

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)734/12-13
(The minutes have been seen by
the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/ED

Panel on Education

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 11 March 2013, at 4:30 pm
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex

- Members present** :
- Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP (Chairman)
 - Hon IP Kin-yuen (Deputy Chairman)
 - Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
 - Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
 - Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP
 - Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, JP
 - Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
 - Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
 - Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
 - Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
 - Hon WONG Yuk-man
 - Hon Claudia MO
 - Hon Charles Peter MOK
 - Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
 - Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
 - Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
- Members absent** :
- Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
 - Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP
 - Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
 - Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP
 - Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
 - Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
 - Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok

Public Officers : Agenda item IV
attending

Mr Kevin YEUNG
Acting Secretary for Education

Mr Wallace LAU
Principal Assistant Secretary (Higher Education)
Education Bureau

Miss Wendy CHUNG
Principal Assistant Secretary (Infrastructure &
Research Support)
Education Bureau

Miss Janice TSE Siu-wa, JP
Deputy Secretary for Food & Health (Health)1
Food and Health Bureau

Mr Thomas CHAN Chung-ching, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning &
Lands)1
Development Bureau

Agenda item V

Mr Kevin YEUNG
Acting Secretary for Education

Mrs Michelle WONG
Deputy Secretary for Education (4)

Miss WU Po-ling
Principal Assistant Secretary (School Development)
Education Bureau

Agenda item VI

Professor WONG Chack-kie, JP
Member(2), Central Policy Unit

Ms Sharon HO
Secretary, Research Grants Council
University Grants Committee Secretariat

Mr Wallace LAU
Principal Assistant Secretary (Higher Education)
Education Bureau

**Invited
Participants**

: Agenda item IV

Hong Kong Baptist University

Professor Albert CHAN
President and Vice-Chancellor

Mr Andy S C LEE
Vice-President (Administration) and Secretary

Mr L C LAM
Director of Estates Office

Hong Kong Baptist University Student Union

Miss FUNG Ching-man
President

Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Mr Ivan HO Man-yiu
Deputy Chairman, Board of Local Affairs

Hong Kong Institute of Planners

Mr TAM Po-yiu
Immediate Past President

Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design

Mr Vincent NG
Vice-President (Local Policies)

**Clerk in
attendance**

: Miss Polly YEUNG
Chief Council Secretary (4)4

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

Ms Sandy HAU
Legislative Assistant (4)3

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes

(LC Paper No. CB(4)456/12-13 -- Minutes of meeting on
14 January 2013)

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2013 were confirmed.

II. Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(4)396/12-13(01) -- Letter dated 5 February 2013
from Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN regarding the
subject of self-financing
post-secondary education

LC Paper No. CB(4)406/12-13(01) -- Letter from Hon Claudia MO
concerning arrangement of
Joint University Programmes
Admission System

LC Paper No. CB(4)406/12-13(02) -- Administration's written
response to letter from Hon
Claudia MO concerning
arrangement of Joint
University Programmes
Admission System

LC Paper No. CB(4)419/12-13(01) -- Letter from Dr Hon Kenneth
CHAN concerning closure of
the Sacred Heart Canossian
College of Commerce

LC Paper No. CB(4)419/12-13(02) -- Administration's written response to letter from Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN concerning closure of the Sacred Heart Canossian College of Commerce

LC Paper No. CB(4)421/12-13(01) -- Administration's written response to a letter from Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN addressed to the Secretary for Education regarding the use of Chinese name "大學" by Savannah College of Art and Design

LC Paper Nos. CB(4)422/12-13(01) & (02) -- Letter from Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN addressed to the Secretary for Education concerning initiation of Moral and National Education Subject and the Administration's written response)

2. Members noted the above papers issued since the last meeting.

III. Items for discussion at the next meeting

(Appendix I to LC Paper No. CB(4)460/12-13 -- List of outstanding items for discussion

Appendix II to LC Paper No. CB(4)460/12-13 -- List of follow-up actions)

3. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for 17 April 2013 at 8:30 am –

(a) Provision of international school places and facilitation measures;

- (b) Project 3349EP – A 30-classroom primary school at Site 1A-3, Kai Tak Development, Kowloon;
- (c) Project 3350EP – A 30-classroom primary school at Site 1A-4, Kai Tak Development, Kowloon; and
- (d) Measures to address issues arising from the drop in secondary student population – Follow-up to special meetings on 2 and 3 November 2012.

4. Before proceeding to the discussion items on the agenda, the Chairman drew members' attention to Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure which provided that a Member shall not move any motion or amendment relating to a matter in which he had a pecuniary interest, whether direct or indirect, or speak on any such matter, except where he disclosed the nature of that interest. He reminded members to declare interests, if any, in respect of any of the agenda items at today's meeting.

IV. Issues relating to the existing policy on the use of land for education purposes

(LC Paper No. CB(4)460/12-13(01) -Paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(4)460/12-13(02) -Submission from Hong Kong Baptist University)

Related papers

Administration's answer to an oral question raised by Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai at the Council meeting of 6 February 2013

Administration's answer to a written question raised by Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai at the Council meeting of 27 February 2013

Government statement on Hong Kong Baptist University's request to use the site of the former campus of Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Lee Wai Lee) dated 4 March 2013
(<http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/201303/04/P201303040689.htm>)

5. The Chairman declared that he was a Court member of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University ("HKPolyU") and of the Hong Kong Baptist

University ("HKBU"), and also the supervisor and member of the school management committee of Lam Tai Fai College. Mrs Regina IP declared that she was a member of the school management committee of a Direct Subsidy Scheme school and the principal of Savantas Liberal Arts Academy. Ms Claudia MO declared that she taught courses at HKBU and the Chinese University of Hong Kong ("CUHK"). Mr Christopher CHUNG declared that he was a Court member of the University of Hong Kong ("HKU") and a Council member of the Hong Kong Arts School. The Deputy Chairman declared that he was a Court member of HKU, a part-time lecturer of HKU and the Hong Kong Institute of Education. Dr Helena WONG declared that she was a lecturer of HKPolyU. Dr Fernando CHEUNG declared that he was a lecturer of HKPolyU.

6. Ms Claudia MO queried why the policy secretaries of the bureaux concerned (namely, the Education Bureau ("EDB"), the Development Bureau ("DEVB") and the Food and Health Bureau ("FHB") were not in attendance for this agenda item which was of great importance. In this regard, the Chairman informed members that Mr Kevin YEUNG was the Acting Secretary for Education ("Acting SED") as Mr Eddie NG was on duty visit. He further said that he was fully aware of the importance of and widespread public concern arising from this agenda item. Hence, he had instructed the Secretariat to convey his request to the Administration that the Secretary for Food and Health and the Secretary for Development should also attend the Panel meeting to answer members' question. In response to the written request of the Secretariat on 8 March 2013, the EDB had replied in writing on the same day that the DEVB and FHB would be represented by Mr Thomas CHAN, Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning & Lands)¹ ("DSDEV(P&L)¹") and Miss Janice TSE, Deputy Secretary for Food & Health (Health)¹ ("DSFH(H)¹") respectively. The Chairman advised that should members have any query about the attendance of representatives from the Administration, they were at liberty to seek the Administration's explanation at this meeting.

Briefing by the Administration and other parties

7. At the invitation of the Chairman, Acting SED briefed members on the issues relating to the existing policy on the use of land for educational purposes by highlighting the salient points in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(4)460/12-13(01)].

8. Members noted the submission from Hong Kong Baptist University [LC Paper No. CB(4)460/12-13(02)]. Prof Albert CHAN, President and Vice-Chancellor of HKBU, and Miss FUNG Ching-man, President of HKBU Student Union, presented their views. Mr Ivan HO of Hong Kong Institute of

Architects, Mr TAM Po-yiu of Hong Kong Institute of Planners and Mr Vincent NG of Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design also stated their views.

Discussion

Campus development of tertiary institutions

9. Mr Albert HO asked EDB to explain its role in the planning process in relation to the use of land for education purpose, in particular its assessment of the development needs of HKBU.

10. In response, Acting SED advised that as explained in the Administration's paper, government land would be allocated to University Grants Committee ("UGC")-funded institutions for campus development in accordance with the prevailing policy and procedures. To meet the shortfall in student hostels and academic space of HKBU, the Government had reserved the northern portion of the site of the former campus of the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Lee Wai Lee) ("ex-IVE(LWL) site") for use by HKBU. If fully utilized, HKBU's requirements for student hostel places and academic space up to the 2014-2015 academic year could be fully met under the prevailing policies and calculation criteria. The southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site was beyond HKBU's requirements under the existing policies. After careful assessment, EDB was of the view that it was not necessary to reserve the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site for the expansion of higher education institutions, including HKBU. EDB also agreed that the site could be surrendered to the Government for other uses so as to optimize the use of scarce land resources.

11. The Deputy Chairman did not subscribe to the Administration's explanation, and considered that the Government should adopt a long-term vision on the planning and development of universities, instead of considering the development needs of universities merely with reference to the requirements under existing policies and standards. Dr Fernando CHEUNG shared a similar view and asked whether EDB had consulted HKBU before surrendering the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site to the Government for other uses. Ms Claudia MO took the view that SED should demonstrate his support for the development of the tertiary education sector by striving to retain the site for educational use.

12. In response, Acting SED confirmed that the Administration and UGC had all along supported HKBU and other UGC-funded institutions in their campus development on a fair and consistent basis in accordance with well-established policies. Principal Assistant Secretary (Higher Education)

said that HKBU had been consulted on its campus development needs for the triennium 2012-2013 to 2014-2015 when the Government and UGC conducted the triennial planning cycle and funding requirements for the UGC sector.

13. Mr WONG Yuk-man noted from media reports that Prof Albert CHAN had stated that he would resign from his current post if HKBU could not secure the use of the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site for its proposed development of Chinese medicine hospital. Mr WONG considered that although the policy on the use of land involved different bureaux and departments, the use of land resources for educational purposes should be within the jurisdiction of EDB. Mr WONG noted that some statistics had been given in the Government's press statement issued on 4 March 2013 to illustrate that the Government had made available sufficient land resources and funding to fully meet the needs of HKBU for campus development. He considered that EDB should also set out further explanation on the calculation criteria and in what ways the northern portion of the site would be sufficient to meet the development needs of HKBU. Miss FUNG Ching-man, President of HKBU Student Union, concurred that the Government should explain the rationale and calculation criteria leading to its conclusion that the development needs of HKBU would be fully met with the allocation of only the northern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site.

Rezoning the ex-IVE(LWL) site and including it in the land sale programme

14. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that the ex-IVE(LWL) site was designated for "Government, Institution or Community" ("GIC") use and had been used for educational purpose for decades. Dr CHEUNG questioned the immediate need, if any, for rezoning this site for medium-density luxury residential development. Mr Charles MOK remarked that since the site in question was surrounded by the campus of HKBU on three sides, rezoning the southern portion of the site for medium-density residential development might not be the best development option. Nevertheless, consideration might be given to building public rental housing or Home Ownership Scheme flats on the site. Mr WONG Yuk-man also opined that the development of luxury residential properties could hardly address the housing needs of the community. The Chairman sought clarification on whether it was the Government's stance that the site was most suitable for medium-density residential development.

15. In response, DSDEV(P&L)1 said that after careful assessment, the Government had come to the view that the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site was not required to be reserved for higher education purpose or other GIC uses. As the areas to the west and south of the site were mainly for residential development and there were no incompatible uses in its

vicinity, the Administration considered that the site was suitable for medium-density residential development and had submitted a proposal to the Town Planning Board ("TPB") to rezone the southern portion of the site for this purpose.

16. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung was concerned that the Administration had bypassed the proper town planning procedures as it had included the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site in the land sale programme ("LSP") before TPB had the opportunity to consider representations received during the two-month consultation period and make its final decision on the use of the site. Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered that DEVB should devise a long-term plan on the supply and use of land, and should not compete for a site that had been used for educational purpose for decades. Ms Claudia MO asked whether the DEVB could remove the listing of the site on LSP.

17. In response, DSDEV(P&L)1 confirmed that the Administration had all along followed established planning procedures in handling the ex-IVE(LWL) site. After assessment and consultation with relevant bureaux/departments, the Administration had come to the view that the site was not required to be reserved for GIC use and was suitable to be rezoned for residential purpose. Hence, in late 2012, the Planning Department submitted the relevant rezoning proposal to TPB with a view to optimizing the use of land and meeting the housing needs of the community. DSDEV(P&L)1 advised that it was the established practice of the Government to include in LSP those sites that were anticipated to be available within the year, but were not immediately available pending completion of various processes and town planning procedures. This arrangement would provide the market with information about anticipated land supply and facilitate preparation by the market. He reaffirmed that including the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site in the land sale programme was in line with the established practice, and that the site would only be put up for sale after completion of the necessary processes.

18. Mrs Regina IP enquired whether the policy of "Hong Kong property for Hong Kong people" would apply to the residential development on the ex-IVE(LWL) site. In reply, DSDEV(P&L)1 said that at the present stage, the Government had decided to apply the "Hong Kong property for Hong Kong people" measure to two sites in the Kai Tak area requiring the flats built thereon to be sold to Hong Kong residents only. The Government would consider the need to include similar requirements in the Conditions of Sale of other sites in the light of future market conditions.

19. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung remarked that if the three policy secretaries concerned could not resolve the use of the site in question, they should seek the

direction of the Chief Secretary for Administration ("CS") or even the Chief Executive ("CE"). Mr LEUNG asked whether instruction had been sought from CS or CE. Acting SED reaffirmed that relevant bureaux/departments had followed established procedures in handling the matter and he had not sought advice from CS or CE.

20. On the question of whether the Government had consulted HKBU before recommending to TPB to rezone the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site for residential use, Professor Albert CHAN said that the Government had not consulted HKBU on the matter. Prof CHAN and Mr Andy LEE reiterated that HKBU opposed the rezoning of the site for luxury residential development, and urged that the site should be retained for educational use. In this connection, Dr Fernando CHEUNG was concerned whether any government officials had been at fault by deciding arbitrarily to recommend to TPB a change in land use.

21. Miss FUNG Ching-man noted from the Government's press statement issued on 4 March 2013 that the proposed rezoning was to meet the community's housing needs. However, Miss FUNG queried whether the development of luxury residential properties, instead of public housing units or homes for the elderly, was conducive to solving the housing problem.

22. Mr TAM Po-yiu declared that he was an external examiner of the Department of Urban Planning and Design of HKU. Mr TAM said that from the perspective of a planner, there was nothing wrong for residential properties to be located near university campus, and rezoning the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site for residential use was a compatible option as there were low-density residential properties in the vicinity. However, in accordance with the statutory town planning procedures, it would be for TPB to decide on the land use having regard to all relevant requirements, including the representations, if any, on the amendments to the approved outline zoning plan.

23. Mr Ivan HO said that the Hong Kong Institute of Architects considered that the proposed use of the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site, similar to other sites, should be handled in accordance with the established policy and applicable town planning procedures. Government land should not be granted to any party simply because it was located in the proximity of the party concerned. However, Mr HO found it questionable for the Government to include the site on its LSP prior to TPB's final decision after completion of all the statutory procedures. Mr HO said that he was not convinced of the merits of rezoning the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site to residential use because from the planning perspective, rezoning the site to residential use

might not create synergy nor benefit to the neighbouring areas. Due to the scarcity of land resources to serve different uses, Mr HO considered that the Government should immediately conduct a comprehensive review and formulate a long term plan for the development of universities.

24. Mr Vincent NG declared that he had participated in HKBU's campus development projects and was familiar with HKBU's circumstances. Mr NG took the view that the Government's move had amply reflected its eagerness to identify sites for residential development regardless of other social needs in the planning process, such as education, medical service, public space etc. He did not consider that building luxury residential properties would help resolve the housing problem. Although according to the Government's assessment, there was no immediate need to allocate the site to any higher educational institution, Mr NG took the view that the Government should adopt a long-term planning perspective and retain the ex-IVE(LWL) site for future educational use. Given that HKU and HKPolyU had implemented expansion plans in the vicinity of their main campus, the Government should consider ways to achieve the optimal use of land in urban planning and campus development.

HKBU's proposed development of a Chinese medicine hospital

25. Dr Helena WONG said that currently, three local universities, namely CUHK, HKU and HKBU, offered UGC-funded programmes on Chinese medicine. However, they did not have affiliated Chinese medicine hospitals for clinical training and internship. Dr WONG considered that the Administration should take action to address the need for Chinese medicine hospitals in Hong Kong. Ms Claudia MO recalled that the Government had once stated that it supported the development of Hong Kong as a Chinese medicine hub. She was concerned that there was no Chinese medicine hospital in Hong Kong and clinical internship opportunities could only be found in the Mainland.

26. In response, DSFH(H)1 advised that the Administration supported the development of Chinese medicine and Chinese medicine hospitals in Hong Kong. The Chinese Medicine Development Committee had decided to study the feasibility of Chinese medicine in-patient service such as how to provide resuscitation facilities for Chinese medicine in-patient service. There was no established policy to provide government land for the development of a private Chinese medicine hospital. Currently, clinical internship of local Chinese medicine programmes could be arranged at local Chinese medicine clinics and at Chinese medicine hospitals in the Mainland.

27. In this connection, the Chairman reminded members that the existing policy on the promotion of Chinese medicine and the development of Chinese medicine hospitals in general was outside the scope of this agenda item.

28. Mrs Regina IP asked whether FHB supported HKBU's proposal of developing a Chinese medicine hospital. In response, DSFH(H)1 advised that FHB in principle supported proposals for the development of a Chinese medicine hospital on private land by any interested party to provide Chinese medicine in-patient services. Where conditions permitted, the Chinese medicine hospital so established might also provide clinical training opportunities for institutions in Hong Kong offering Chinese medicine courses.

29. Dr Helena WONG considered that a teaching hospital should be regarded as an educational facility. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung considered that a Chinese medicine hospital could facilitate the teaching and conduct of researches on Chinese medicine. Mr Albert HO enquired about EDB's stance on HKBU's proposed development of a Chinese medicine teaching hospital at the ex-IVE(LWL) site.

30. In response, Acting SED explained the Government's stance that Chinese medicine hospitals were medical facilities for the general public and any proposal to set up such a hospital should first and foremost be considered from the perspectives of healthcare and community needs. HKBU's proposed Chinese medicine hospital was a self-financed project not covered in the current UGC triennial plan for HKBU. If such a hospital was built, HKBU could consider partnering with it for the purpose of providing internship training for its Chinese medicine programme. Regarding the location of a teaching Chinese medicine hospital, there was no requirement that it must be within or close to the university campus.

