

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)1509/17-18
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/ED

Panel on Education

Minutes of meeting
held on Friday, 11 May 2018 at 10:45 am
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP (Chairman)
Hon IP Kin-yuen (Deputy Chairman)
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon SHIU Ka-chun
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon AU Nok-hin
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH

Members attending : Hon SHIU Ka-fai
Hon LUK Chung-hung

Members absent : Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yeet, GBS, JP
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH

Public Officers attending : Agenda item III

Mr Kevin YEUNG, JP
Secretary for Education

Mr WOO Chun-sing
Deputy Secretary for Education (4)

Ms Louise SO
Principal Education Officer (School Administration)
Education Bureau

Agenda item IV

Mrs Ingrid YEUNG, JP
Permanent Secretary for Education

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

Mr Sheridan LEE
Principal Assistant Secretary
(Curriculum Development)
Education Bureau

Professor NG Tai-kai
Executive Director
The Hong Kong Academy for Gifted Education

Agenda item V

Mrs Ingrid YEUNG, JP
Permanent Secretary for Education

Mrs Elina CHAN
Principal Assistant Secretary
(Infrastructure and Research Support)
Education Bureau

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

Staff in attendance : Ms Mina CHAN
Senior Council Secretary (4)4

Miss Mandy NG
Council Secretary (4)4

Ms Sandy HAU
Legislative Assistant (4)4

Action

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

No information paper had been issued so far.

II. Items for discussion at the next meeting

(Appendix I to LC Paper No. CB(4)1030/17-18 -- List of outstanding items for discussion

Appendix II to LC Paper No. CB(4)1030/17-18 -- List of follow-up actions)

2. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting on 1 June 2018 at 10:45am:

(a) Proposed setting up of the Student Activities Support Fund;

(b) Revision of Fee Remission Ceiling under the Kindergarten and Child Care Centre Fee Remission Scheme; and

(c) Updates on promotion of reading.

3. Dr Priscilla LEUNG reiterated her request for discussion of issues on Liberal Studies within the current legislative session. The Chairman advised that according to the Administration's response dated 8 March 2018, a task force had been set up in November 2017 to review the school

Action

curriculum, including Liberal Studies. The Education Bureau ("EDB") would report to the Panel the recommendations of the task force when the consensus on curriculum became clearer.

4. The Secretary for Education ("SED") supplemented that to his understanding, the task force was collecting views from various stakeholders through engagement activities. It was expected that a public consultation would be held in a few months' time and Panel members' views would be sought when the consultation document was ready. Dr Priscilla LEUNG suggested that the task force should gauge views of parents, universities and employers. SED concurred with Dr LEUNG's view and undertook to relay her suggestion to the task force for consideration.

5. Mr Dennis KWOK referred to item 17(g) on the List of outstanding items for discussion, namely the need to introduce legislation related to special education. At the request of the Chairman, Mr KWOK agreed to provide the specific issues of concern that he wished to discuss so that the Secretariat could follow up with the Administration.

6. The Deputy Chairman referred to a joint letter dated 2 May 2018 from himself and five members on matters related to the appointment and extension of appointment of academic staff in University Grants Committee-funded institutions, and requested early discussion of the subject matter. The Chairman advised that the letter had been forwarded to the Administration for its response.

(Post-meeting note: The joint letter and the Administration's response were issued to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(4)1142/17-18(01) and (02) respectively on 25 May 2018.)

III. Arrangements for student guidance teachers/student guidance personnel under the policy of "one school social worker for each school" in primary schools

(LC Paper No. CB(4)908/17-18(01) -- Paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(4)879/17-18(01) -- Joint letter dated 30 March 2018 from 26 Members concerning student guidance teachers in primary schools

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(4)879/17-18(02) -- Administration's written response dated 6 April 2018 to the joint letter dated 30 March 2018 from 26 Members concerning student guidance teachers in primary schools
- LC Paper No. CB(4)883/17-18(01) -- Letter dated 4 April 2018 from Hon HO Kai-ming concerning student guidance teachers in primary schools
- LC Paper No. CB(4)883/17-18(02) -- Administration's written response dated 6 April 2018 to the letter dated 4 April 2018 from Hon HO Kai-ming concerning student guidance teachers in primary schools
- LC Paper No. CB(4)905/17-18(01) -- Submission from 真優化小學學生輔導 SGT 大聯盟
- LC Paper No. CB(4)925/17-18(03) -- Submission from Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union
- LC Paper No. CB(4)925/17-18(04) -- Submission from Asia Professional Counselling & Psychology Association
- LC Paper No. CB(4)1056/17-18(01) -- Further submission from Asia Professional Counselling & Psychology Association
- LC Paper No. CB(4)1056/17-18(02) -- Submission from a member of the public

Action

LC Paper No. CB(4)1066/17-18(01) -- Submission from Hong Kong Social Workers' General Union)

7. The Chairman recapitulated that the agenda item had been carried over from the meeting on 13 April 2018 as the discussion was not finished.

Discussion

Implementation of the policy of "one school social worker for each school"

8. Dr CHENG Chung-tai and the Deputy Chairman considered it undesirable to make such a hasty decision of introducing the policy of "one school social worker for each school" before a comprehensive review of the student guidance service was made. Dr CHENG suggested that preventive, counselling and developmental student guidance services should be reviewed, and the mode of collaboration among Student Guidance Teachers ("SGTs"), Student Guidance Personnel ("SGP") and social workers should be mapped out. The Deputy Chairman was concerned that the new policy seemed to fall short of the community's expectation of providing each school with one social worker on top of its existing resources.

9. SED advised that under the Comprehensive Student Guidance Service, schools might choose to appoint SGTs or receive the Student Guidance Service Grant to employ SGP (including social workers) to provide guidance service to students. Due to the increasing complexity of student problems and the recent child abuse cases, the Administration saw the urgent need to strengthen social work and student guidance services in primary schools. The new policy of "one school social worker for each school" was hence implemented to enable each school which opted to join to be immediately provided with at least one social worker. In tandem, EDB would consider the direction of the development of guidance service in the long term by reviewing the mode of collaboration between student guidance and social work services, identifying improvement areas and exploring with the education sector the best way to provide guidance and social work services for students.

10. Mr HO Kai-ming relayed SGTs' concerns that some school heads thought more resources would be received if schools employing SGTs chose to appoint social workers under the new policy. Hence, some serving SGTs were asked to fill regular teaching vacancies and take up regular teaching load. He suggested the Administration to explain clearly the new arrangements to schools via briefing sessions or circular memorandum. SED assured members that EDB would make further clarification with the school sector, in particular the 119 schools employing SGTs, on the relevant arrangements.

Action

11. Ms Claudia MO was worried that serving SGTs/SGP would gradually be replaced with social workers under the new policy. She asked EDB to strongly advise schools to retain the serving SGTs/SGP. SED responded that under the new policy, schools employing SGTs could continue with the existing arrangements while those employing SGP could continue to employ them with the enhanced Top-up Student Guidance Service Grant ("Top-up Grant"). EDB had encouraged schools to accord priority to employing their serving SGP deemed suitable.

Qualifications of school social workers

12. Noting that the objective of the new policy was to ensure that each primary school had at least one school-based registered graduate social worker with professional qualifications to meet its needs, Mr Dennis KWOK expressed grave concern that serving SGP who were non-graduate social workers might lose their jobs after the implementation of the new policy. He enquired about the anticipated number of serving SGP to be affected, and whether the social welfare and education sectors had ever been consulted on the new arrangements.

13. SED explained that the education and social welfare sectors had been consulted on the implementation details of the policy of "one school social worker for each school". Overall speaking, the guidance resources provided for all schools would be increased (i.e. an additional amount of at least \$200,000 per school) under the new policy. For example, the manning ratio of social worker would be improved from 0.5 to 1 for each primary school operating 17 classes or less. An enhanced Top-up Grant would be provided for schools with 12 or more classes. As such, schools which had employed more than one SGP before should have adequate resources to employ an additional SGP if they so wished. On the number of serving SGP to be affected, SED advised that it was difficult to provide such information at the present stage because EDB allowed a three-year transitional period for schools to switch to the new funding mode. Schools could retain their serving SGP with the existing funding mode during the transitional period or even after the transitional period after discussion with EDB.

14. Dr CHENG Chung-tai pointed out that the implementation of the new policy had caused panic among serving SGP as around 50% to 60% of them were experienced non-graduate social workers. SED clarified that according to EDB's information, about 90% of primary schools were served by social workers and about 70% of them were graduate social workers. Therefore, it was considered appropriate to upgrade the qualification requirements of school social workers under the new policy.

Action

15. Mr SHIU Ka-chun relayed the suggestions of some SGP with psychology or counseling degrees to rename their post title as "Student Counsellor" to better reflect the job nature and to issue a circular to remind schools to make use of the additional grant to employ them under the new funding mode. He further suggested the Administration to consider recognizing school social workers as having met the qualification requirements under the new policy if they only held a degree of relevant discipline, such as counselling, psychology, etc. or once they were admitted into a social work degree programme.

16. Sharing similar views with Mr SHIU Ka-chun, the Deputy Chairman said that the contribution and work of SGTs/SGP should be recognized. He suggested the Administration to consider offering a longer transitional period for serving SGTs/SGP to obtain the qualifications required under the new policy, recognizing non-graduate school social workers who were admitted into a social work degree programme as reaching the qualification threshold, recognizing degrees of relevant discipline as equivalent to a degree of social work, and accepting SGP's length of service in lieu of qualifications.

17. Mr LUK Chung-hung pointed out that some SGTs/SGP were registered social workers without a degree in social work, however, they held degrees of relevant discipline. In his view, their qualifications and work experience were relevant and helped enhance social work and guidance services in schools. He suggested the Administration to consider putting in place exemption arrangements so that these SGTs/SGP could continue to provide guidance service in schools.

18. SED reiterated that schools could retain their serving SGP with the existing funding mode at least during the transition period. Under the new funding mode, schools could continue to use the additional grant to employ SGP. The role and duties of SGP could also be considered in the review of the student guidance service in primary schools. As for whether degrees in psychology, counselling, etc. were equivalent to a degree in social work, SED considered it necessary to gauge the views and concerns of the social welfare sector before a decision could be made. At the request of Mr SHIU Ka-chun, SED undertook to provide the respective numbers of SGP serving in primary schools who were graduate social workers and non-graduate social workers.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1283/17-18(01) on 21 June 2018.)

Action

Future arrangements

19. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan and Mr HUI Chi-fung sought clarification on the roles, functions and responsibilities of school social workers and SGTs/SGP under the new policy. SED explained that SGTs, who were more familiar with the needs of students, would be expected to provide preventive guidance service to assist students in overcoming developmental and educational difficulties. As for social workers, they would follow up on individual cases and provide appropriate counselling services for students with specific needs. Given the distinctive roles and responsibilities of social workers and SGTs/SGP, Mr CHEUNG and Mr HUI urged the Administration to consider adopting "one social worker plus one SGT/SGP for each school" in the future. Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and the Deputy Chairman also called for the same arrangement.

20. Dr CHENG Chung-tai opined that student guidance service should be developed in the direction of "at least one SGT for each level of studies" in the long run. Given that social work and student guidance services were complementary to each other and there was only a small number of serving SGTs and SGP (119 and some 500 respectively), Ms Claudia MO was of the view that the Administration should consider the suggestions of "one social worker plus one SGT" or "one social worker plus one SGT plus one SGP" after the three-year transitional period.

21. SED assured members that while implementing the new policy, the Administration would explore with the education sector the feasibility of various options, including "one social worker plus one SGT", taking into account the circumstances of individual schools and the full utilization of resources.

