at the special meeting on 25 May 2020

**議案措辭**

就本年度香港中學文憑試歷史科試卷出現有問題的題目，香港考試及評核局(考評局)卻監管不力，引起本港社會重大爭議，更冒犯了受日本侵華傷害的中國人民，亦令考生感到困擾。就此，本會促請考評局就此事公開道歉及作全面交代。

(張國鈞議員動議，蔣麗芸議員及梁志祥議員和議)

**Wording of the Motion**

(Translation)

Regarding a problematic question appeared in the History examination paper of this year's Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination, the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority ("HKEAA") has failed to monitor the situation properly. This has not only aroused heated controversies in Hong Kong society, but also offended the Chinese people who suffered during the Japanese invasion of China. Candidates were disturbed as well. In this connection, this Panel urges HKEAA to make a public apology and give a full account of the incident.

(Moved by Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and seconded by Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan and Hon LEUNG Che-cheung)

教育事務委員會  
Panel on Education

在 2020 年 5 月 25 日的特別會議上  
就議程項目"香港中學文憑考試的擬題機制"提出的議案  
Motion proposed under the agenda item  
"Mechanism of question setting of the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary  
Education Examination" at the special meeting on 25 May 2020

**議案措辭**

教育局對香港中學文憑試歷史科試題其中一分題表示該試題「嚴重傷害了在日本侵華戰爭中受到莫大苦難的國民的感情和尊嚴」並逼令考評局取消該試題。本委員會認為此舉是以政治凌駕專業。為了政治正確而犧牲了學生的利益，影響考試的公平性。本委員會促請教育局及考評局收回取消此題目的決定。

(張超雄議員動議)

**Wording of the Motion**

(Translation)

Regarding one of the sub-questions in the History examination paper of the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination, the Education Bureau ("EDB") commented that the question "seriously hurt the feelings and dignity of the Chinese people who suffered great pain during the Japanese invasion of China", and forced HKEAA to invalidate the question. This Panel considers this an act of overriding professionalism with politics, which has sacrificed the interest of students and affected the fairness of the examination in order to maintain political correctness. This Panel urges EDB and HKEAA to withdraw their decision of invalidating the question.

(Moved by Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung)