

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)901/02-03
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/ED

Panel on Education

Minutes of special meeting
held on Monday, 2 December 2002 at 4:30 pm
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

- Members Present** : Dr Hon YEUNG Sum (Chairman)
Dr Hon David CHU Yu-lin, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Eric LI Ka-cheung, JP
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon SZETO Wah
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon MA Fung-kwok, JP
- Members Absent** : Hon YEUNG Yiu-chung, BBS (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk
Dr Hon LO Wing-lok
Hon WONG Sing-chi
- Public Officers Attending** : Professor Arthur LI, GBS, JP
Secretary for Education and Manpower
- Mrs Fanny LAW, JP
Permanent Secretary for Education and Manpower

Mr Peter CHEUNG, JP
Secretary-General, University Grants Committee

Clerk in Attendance : Miss Flora TAI
Chief Assistant Secretary (2)2

Staff in Attendance : Mr Stanley MA
Senior Assistant Secretary (2)6

Action

I. Briefing on the Higher Education Review

[Legislative Council (LegCo) Brief issued by the Education and Manpower Bureau File Ref : EMB CR 3/21/2041/89]

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Secretary for Education and Manpower (SEM) highlighted the Government's decisions on the higher education review on the basis of the final recommendation of the University Grants Committee (UGC) following the public consultation.

Funding of sub-degree programmes

2. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong questioned the rationale for adopting the policy to provide 82% subsidy to degree programmes of UGC-funded institutions, but nil to sub-degree programmes. He considered the policy discriminatory against sub-degree students. Although students already enrolled in publicly subsidised sub-degree programmes would not be affected by the change before they graduated, some of them still protested against such an unfair policy.

3. SEM explained that there were many sub-degrees programmes in the market which were offered on a self-financing basis. The Administration would consider the needs of the community in determining which sub-degree programmes should continue to be publicly funded. He pointed out that the savings recovered from the sub-degree sector would be ploughed back mainly to benefit students in the same sector through measures such as improving the package of financial assistance to students of self-financing courses.

4. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong was dissatisfied with the Administration's response. He considered that there was no reason for such a large deviation in providing subsidy to degree programme students and sub-degree programme students. Mr CHEUNG cautioned that sub-degree students might eventually

Action

express strong resentment against the discriminatory policy, which was clearly unfair to them.

5. SEM responded that the Administration would have to ensure the most effective use of public funds in the light of changing needs and circumstances of the community. In effect, the new policy would benefit more students. With an expanding post-secondary sector, there was a need to free up resources so that more might benefit from public subsidy in one form or another.

6. Secretary-General, University Grants Committee (SG(UGC)) stressed that the purpose of requiring sub-degree programmes to be operated on a self-financing basis was to channel resources to where it was most needed. In general public funds would be provided for sub-degree courses that required high start up and maintenance costs or access to expensive laboratories/equipment; courses that met specific manpower needs; and courses that could be regarded as endangered species, i.e., courses that lacked market appeal to the provider and the average student, such as pure arts or science were inadequately provided in the market. He considered that for the longer term development of the higher education sector, it was necessary to provide a level playing field for non-publicly funded institutions offering self-financing sub-degree programmes.

7. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung enquired about the criteria for provision of subsidy to sub-degree programmes. He pointed out that the average cost of sub-degree programmes was in the range of \$30,000 to \$50,000 a year. It was very likely that less wealthy sub-degree students would run into debts when they graduated. Mr LEUNG considered that the policy would strangle the opportunity of students from less well-off families to pursue further studies.

8. SEM said that instead of subsidising UGC-funded institutions in the provision of sub-degree programmes, the Administration considered it more appropriate to use the resources to subsidise students who were in need of some form of financial assistance. He added that pursuing post-secondary education was to some extent an investment for one's enhancing career development opportunities. Individuals who could afford should contribute to their own advancement while the Administration would provide grants and low interest loans to needy students.