22. Mr HO Kai-ming said that to his understanding, EDB had no longer provided SGT training and only a few SGT training courses were offered by tertiary institutions. As a result, there were only ten odd new qualified SGTs each year. He called on the Administration to set out the qualifications required of an SGT to ensure sufficient manpower provision to support students. SED responded that EDB would consider the provision of training courses for SGTs after the way forward for student guidance service had been mapped out.

23. Dr Priscilla LEUNG pointed out that some primary teachers might require guidance service and suggested the Administration to take this into consideration when reviewing the mode of collaboration between student guidance and social work services. SED responded that students would be the major consideration in allocating education resources. The provision of guidance service to teachers could be considered in a separate context.

Action

Nevertheless, he believed that school social workers would be most willing to offer help to teachers in need, if necessary.

Motion

24. The Chairman referred members to the motion proposed by the Deputy Chairman (wording of the motion in the **Appendix**) and put the motion to vote. The majority of members present voted for the motion. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried and requested the Administration to provide a written response to the motion passed.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1283/17-18(01) on 21 June 2018.)

IV. Proposed further injection to the Gifted Education Fund

(LC Paper No. CB(4)1030/17-18(01) -- Paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(4)1030/17-18(02) -- Background brief entitled "Gifted Education Fund" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

Briefing by the Administration

25. Permanent Secretary for Education ("PS(Ed)") briefed members on the Administration's measures to strengthen gifted education and talent development in Hong Kong, and its proposal to inject \$800 million into the Gifted Education Fund ("GEF"), details of which were set out in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(4)1030/17-18(01)].

Declaration of interest

26. The Chairman drew members' attention to Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure, which provided that a Member shall not move any motion or amendment relating to a matter in which he had a pecuniary interest, whether direct or indirect, or speak on any such matter, except where he disclosed the nature of that interest. She reminded members to declare interest, if any, in the subject under discussion.

Action

Discussion

Need for injection into the Gifted Education Fund

27. Dr CHENG Chung-tai queried the need for an injection of \$800 million into GEF to support the operation of the Hong Kong Academy for Gifted Education ("HKAGE") as the \$800-million GEF had just been established in 2016. PS(Ed) clarified that the GEF had been established in November 2016 with an endowment of \$800 million to generate investment income to support HKAGE's operation and gifted education development in Hong Kong. As the investment of GEF had only started from March 2017, the actual investment income in 2017 was insufficient for HKAGE to meet its operational expenses in the 2017-2018 school year. Moreover, the existing low rate of investment return was insufficient for HKAGE to meet its operation expenses and for the Government to engage other relevant organisations to promote gifted education. Hence, there was a concrete need to increase the investment return of GEF by increasing the amount of the endowment.

28. Noting that the income generated in 2017 was insufficient to meet HKAGE's operational expenses, the Deputy Chairman enquired about the amount of income generated in 2017. PS(Ed) advised that HKAGE's expenditure in the 2017-2018 school year was around \$36 million. The income generated from GEF in 2017 was \$22.4 million, of which about \$14 million had been deployed to support the operation of HKAGE. Dr CHENG Chung-tai considered the funding of \$14 million significant enough to cater for the operational needs of HKAGE which was a non-governmental organization.

29. Mr SHIU Ka-chun was concerned whether further injections into GEF would be required in future. PS(Ed) explained that the rate of return for 2017 was only 2.8% which was much lower than its expected rate of about 5%. A more prudent approach was therefore adopted to estimate the investment income to be generated. Assuming a rate of return in the range of 3.7% to 4.9% a year from 2019 to 2022, the annual investment income to be generated by the 1.6 billion GEF would be around \$60 million to \$78 million. Barring any unforeseeable circumstances, it was confident that the investment income would be able to support the operation of HKAGE with an expanded scope of services.

30. The Chairman asked whether EDB could use part of the principal of GEF if necessary. PS(Ed) advised that to uphold fiscal discipline, the principal could only be used under very exceptional circumstances.