31. Members noted that according to HKBU, it had proposed to the Government that the entire ex-IVE(LWL) site be allocated to HKBU for long term development. On the question of whether the Government had promised to allocate the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site to HKBU for the development of a Chinese medicine hospital, members noted that the Administration and HKBU held different views. Referring to the Government's press statement issued on 4 March 2013 which mentioned a meeting held on 10 October 2012 between HKBU and FHB, Dr Fernando CHEUNG sought further information from FHB about the meeting. The Deputy Chairman also enquired on the action, if any, taken after the said meeting to follow up HKBU's proposal to use the ex-IVE(LWL) site for development a Chinese medicine hospital.

32. In response, DSFH(H)1 said that in recent years, HKBU had put forward to FHB various ideas on the development of a Chinese medicine hospital. In June 2011, the Administration was advised that HKBU had found common ground with the Tsim Sha Tsui District Kai Fong Welfare Association ("TSTKFWA") in establishing a Chinese medicine hospital at the Association's building. In November 2011, HKBU submitted a detailed proposal to FHB. Since then, FHB had followed up the matter with HKBU. In September 2012, HKBU provided supplementary information on its proposal, which included detailed information on the mode of collaboration with TSTKFWA, the timetable for the development, feasibility study report and budget etc. The Government had all along supported this joint project. Subsequently, at an informal meeting on 10 October 2012, HKBU indicated that difficulties had been encountered in the joint development plan with TSTKFWA and that it was also interested in developing the hospital on the ex-IVE(LWL) site as an alternative. After the informal meeting, HKBU provided a one-page layout plan to FHB by e-mail showing the location of the proposed hospital at the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site. The plan however did not contain detailed information. FHB subsequently understood from other government departments that this proposed alternative site did not belong to HKBU and was therefore not feasible under existing policies. FHB continued its efforts on liaising with other government departments on how to assist HKBU in respect of its joint project with TSTKFWA. DSFH(H)1 further said that the Government was only formally notified by HKBU on 18 February 2013 of the withdrawal of its joint project with TSTKFWA. In the same letter, HKBU mentioned that it considered the ex-IVE(LWL) site to be the most suitable site for building the Chinese medicine hospital.

33. Noting that HKBU had provided a layout plan to FHB by e-mail on 10 October 2012, the Deputy Chairman asked whether this should be taken as HKBU's intention to pursue the development of a Chinese medicine hospital at the ex-IVE(LWL) site. DSFH(H)1 responded that on 10 October 2012, HKBU had not advised FHB that it had given up its joint project with TSTKFWA to pursue an alternative instead.

34. At the invitation of the Chairman, Prof Albert CHAN stated that in the view of HKBU, the meeting held with FHB on 10 October 2012 was a formal and official meeting. A senior official from FHB, the then Chairman of the Council of HKBU, a Vice-President responsible for administration and himself were present. The discussion at that meeting was primarily about HKBU's proposal to develop a Chinese medicine hospital at the ex-IVE(LWL) site. The official also indicated that he would assist HKBU in its request to use the site in question to develop a Chinese medicine hospital. Moreover, prior to the said meeting, HKBU had already submitted to FHB its detailed proposal on

development of a Chinese medicine hospital. The only change made to the proposal in October 2012 was the proposed location of the hospital. Prof CHAN said that it had been HKBU's well-known intention for many years to establish a Chinese medicine teaching hospital and this initiative was included in HKBU's 10-year development plan - "Vision 2020" approved by the Council of HKBU. HKBU had a reasonable expectation that FHB would follow up with relevant bureaux/departments on its revised proposal. On the question of whether HKBU had followed the formalities and established procedures in pursuing its proposal, Prof CHAN said that all along, when submitting its proposal and supplementary information for the consideration of the Administration, HKBU had not been advised that it did not follow the relevant procedures.

35. Mr TAM Po-yiu gave his view that a teaching hospital might not necessarily be in the proximity of the main university campus. Noting that the Government and the Shenzhen authority had jointly conducted a planning study on the development of the Lok Ma Chau Loop, Mr TAM said that the Government and other parties might wish to consider the feasibility of developing Chinese medicine hospitals in the Loop area.

Motion

36. The Chairman informed members that he had received the wordings of a motion proposed to be moved by Ms Claudia MO. He advised that the proposed motion was related to the agenda item under discussion and could therefore be moved. Dr Fernando CHEUNG proposed to move certain amendments to the original motion. Both Ms MO's original motion and Dr CHEUNG's amendments had been set out in writing and tabled before members. Members agreed to deal with the motion, and that further debate would not be required since the Panel had already discussed the subject at length.

37. At the invitation of the Chairman, Acting SED reiterated that the bureaux and departments involved had all along followed the established procedures when handling the ex-IVE(LWL) site.

38. With the concurrence of Ms Claudia MO and Dr Fernando CHEUNG, the Chairman put to vote Ms Claudia MO's motion as amended by Dr Fernando CHEUNG (at **Annex 1**). Eight members voted for the motion, no member voted against. One member abstained. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response to the motion was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)538/12-13(01) on 2 April 2013.)