9. Mr Tommy CHEUNG said that in view of the resources constraints, the Liberal Party supported that new sub-degree programmes should be operated on a self-financing mode. He considered that subsidisation for existing sub-degree programmes with a long and reputable history such as those higher diploma programmes offered by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (HKPU) and the City University of Hong Kong (CityU) should not be discontinued. He expressed

Action

concern about the effects of switching the funding for the sub-degree programmes provided by these two institutions from publicly-funded to self-financing on the long-term viability of these programmes and on staff members who had made substantial contribution to the development of these programmes. He pointed out that these sub-degree programmes had contributed to the development of Hong Kong in the past decades and suggested that the Administration should extend the criteria for funding sub-degree programmes as described in paragraph 6 above to cover these programmes. The Chairman shared the same concern and requested the Administration to continue the current provision of funding for sub-degree programmes in HKPU and CityU so as to minimise the impact of the self-financing policy on the operation of these sub-degree programmes.

10. SEM stressed that the Administration understood the concerns of stakeholders, the affected institutions and their staff. To address their concerns, UGC would adopt a gradual approach and work with the affected institutions to review their sub-degree programmes on the basis of the three criteria for providing funding. In fact, the recommendations arising from the Higher Education Review had entailed considerable changes to existing systems, in particular the funding formulas which would require careful design and consultation. In this connection, the current triennium would "roll over" for one year to cover the 2004-05 academic year, postponing the new triennium to 2005-06 to 2007-08. This would mean that UGC-funded institutions operating these programmes would have time to prepare for the switch of funding mode. From a policy perspective, the Administration considered it necessary to achieve a more equitable distribution of resources and maintain a fair competition between existing and new operators of sub-degree programmes in the long term.

11. Mr Tommy CHEUNG remarked that the Administration should give an undertaking on continuous provision of funding for sub-degree programmes, or allow a considerable length of transitional period. The Chairman remarked that it was unfair to discontinue the provision of subsidy to existing sub-degree programmes with a long and reputable history by saying that it was fair to require all existing and new operators of sub-degree programmes to operate on a self-financing basis. He urged the Administration to take into account the historical development and contribution of the higher diploma programmes in the development of Hong Kong in the past decades.

12. SEM reiterated that UGC would continue to discuss with institutions and that public subsidies would be phased out gradually. He anticipated that institutions would be able to work out measures to cope with the change in funding policy.

Action

13. The Chairman queried whether the policy objective of enhancing the age participation rate in post-secondary education to 60% was practicably achievable in ten years' time. He expressed concern that such an over ambitious policy objective would become another version of the government commitment of building 85,000 flats a year. The Chairman pointed out that in order to achieve such an ambitious target, the Government had to cut its funding allocated to sub-degree programmes saying that UGC-funded institutions should compete with other programme operators on the basis of a free market. He said that sub-degree programmes run by UGC-funded institutions had provided students who for various reasons were unable to gain entrance to universities after senior secondary school education with another opportunity to access to university education, and had proved their values to the society over the years. The Chairman stressed that the Administration should take cautious measures to enable publicly funded sub-degree programmes to switch to operate on a self-financing basis so as to minimise the adverse impact on the staff and students concerned.

14. SEM said that he understood the concerns of the affected staff in UGC-funded institutions. He, however, pointed out that staff should accept the principle that creating competition for providing quality sub-degree programmes was beneficial to the long-term development of higher education. SEM reiterated that the savings achieved as a result of implementing the self-financing policy would be used to benefit students in the sub-degree sector and the Administration would endeavour to increase more places in the second and third year of the undergraduate programmes by phases in the next triennium.

15. The Chairman disagreed with the Administration's response. He remarked that the increase in second- and third-year university places could only make up for the shortfall for achieving the policy objective of 18% participation rate in first year first degree places. He stressed that it should not be considered as an additional measure to benefit sub-degree students.

16. PSEM said that the Administration would consider enhancing the financial assistance scheme to a similar level as that for university students to ensure that no students would be denied access to sub-degree programmes by a lack of financial means. She cited the sub-degree programmes of the School of Professional and Continuing Education (SPACE) as an example to illustrate that self-financing programmes were not necessarily inferior in quality. The graduates of many sub-degree programmes of SPACE were qualified for enrolment to second year undergraduate programmes in UGC-funded institutions. She assured members that the Administration would not sacrifice the quality of education for the sake of achieving the objective of enabling 60% of secondary school leavers to pursue post-secondary education. She added that the Administration would collaborate with UGC and the Hong Kong Council for Academic Accreditation to establish

Action

quality assurance mechanisms for monitoring the standards of self-financing sub-degree programmes.

17. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong considered that the Administration was adopting double-standards in provision of subsidies to the degree sector and the sub-degree sector. He considered it contradictory to say that all sub-degree programmes should be self-financing in order to maintain fair competition in the one hand, but ignore the fact that students engaging in degree programmes or sub-degree programmes should be equally subsidised on the other.

18. SEM responded that the policy to fund undergraduate programmes did not contradict with the policy to require sub-degree programmes to be self-financing because the programmes were different. He stressed that there was no question of sub-degree students being treated unfairly.

19. Ms Cyd HO enquired about the availability of the five land sites which would be allocated to sub-degree programme operators at a nominal rental to facilitate the development of community colleges. PSEM responded that there was some delay due to discussions over the terms and conditions for allocation of the five land sites. She assured members that applications for the allocation of the prescribed sites would be invited within the week.

Admission of non-local students

20. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that he did not agree with the Administration's saying that increasing the maximum recruit of non-local undergraduate and taught graduate students from the current 2% to 4% of the publicly funded places was a mild increase which would not affect the educational opportunities of local students. He questioned the need to increase the non-local student intake while local sub-degree students were not subsidised.

21. SEM responded that increasing the percentage of non-local student intake to 4% of the publicly funded places would stimulate competition and bring about educational and cultural benefits to local students in UGC-funded institutions. In fact, institutions had expressed support for such an increase. He pointed out that the most famous universities in the United States such as the Harvard University had not set any limit for admitting outstanding non-local students.

22. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that he would not object to increasing quota for non-local undergraduate and taught postgraduate students, if the level of subsidy for local students remained unchanged. He considered it harsh for local sub-degree students to accept the government's policy of subsidising non-local students instead of local students. SEM responded that non-local students were subsidised

Action

at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels and that would not affect the resources allocated for subsidising sub-degree programmes.

23. Ms Audrey EU asked the Administration to explain why it decided to increase non-local student intake to 4% of the subsidised places. She also asked about the quality of the enrolled non-local students and the criteria for recruiting these students.

24. SEM responded that during the consultation period on the higher education review, UGC-funded institutions had indicated the wish to diversify their intake base to include more non-local students with outstanding academic performance. At present, institutions were allowed to recruit non-local undergraduate and taught post-graduate students up to 2% of the publicly funded places plus another 2% using private funding, but the actual number of non-local students was around 1.5% only. The relaxation of the quota to 4% of the publicly funded places would make it worthwhile for institutions to launch a recruitment campaign outside Hong Kong. SG(UGC) supplemented that the 150 non-local students from the Mainland funded by the Hong Kong Jockey Club in the past three years had proved that participation of non-local students had substantially stimulated competition and enhanced the learning atmosphere within the university campuses. UGC had encouraged institutions to recruit more non-local students in the current academic year, and considered it appropriate to set the quota at 4% of the publicly funded places which amounted to 580 students in the present circumstances.

25. Ms Audrey EU asked about the quality of non-local students from other countries other than the Mainland. SG(UGC) responded that non-local students from other countries other than the Mainland were few at present. He pointed out that institutions were not enthusiastic about overseas recruitment in the past. They were encouraged to do so in the current academic year. With the approved increase in non-local student intake, institutions would have more incentive to collaborate in joint recruitment of overseas students.

Deregulation of university remuneration

26. Mr SZETO Wah noted that according to paragraph 18 of the LegCo Brief, to address the concern of staff and management, UGC-funded institutions would be given the option to decide whether and when to introduce their own remuneration systems, i.e., whether to delink their staff salaries from the civil service pay system. Referring to paragraph 27 of the Administration's paper, Mr SZETO pointed out that the Chinese University of Hong Kong and Hong Kong University of Science and Technology had set up internal task forces to explore the possibility of their merger in consultation with their staff and students. He asked whether other institutions would follow the good practice to consult staff

Action

and students before deciding whether to delink staff salaries from the civil service pay system.