31. The Deputy Chairman enquired about the justifications for establishing GEF which incurred considerable administrative costs. In his

Action

view, it was more appropriate to provide recurrent funding to support HKAGE's operation. PS(Ed) advised that it was a usual practice for the Administration to set up funds to secure a stable source of income to support long-term and on-going initiatives which would obviate the need for these initiatives to compete for resources with other expenditure items. The Deputy Chairman did not subscribe to PS(Ed)'s explanation, and said that the injection had indicated the failure of GEF to secure a stable source of income. The Administration should re-consider providing recurrent funding to support HKAGE's operation.

Operation of HKAGE

32. Dr CHENG Chung-tai noted from media reports that the enrolment and attendance rates of programmes offered by HKAGE were low, and sought explanation on that. Professor NG Tai-kai, Executive Director of HKAGE, clarified that the media reports were somewhat misleading. He explained that the average completion rate of HKAGE's programmes was 80%, which was very high given that HKAGE was not an ordinary school requiring compulsory attendance. As a majority of HKAGE's students were nominated by their schools, schools might not nominate the right students on some occasions. In the past few years, about 50% of the nominees had chosen not to take part in the programmes. PS(Ed) undertook to provide detailed information on the student enrolment and completion rates of HKAGE's programmes.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1193/17-18(01) on 4 June 2018.)

33. Dr Helena WONG said that the Democratic Party supported the development of gifted education. However, she was concerned that HKAGE had not made its financial position public. She considered it necessary to enhance the financial transparency and accountability of HKAGE.

34. PS(Ed) advised that HKAGE's Board of Directors would be responsible for monitoring its financial position. Board members included, among others, Ms Emily LAU Wai-hing, school principals, EDB's Deputy Secretary and herself. In 2017-2018, the staff and general costs were around \$29 million and the programme costs were about \$6.7 million. She highlighted that HKAGE had to seek additional resources to retain staff as it had been experiencing staff turnover problem. The turnover rate was 65% in 2017-2018. She undertook to provide the financial figures of HKAGE for the past two years, and explore with HKAGE the feasibility of making public its auditor's reports. Professor NG Tai-kai added that there were 53 staff members in HKAGE.

Action

(*Post-meeting note*: The Administration's response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1193/17-18(01) on 4 June 2018.)

35. Mr SHIU Ka-chun was concerned about how HKAGE would help gifted students who had poor social skills. PS(Ed) confirmed that the provision of affective education programmes and counselling services would be scaled up to cater for the affective needs of exceptionally gifted students.

36. The Chairman enquired about the timetable for setting quantitative targets for HKAGE's initiatives and conducting tracking surveys on the performance of HKAGE's student members. PS(Ed) advised that it would be more appropriate to do so after GEF had supported HKAGE for a few more years when HKAGE's scope of services could be expanded. PS(Ed) added that about 11 500 students had participated in HKAGE's programmes in the 2016-2017 school year .

Gifted education in Hong Kong

37. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan said that the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the injection into GEF. He sought information on the places and practices to which HKAGE had made reference in the development of gifted education.

38. PS(Ed) advised that the Administration had made reference to the practices of Singapore and Israel, and relevant literatures of other places to understand their experiences in promoting gifted education. Professor NG Tai-kai supplemented that reference had also been made to the development of gifted education in South Korea, Taiwan and the United States, etc. In fact, gifted education in Hong Kong and Israel were quite similar, with no specialized schools for gifted students, unlike the approach in Singapore and South Korea. Gifted students received formal education in public sector schools and took part in gifted education programmes on Saturdays and Sundays. The successful experience of Israel in developing gifted education had served as the most useful reference for Hong Kong.

39. Mr Dennis KWOK was concerned whether the existing gifted education policy recognized twice-exceptionally students/gifted students with special educational needs ("SEN"), and whether HKAGE would take the initiative to identify these students and provide them with appropriate support.