39. DSFH(H)1 indicated that she would like to make some further clarifications regarding HKBU's proposal to use the southern portion of the ex-IVE(LWL) site. Due to time constraint, the Chairman invited her to provide the information in writing after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: A letter from FHB dated 19 March 2013 was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)514/12-13(01) on 22 March 2013. A letter from HKBU in response to FHB's aforesaid letter was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)537/12-13(01) on 2 April 2013.)

(The Chairman left the meeting at this juncture and the Deputy Chairman took over the chair.)

V. Student guidance service in primary schools

(LC Paper No. CB(4)460/12-13(03) -- Paper provided by the Administration)

Briefing by the Administration

40. At the invitation of the Deputy Chairman, Acting SED briefed members on the background and development of the Comprehensive Student Guidance Service ("CSGS") and the enhancement of student guidance service in primary schools by highlighting the salient points in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(4)460/12-13(03)]. In gist, the essence of CSGS in primary schools was to establish a guidance system which did not rely on individual professional staff to maintain the stability of guidance service. The design of CSGS for primary schools was to provide comprehensive service to suit the preventive and developmental needs of primary students while there was obvious difference on the need for casework support between students of primary and secondary levels. For the past decade, there was progressive improvement in CSGS resources, including the introduction of a top-up Student Guidance Service ("SGS") Grant in the 2012-2013 school year and allowing more flexibility in resource deployment by primary schools to best suit their circumstances in catering for their students' needs.

Discussion

Need of an overall review of CSGS

41. Dr Fernando CHEUNG noted that under CSGS, primary schools deploying the SGS Grant and the top-up SGS grant to procure student guidance service from non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") were required to conduct tendering exercise at least once every three years. As establishing rapport between guidance personnel and students was crucial to the effectiveness of student guidance service, Dr CHEUNG was concerned that the tendering system would affect the stability and continuity of service. In addition, there was no requirement that each primary school must have its own school social worker to take up the role of guidance personnel. Referring to a survey conducted by the Hong Kong Social Workers General Union in which it was reported that the turnover rate of student guidance personnel in primary schools in the 2010-2011 school year was as high as 33%, Dr CHEUNG urged the Administration to conduct an overall review of CSGS in order to ascertain the problems, if any, in the current arrangements.

42. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che was also of the view that the quality of student guidance service would inevitably be affected due to the need to conduct a tendering exercise once every three years. Mr CHEUNG considered that the tendering system was not conducive to the building up of long-term relationship and mutual trust between student guidance personnel and students. He enquired whether the Administration would conduct an overall review on CSGS immediately.

43. In response, Acting SED advised that CSGS adopted a whole-school approach to provide structured and holistic guidance service instead of relying on individual professionals. This approach was conducive to the sustainability of service while minimizing the impact arising from the turnover of individual guidance personnel. In tandem with the launch of CSGS in primary schools in the 2002-2003 school year, an additional mode of resources allocation was offered so that schools might opt for either student guidance personnel or SGS Grant. Under the latter, primary schools could deploy the funding flexibly either for employment of student guidance personnel or procuring student guidance services. This arrangement could provide flexibility of resources deployment and cater for school circumstances and students' needs. Acting SED said that for the time being, the Administration had no plan to review CSGS, nor to change the funding modes. However, EDB would maintain frequent communication with the sector to keep abreast of and monitor the development.

Deployment of resources

44. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che raised the query that although the Government had provided the top-up SGS grant to schools for student guidance service, such funding might not have been spent on providing student guidance service. He was also concerned that schools might have benefited from a lower tender price and retained the surplus of the top-up SGS grant for other uses.

45. Acting SED confirmed that the SGS Grant and the top-up SGS grant were provided to schools specifically for the purpose of implementing student guidance service. Schools in receipt of the SGS Grant and the top-up SGS grant could deploy the funding flexibly either for employing student guidance personnel or procuring the necessary services from service providers having regard to the needs of students and the circumstances of the schools. Since the top-up SGS grant had only been introduced starting from the 2012-2013 school year, EDB would monitor its effectiveness before considering any new direction in the long run.

46. Dr Helena WONG noted from the Administration's paper that the Administration had drawn reference from the guidance and discipline model of the United States of America ("US") and introduced the concept of CSGS. However, Dr WONG said that unlike the US model, primary schools in Hong Kong were not required to provide both a student counselor and a school social work for their student guidance service. Dr WONG considered that there should be a school social worker for each primary school.

47. In this connection, Acting SED explained that the Administration had provided additional resources to schools and at the same time allowed flexibility for schools to deploy the resources in a manner which could best suit their needs. Under the existing arrangement, primary schools could engage social workers and/or procure necessary services from NGOs using the SGS Grant and top-up SGS grant. The Administration would not rule out the need of some primary schools for the service of school social workers, but considered that the main requirement of primary schools was for preventive and developmental service instead of casework.

48. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung considered that notwithstanding the flexibility given to schools under the additional mode of resources allocation as depicted in the Administration's paper, schools should abide by some basic requirements set by EDB when administering and deploying such resources. He sought the Administration's advice on the requirements, if any, that schools should comply with in this regard.

49. In response, Principal Assistant Secretary (School Development) ("PAS(SD)) re-affirmed that the SGS Grant and top-up SGS grant should be used for student guidance service and not for other purposes. EDB had revised the Guidelines on CSGS accordingly to set out the arrangements relating the provision and deployment of the SGS Grant and the top-up SGS grant. She further advised that a self-evaluation mechanism was in place under which each school was required to prepare its annual school plans and reports to account for their work to the stakeholders. Through advisory school visits, EDB would monitor the implementation of CSGS in primary schools and provide support to schools where necessary.

50. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung pointed out that students with special educational needs ("SEN") required not only academic support, but also guidance and counseling services. However, at present, the resources available to schools to support SEN students were insufficient.

51. Whilst noting the concern about SEN students, Acting SED highlighted that the SGS Grant and the top-up SGS grant were for the purpose of providing student guidance service to students in general. Schools could avail themselves of other forms of support and assistance that catered specifically for the needs of SEN students.

Evaluation mechanism of student guidance service in schools

52. Dr Helena WONG enquired whether EDB had gauged the views of school principals and teachers regarding the implementation of CSGS in their schools, and collected information on the problems faced by primary students.

53. Referring to the annual plans prepared by schools, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung sought the following information:

- (a) the performance indicators, if any, set by EDB against which the effectiveness of the student guidance service as set out in the schools' annual plans could be evaluated;
- (b) whether EDB could provide an overall report on the effectiveness of student guidance services at schools;
- (c) the number of schools that had provided after-lesson guidance service to students through professional personnel such as educational psychologists; and

- (d) the feedbacks of students on whether and how they could benefit under CSGS.

54. PAS(SD) supplemented that the annual plan was part of the school self-evaluation mechanism. In addition, EDB also conducted external review on tens of schools annually. Support for student development was one of the four domains assessed under the external review. In recent years, the performance of most of the schools on this item was impressive with positive outcomes, including schools having attached importance on the nurturing of students' personal development as well as cultivating a caring school culture, setting clear themes on their guidance and discipline work and providing a wide variety of school-based guidance programmes for students.

55. Concluding the discussion, the Deputy Chairman said that EDB should carefully consider members' views on the implementation of CSGS. He also asked the Administration to provide the information requested by Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung in writing after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)618/12-13(01) on 2 May 2013.)

VI. Issues arising from the Public Policy Research Funding Scheme – Follow-up to special meeting on 21 February 2013

(LC Paper No. CB(4)438/12-13(01) -- A motion dated 21 February 2013 from Hon IP Kin-yuen)

56. The Deputy Chairman said that as this agenda item concerned a motion proposed by him which had not been dealt with at the special meeting on 21 February 2013 due to insufficient time, he considered that it would be more appropriate for another Panel member to preside over the discussion of this item to avoid any possible role conflict. Members agreed that Dr Fernando CHEUNG should preside over the discussion of this item. Dr CHEUNG took over the chair.

57. Dr Fernando CHEUNG recalled that the relevant issues had been thoroughly deliberated at the meeting held on 21 February 2013. As such, he did not consider that a further debate on the motion was needed before the Panel proceeded to vote on the motion.

58. At the invitation of Dr CHEUNG, the Deputy Chairman recapitulated the main points of his motion.

59. At the invitation of Dr Fernando CHEUNG to speak on the motion, Member(2), Central Policy Unit ("M2/CPU") said that as explained at the meeting on 21 February 2013, the revised mode of operation of the Public Policy Research Funding Scheme ("PPRFS"), which would commence in 2013-2014, would not affect academic freedom. After taking over the administration of PPRFS, CPU would continue to work closely with stakeholders including academics to promote public policy research.

60. Mrs Regina IP enquired on the reasons for the decision to change the approving authority under PPRFS from the Research Grants Council ("RGC") to CPU. In response, M2/CPU advised that since the introduction of PPRFS, the social, economic and political landscape of Hong Kong had undergone significant and continued changes over the years. Rising public expectations on the Government had entailed the need for more public policy researches which were less academic in nature, but more focused on local actual situations and generating options to address issues of public concern.

61. Noting the wide range of topics covered in past public policy researches conducted by academics, Mrs Regina IP asked whether under the revised arrangements, CPU would issue instructions on research topics, resulting in less choices for researchers. In response, M2/CPU advised while CPU would identify research directions, areas and topics, it would not issue top-down instructions. Applicants under PPRFS could also propose research topics that could best address the current policy research needs of the community and the Government.

62. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung enquired on the duration of the revised arrangements for PPRFS, and whether they would continue beyond 2013-2014. In reply, M2/CPU said that the revised mode of operation would commence in 2013-2014. However, for the time being, he was not in a position to confirm the way forward for PPRFS, as the requisite annual funding had to be approved by the Finance Committee.

63. Dr Fernando CHEUNG put the Deputy Chairman's motion to vote. Six members voted for the motion, no member voted against. One member abstained. Dr CHEUNG declared that the motion was passed.

64. In this connection, Dr Fernando CHEUNG asked the Administration to provide written information and revert to the Panel on the implementation of PPRFS after the revised arrangements had commenced in 2013-2014.

M2/CPU responded that CPU was prepared to maintain communication with the Legislative Council and would seriously consider Dr CHEUNG's request.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response to the motion passed at the meeting was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)509/12-13(01) on 22 March 2013.)

VII. Any other business

65. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:35 am.

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
3 June 2013

**就議程項目"使用土地作教育用途的現行政策相關事宜"
通過的議案**

**Motion passed under agenda item "Issues relating to the existing policy
on the use of land for education purposes"**

議案措辭

本委員會反對政府將前香港專業教育學院李惠利分校的教育用地改變用途，撥入賣地表作興建中密度豪宅。並要求政府保留前香港專業教育學院李惠利分校校舍用地作「政府、機構或社區」(GIC)用途，包括作原教育用途。

(毛孟靜議員動議並經張超雄議員修訂)

Wording of the Motion

(Translation)

That this Panel opposes the Government's move of changing the educational use of the site of the former campus of the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Lee Wai Lee) and including the site in the land sale programme for the construction of medium density luxury residential units, and urges the Government to retain the site of the former campus of the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (Lee Wai Lee) for "Government, Institution or Community" ("GIC") use, including the originally designated educational use.

(Moved by Hon Claudia MO and as amended by Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung)

**就議程項目"公共政策研究資助計劃
所引起的事宜 - 2013 年 2 月 21 日特別會議的跟進事項"
通過的議案**

**Motion passed under agenda item "Issues arising from the Public
Policy Research Funding Scheme - Follow-up to special meeting
on 21 February 2013"**

議案措辭

中央政策組在毫無諮詢的情況下，於 2012 年 11 月單方面宣布收回原本委托研究資助局進行的「公共政策研究資助計劃」的撥款權，並於其後更改計劃的撥款對象、審批機制和運作模式。本事務委員會認為中央政策組此舉異常粗暴，在缺乏充分理據的情況下違反其原先作出的信諾；而且在缺乏充分諮詢的情況下更改撥款機制，有破壞學術自主之嫌，可能導致學術研究淪為政府政策的宣傳工具。本事務委員會認為中央政策組此舉極為不恰當，對此表示極度遺憾。

本事務委員會促請中央政策組撤回此一收回撥款權的決定，重新履行其原先對研資局的委托，即由研資局繼續負責這一輪「公共政策研究資助計劃」的撥款工作，至 2015 年為止。如果中央政策組有意探討是否有需要及如何改進該計劃的實施，本事務委員會認為該組應展開公眾諮詢。

本事務委員會同時促請大學教育資助委員會(包含研究資助局)及各大院校，堅定地維護學術自主與自由，同時進一步積極地推動本地的公共政策研究。

(葉建源議員動議)

Wording of the Motion

(Translation)

That given that the Central Policy Unit had announced unilaterally in November 2012, without any prior consultation, the resumption of its funding authority under the Public Policy Research Funding Scheme which was originally entrusted to the Research Grants Council ("RGC") while the beneficiaries, approval mechanism and operation mode of the Scheme were also altered subsequently, this Panel considers that this blatantly rude move of the Central Policy Unit has violated its original pledges without sound justifications; moreover, in the absence of sufficient consultation, the changes introduced to the funding mechanism may arouse suspicion of damaging academic autonomy, which could result in academic research being manipulated by the Government to publicize its policies; this Panel considers this move of the Central Policy Unit extremely inappropriate and expresses grave dismay at it.

That this Panel urges the Central Policy Unit to withdraw its decision on the resumption of its funding authority by entrusting afresh such authority to RGC, allowing RGC to continue to be responsible for the funding work of the current round of the Public Policy Research Funding Scheme until 2015; this Panel considers that the Central Policy Unit should conduct public consultation exercises if it intends to explore the need and the way of improving the implementation of the Scheme.

That this Panel also urges the University Grants Committee, including RGC, and various institutions to safeguard steadfastly academic autonomy and freedom and to actively further promote local public policy research.

(Moved by Hon IP Kin-yuen)