27. SEM responded that the salary scales of universities had been linked to the civil service since the 1970s, imposing unnecessary rigidity and undermining institutions' competitiveness in global recruitment. He stressed that university councils, many of which had staff and student representatives, had the discretion to decide whether and when to delink from the civil service pay system. PSEM supplemented that UGC had not made any specific recommendation on merger of universities, although the report was strongly in favour of role differentiation, mission focus, collaboration and strategic alliances. The Administration would support proposals from institutions with complementary strengths to merge, but would not interfere with the autonomy of the institutions.

28. Mr SZETO Wah pointed out that staff and student representatives were the minority in the composition of university councils and could hardly influence the decisions of university councils. He was concerned that the voice of staff and students would not be heard when an institution decided whether to delink or not.

29. SEM responded that universities would consult their staff and students and make their decisions in a rational manner. It would not be appropriate to presume that university councils would not consider the views of staff and students.

30. The Chairman pointed out that the decisions of university councils were normally made by voting and the views of the majority would always prevail. He asked whether deregulation of university remuneration would result in a decrease in budget allocation. SEM assured members that deregulation of university remuneration would be a cost neutral exercise. The Administration would ensure that overall, institutions adopting new pay packages would not be worse off than if they continued to maintain the link in terms of the public funding they received.

31. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that SEM had recently indicated during a radio interview that UGC-funded institutions should be prepared for another budget cuts in the face of current economic circumstances. He considered that a further cut in resource allocation would force institutions to reduce staff salaries by way of delinking their salary scales from civil service system. He therefore asked whether the Administration could guarantee that there would not be any change in resources allocation for UGC-funded institutions in the years to come.

32. SEM responded that the Administration could only guarantee that institutions delinking their staff salaries from the civil service system would not be worse off than if they continued to maintain the link in terms of the public funding they received. Not arising from the higher education review but as a response to

Action

the latest efficiency drive across Government, the Administration would have to discuss with the UGC sector to achieve efficiency savings in line with other government departments in 2004-05 and in the 2005-06 to 2007-08 triennium.

33. Ms Audrey EU said that she had the impression that while staff was generally not in favour of deregulation of university remuneration, heads of UGC-funded institutions in general had positive comments on the proposal. She asked whether the Administration had taken a position on the matter and duly considered its implications.

34. SEM responded that the Administration had not taken a position as to whether institutions should delink their staff salaries from the civil service system. The Administration saw the merits in deregulating university pay and agreed to remove the mandatory requirement to link with the civil service salary scale. SEM stressed that deregulation would give flexibility to institutions in devising their own remuneration packages on the basis of merit and performance, as well as adapting to changing needs and circumstances in the future. He added that institutions were free to use any savings arising from delinking for other developments.

Private funding support

35. Mr MA Fung-kwok noted that UGC had recommended the identifications of a few institutions for focused public and private sector support according to the institutions' role and areas of strength, and the use of matching grants and other incentives to generate additional momentum for private sector participation in supporting higher education. He asked about the Administration's stance in respect of the recommendations and how the Administration would encourage private sector support in higher education.

36. SEM said that the Administration agreed with UGC that a small number of institutions should not be identified as the focus of funding, but focused public and private sector support should be provided for their areas of strength.

37. SG(UGC) explained that the rationale for UGC's final recommendations was to create competition among institutions by way of a funding mechanism which involved both public and private sector support. In essence, UGC intended to diversify the funding base for higher education by strengthening the fundraising capabilities of institutions and enhancing the transparency of UGC's monitoring and assessment exercises so as to provide useful information to prospective donors and sponsors. For research projects funded from sources other than the Research Grants Council, the institutions should recover full costs, instead of just the direct costs from the sponsors. In addition, UGC had recommended the provision of

Action

matching grants and other incentives to increase the momentum for developing a stronger philanthropic culture in the community. However, it appeared not optimistic for the Government to commit further provisions in the light of the current economic circumstances.

38. In response to Mr MA Fung-kwok's further enquiry, SG(UGC) said that UGC had yet worked out the policy and mechanism for providing matching grant to institutions, but would make reference to relevant programmes such as the scholarship scheme for Mainland students and student exchange programmes where the Administration had provided a matching grant.