40. Professor NG Tai-kai advised that HKAGE would not disqualify any students with SEN. It in fact had admitted some of these students. However, HKAGE had not taken the initiative to identify gifted students with SEN as

Action

the assessment for identifying gifted students was not compulsory for all students under the existing policy. Also, HKAGE would not single out gifted students with SEN as a special group for special treatment. PS(Ed) added that under the existing policy, an inclusive approach was adopted for developing the talents of gifted students (including gifted students with SEN). Gifted students would receive education in mainstream schools and be recommended to take part in gifted education programmes offered by HKAGE during school holidays. They could be nominated by schools or self-nominated. The Government had no plan to seek out gifted students (including those with SEN) amongst the student population at the present stage. Nonetheless, the Government would explore ways to improve the collaboration between HKAGE and schools to identify gifted students (including those with SEN). PS(Ed) agreed to provide information on the Administration's policy on gifted students with SEN and the support services to facilitate early identification of these students.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1193/17-18(01) on 4 June 2018.)

Summing up

41. The Chairman concluded that the Panel raised no objection to the Administration's submission of the funding proposal to the Finance Committee ("FC").

42. The Chairman said that the Panel could visit HKAGE to gain a better understanding of its work. Mr SHIU Ka-chun echoed. The Chairman instructed the Secretariat to arrange the visit before the Administration's submission of the funding proposal to FC.

(Post-meeting note: The Panel visited HKAGE on 26 June 2018.)

V. 8096EB - Construction of an assembly hall at Munsang College at 8 Dumbarton Road, Kowloon City

(LC Paper No. CB(4)1030/17-18(03) -- Paper provided by the Administration)

43 The Chairman drew members' attention to Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure, which provided that a Member shall not move any motion or amendment relating to a matter in which he had a pecuniary interest, whether direct or indirect, or speak on any such matter, except where he disclosed the nature of that interest. She reminded members to declare interest, if any, in the subject under discussion.

Action

Briefing by the Administration

44. PS(Ed) briefed members on the proposed capital works project for constructing an assembly hall block at Munsang College in Kowloon City, details of which were set out in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(4)1030/17-18(03)].

Discussion

45. The Deputy Chairman expressed support for the proposed project as Munsung College did not have its own assembly hall. He pointed out that many public-sector primary and secondary schools such as Kowloon Tong School (Secondary Section) did not have assembly halls at present. He enquired about the number of public-sector schools without an assembly hall and the Administration's concrete plans to construct assembly halls for these schools.

46. Mr Vincent CHENG was supportive of the proposed project. Sharing the Deputy Chairman's concern, he enquired whether major improvement works would be conducted to improve the facilities of schools built according to the past planning standards so as to meet the changing needs in teaching and learning.

47. PS(Ed) stressed that the Administration attached great importance to schools' teaching and learning environment. Over the years, various measures, including the School Improvement Programme ("SIP") implemented between 1994 and 2006, had been put in place to enhance school facilities. In 2018-2019, the funding allocation for school maintenance and repairs had been greatly increased by about 28%. For Kowloon Tong School (Secondary Section), a new annex block with facilities including student activity centre, classrooms, staff room, staff common room and meeting room, etc., were provided through SIP in 1999. Moreover, necessary maintenance and improvement works had been carried out for this School through the annual major repairs exercise and emergency repairs mechanism. Given such, when prioritizing requests received from schools for in-situ redevelopment, priority could not be accorded to this School at the present stage. PS(Ed) undertook to provide the respective numbers of public-sector primary and secondary schools without an assembly hall and the Administration concrete plan to provide these schools with assembly halls. The Deputy Chairman did not subscribe to PS(Ed)'s response, and maintained his view that all schools should be provided with standard facilities, including assembly hall.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1280/17-18(01) on 20 June 2018.)