Role of UGC in higher education

39. Ms Cyd HO cited paragraph 2.14 of UGC's report on Higher Education in Hong Kong (the Report) which specified that UGC should debate and review its simultaneous strengths and weaknesses, and UGC would fall short in its review of higher education if UGC did not extend an examination to itself. She asked whether UGC had conducted an internal review of its procedures and would take a more proactive role in steering the higher education sector by means of strategic planning and also in the provision of strategic advice to the Government in the light of the implementation of the accountability system for principal officials. In this connection, the Chairman asked whether the role and independence of UGC had changed after a political appointee was charged to oversee the educational issues.

40. SG(UGC) responded that so far he had not detected any substantial change in the role of UGC after the appointment of SEM. He pointed out that it was natural that SEM should take the lead in announcing the Government's decisions on the higher education review. As regards the role of UGC, SG(UGC) said that during the higher education review, UGC considered that its role had focused too much on resources allocation and monitoring. UGC reckoned that the public should play a greater monitoring role, i.e. increasing "stakeholder monitoring" in the supervision of the performance of UGC-funded institutions, provided that these institutions had established a sound governance structure. Deregulation was the future direction and the proposal of delinking the pay scales of UGC-funded institutions from the civil service pay system was put forward in such a context. UGC intended to strengthen its role in strategic planning and policy development in the degree-awarding sector.

41. Ms Cyd HO said that UGC had all along acted as a "buffer" between the Government and the UGC-funded institutions in order to safeguard academic freedom and institutional autonomy of institutions. She asked whether such safeguard still existed after the implementation of the accountability system for

Action

principal officials. Ms HO expressed support for strengthening "stakeholder monitoring" over the performance of UGC-funded institutions. She said that it was necessary to increase the transparency of the institutional governance and participation of teachers and students in university councils. Ms HO expressed concern that if UGC reduced its monitoring role before "stakeholder monitoring" was strengthened, it might lead to political interference in the affairs of UGC-funded institutions.

42. SG(UGC) responded that according to the feedback from heads of UGC-funded institutions and the higher education sector as a whole, the role of UGC in monitoring the performance of UGC-funded institutions had increased. He stressed that UGC and SEM were candid partners in the development of the higher education.

43. SEM said that UGC and the Administration played different roles and would collaborate efforts to enhance the development of higher education. He also considered UGC's intermediary role essential for the healthy development of the higher education sector. SEM stressed that the Administration had no intention to interfere with the internal management of UGC-funded institutions. He added that UGC would conduct an internal review of its own role and operation when the landscape for higher education was better defined.

44. Ms Cyd HO asked whether UGC could provide an information paper on its role and functions as a result of the implementation of the accountability system for principal officials, and how it would collaborate with the Administration to promote the development of higher education in Hong Kong. She considered that UGC should clarify its position in respect of its final recommendations on the future development of the higher education sector.

45. SG(UGC) responded that the mission and terms of reference of UGC had been clearly set out in its publication entitled "Facts and Figures" which remained after the introduction of the accountability system. He pointed out that from a long term policy perspective, the monitoring of sub-degree programmes would be transferred to the newly established Manpower Development Committee. As a result of such transfer, UGC's scope of work would cover all tertiary institutions offering degree programmes which could include the Open University of Hong Kong, the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts and Shue Yan College. UGC would review its operation and role in the context of such change.

Institutional governance and staff grievances

46. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong noted that the Government supported UGC's recommendation that UGC-funded institutions should clearly define their

Action

organisational, financial and quality assurance arrangements with their continuing education arms or community colleges. He asked whether such quality assurance arrangements would include the establishment of an independent and transparent mechanism to deal with students' grievances and complaints. Mr CHEUNG pointed out that extending the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman to tertiary institutions could not resolve the problem of staff grievances and complaints since the Ombudsman could only handle procedural issues but not academic issues. He cited the recent events surrounding non-renewal of contract in the School of Law of CityU as an example to illustrate the need to establish an open and transparent mechanism to handle staff grievances and complaint in the higher education sector. He stressed that LegCo Members would not like to interfere with the internal management of institutions, but had the obligation to handle complaints received from staff and students in the higher education sector.

47. SEM responded that students and staff who felt aggrieved would seek the assistance of LegCo Members if they were not satisfied with the decision of the internal mechanisms established by the institutions. He anticipated that UGC-funded institutions would review their governance structures and improve the openness and transparency of their grievance and complaint mechanisms.

48. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that members would receive fewer complaints from students and staff of UGC-funded institutions if appropriate grievances and complaint mechanisms were in place. He suggested that the Administration should not only encourage but also supervise the institutions to increase external participation and transparency in their grievance procedures.

49. SG(UGC) responded that all UGC-funded institutions should have established an internal mechanism for handling staff grievances and complaints. Some university councils were reviewing their governance structures to ensure "fitness for purpose", drawing on the principles and international good practice set out in the Report. UGC would monitor the progress of the review developments in individual institutions and would conduct periodic comprehensive audits on the institutions covering teaching, research, governance and community services. He cited the Independent Committee on Review of Recent Events in the School of Law established by CityU to investigate the disputes arising from non-renewal of contracts as an example to illustrate that some institutions had increased external participation and transparency in their grievances procedures.

50. Ms Audrey EU shared the view of Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong. She said that there was a genuine need to establish a sound mechanism to handle staff grievances and complaints in the higher education sector. She pointed out that external participation could not fully understand and resolve internal staff disputes. She suggested that the Administration should play a proactive role to facilitate the

Action

establishment of an effective mechanism to handle staff grievances and complaints in the long run. Otherwise, more disputes might arise if institutions decided to delink their staff salary scales from the civil service system.

51. The Chairman shared the concern of Ms Audrey EU. He suggested that the Administration should play a role in monitoring the operation of institutions' grievances and complaint mechanisms on a continuous basis. In this connection, Ms Emily LAU asked whether the Administration would continue to explore other alternatives for handling staff grievances and complaints in the higher education sector.

52. SG(UGC) responded that UGC received mixed reactions about the proposal of extending the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman to UGC-funded institutions during the consultation. University councils held a strong view that under the principle of institutional autonomy, institutions should handle internal personnel matters themselves. In fact, the proposal was unlikely to meet staff's demand in full because section 8 of the Ombudsman Ordinance had specified that the Ombudsman shall not undertake investigation in, among other things, personnel matters such as appointments, dismissals, pay and conditions of service, etc. He added that since there were only around 50 cases of staff grievances and complaints in a year, UGC did not consider it necessary to establish an independent council to handle staff grievances and complaints for institutions in the higher education sector. In the circumstances, UGC would continue to encourage institutions to review and improve their grievances and complaint procedures. At the Chairman's request, SG(UGC) agreed to provide an update on the development of an internal grievances and complaint mechanism in individual institutions at an appropriate time.

Adm

Funding of taught postgraduate programmes

53. Ms Audrey EU enquired about the introduction of the 4-year Bachelor of Laws (LLB) and the latest developments of the Postgraduate Certificate in Laws (PCLL). She also asked whether law degree programmes would be provided in other UGC-funded institutions, and if not, whether the existing programmes in the University of Hong Kong and CityU would differentiate by their major areas of studies. Ms EU added that undergraduate programmes in law should preferably be mixed with a related subject such as public administration or government studies.

54. SG(UGC) responded that the Steering Committee on the Review of Legal Education and Training in Hong Kong had submitted its recommendations to UGC. The Administration accepted the recommendations of the Steering Committee in principle. The 4-year LLB curriculum would be introduced in 2004-05 and the new PCLL curriculum would be implemented in 2003-04. As

Action

programmes that meet specific manpower requirements and those which were required for providing full training to certain professionals (e.g. lawyers) would continue to be subsidised, the Administration would continue to provide subsidy to existing PCLL programmes, but the cost recovery rate might be increased progressively.

II. Any other business

Items for next meeting

55. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that the Independent Committee on Review of Recent Events in the School of Law of the CityU had published its report on 19 November 2002. He suggested that the Panel should revisit the issue with a view to concluding the Panel's discussion on the non-renewal of staff contracts in the Law School of CityU. In response, the Chairman suggested that subject to the agreement of Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung, the item "Insurance coverage for teachers" scheduled for discussion at the next regular meeting to be held on 16 December 2002 could be deferred and replaced by the item "Follow-up discussion on the review and appeal mechanism for non-renewal of contract of CityU". Members agreed that the Clerk should follow up the matter.

[*Post-meeting note* : The item "Follow-up discussion on the review and appeal mechanism for non-renewal of contract of CityU" had been added to the agenda for the meeting scheduled for 16 December 2002.]

56. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:20 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
16 January 2003