Action

48. As assembly hall was a standard facility in public-sector schools, Dr Helena WONG enquired about the reasons for not providing Munsang College with its own assembly hall after turning into an aided school in 1978. PS(Ed) explained that school premises had been built in different periods in accordance with the standards at the time of construction, which covered various facilities and had been changing over the years. As the need for upgrading facilities varied among schools, improvement works would be arranged having regard to individual schools' circumstances in accordance with the established mechanism. In fact, EDB had been proactively following up with Munsang College after approving its application for the construction of an assembly hall in 2012. At the request of the Chairman, PS(Ed) agreed to provide the numbers of primary and secondary schools which had submitted applications to EDB for the construction of assembly halls.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1280/17-18(01) on 20 June 2018.)

49. Noting that Munsang College had to contribute \$139.5 million to the proposed project, Dr Helena WONG asked why the proposed project would not be fully funded by the Government if Munsang College was an aided school. PS(Ed) explained that the capital grant from the Government would only cover the provision of standard facilities. Munsang College had to bear the cost of the above-standard facilities including the gymnasium. The Deputy Chairman requested the Administration to include in its papers to the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") and FC a list of above-standard facilities to be provided by Munsang College.

50. The Chairman enquired about the capacity of the assembly hall and whether the size of the existing playground would be affected upon completion of the assembly hall block. Principal Assistant Secretary (Infrastructure and Research Support) responded that the assembly hall should be able to accommodate all students of Munsang College (i.e. about 990 students). PS(Ed) advised that the size of the existing playground would not be reduced. On the other hand, a relatively bigger covered playground would be provided in the new block.

51. Mr Vincent CHENG was concerned about the possible impact of the proposed works on students and residents nearby. PS(Ed) advised that the proposed works would be carried out within Munsang College's existing campus. Moreover, the school sponsoring body had been maintaining a close dialogue with the local community over the proposed project and had urged the contractor to put in place various measures during construction to minimize the disturbances of the proposed project. To ensure safety of

Action

school and road users, the construction site would be separated from the school operation area and covered pedestrian walkways would be provided.

52. The Chairman concluded that the Panel supported the Administration's submission of the proposal to PWSC.

VI. Any other business

53. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:41 pm.

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
28 August 2018

教育事務委員會
Panel on Education

在 2018 年 5 月 11 日的會議上
就議程項目"小學'一校一社工'政策下
學生輔導教師／學生輔導人員的安排"提出的議案
Motion proposed under the agenda item
"Arrangements for student guidance teachers/student guidance personnel
under the policy of 'one school social worker for each school'
in primary schools" at the meeting on 11 May 2018

議案措辭

教育局於本年 4 月 27 日向小學發出「小學一校一社工政策」通函，在新政策下，公營小學如果要保留現有的小學學生輔導教師，就不能獲得編制內的常額的社工職位，局方亦未有提供足夠措施，讓學校保留包括學生輔導員的現有各類專業輔導人員。這項政策明顯與本委員會在 4 月 13 日通過的四項議案並不相符，也與公眾期望的在現有資源之上額外增加社工資源的做法有明顯落差。本委員會重申已通過的四項議案的要求，當局應盡快檢討，以達致加強小學教師的輔導系統及與社工及其他輔導人員共同協作，從而更好地幫助學生克服成長和學習的困擾。

(葉建源議員動議)

Wording of the Motion

(Translation)

On 27 April this year, the Education Bureau issued to primary schools a circular memorandum on "The Policy of One School Social Worker for Each School in Primary Schools". Under the new policy, if a public sector primary school retains its existing Student Guidance Teacher, it will not be provided with a regular social worker post on the establishment. Moreover, the Bureau has not introduced adequate measures to allow schools to retain existing professional counsellors in various disciplines, including student counsellors.

Obviously, such policy is not in line with the four motions passed by this Panel on 13 April. It also falls short of the public expectation for the

allocation of additional resources for social workers on top of the existing resources. This Panel reiterates our demands in the four motions passed that the authorities should conduct a review expeditiously to enhance the student guidance system of primary school teachers as well as the collaboration among primary school teachers, social workers and other student guidance personnel, so as to better help students overcome the perplexities associated with growth and learning.

(Moved by Hon IP Kin-yuen)