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The Chairman's Report for 2014/2015

The most important event in the University during this session is the appointment of Professor Peter Mathieson, as the President & Vice-Chancellor, who took up his office in March this year.

The activities undertaken by the ASA in the session 2014/2015 is presented below.

New Office for ASA
After years of insistent work by the ASA requesting equal treatment of unions in the University, we have finally been allocated some space. As the ASA and HKUEU were allocated the ground floor and first floor of Pao Siu Loong Building, we decided to share the two floors for better utilization of the available floor area. Although most of the renovation works were completed in the autumn of 2014, we only moved into the new office in December 2014. The ASA Office is located now in Room 104 on the first floor of Pao Siu Loong Building. Members are welcomed to come and visit us.

Internal Research Support Programmes
Many colleagues relied on the funding from the Internal Research Support Programmes to recruit their research postgraduate students every year. Since the interviews of the applicants for the research postgraduate students started in early January, offers could be made in February, if the results of these Internal Research Support Programmes were available at that time. However, these results were announced only in the middle of April, too late to recruit good candidates, as many of them had already accepted offers from our sister institutions. We conveyed this important concern to the University in June 2014. The University Research Committee (URC) responded this important issue positively and revised the timetable in announcing these results. With effect from the 2014/15, the results of the Internal Research Support Programmes would be made available to the applicants in February. This is a good example how the ASA and the University Administration can work together for the benefit of staff and the University. We hope that this kind of collaboration can continue when the new senior management team of the University taking up their duties.

Survey on extension of retirement age to 65
We met Professor Mathieson on 16 January 2014 before he joined the University, and expressed our concerns, such as the parity of support in terms of space and staff provided by the University to staff associations, the change of the retirement age to 65, the lack of transparency and unfairness of the tenure and promotion procedures, the Performance Review and Development (PRD) and the Performance Review & Staff Development (PRSD). We impressed on him not only the lack of transparency and the unfairness of these procedures, but also the lack of appeal against the results of these procedures, as the current appeal procedure only considers whether the procedure has been followed or not.

We met Vice-Chancellor again on 23 May 2014, and we managed to reiterate some of our concerns expressed to him in the previous meeting. After we conveyed to him staff”s proposal to change our retirement age to 65 so that we would be as competitive as some of our sister institutions in recruiting, we were a little surprise when Vice-Chancellor raised the issue of a review before a staff could change his/her retirement age to 65. It looks like that he was thinking of reintroducing the procedure on Extension of Appointment beyond Retirement Age, not changing our retirement age. In the current arrangement, tenured and substantiated staff work until they reach the retirement age of 60, and there is no review before that age. If the retirement age is to be changed to 65, tenure or substantiated staff should simply continue to work until
the retirement age of 65 instead of 60, same as in the present arrangement. We have conveyed our concern to Vice-Chancellor in a letter sent to him on 3 June 2014, a copy of which can be found in the Newsletter in June this year.

We had met with Dr Steven J Cannon, Executive Vice-President, and the Director of Human Resources to discuss on changing the retirement age to 65, and the PRD. However, for no reasons at all, the progress had been extremely slow, even after the Government has announced their support for employers to extend the retirement age of their staff to 65.

**Grievances from members**

1. **A colleague could not get tenure**
   
   A colleague was promised a tenure contract post by the Dean and Head, and came back from the US to take up the post of assistant professorship in 2009. However, when the colleague applied for tenure, she was informed that her post was not a tenure one and therefore she could not apply for tenure. The colleague had good track records in grant applications and publications, but her PRD was rated unreasonably/artificially low. The colleague then approached the ASA for help. We went to the Labour Department, and sued the University in the Labour Tribunal. Eventually, the University offered an out-of-court settlement.

2. **Vice-Chancellor issued warning letter to an ASA member**
   
   Although an ASA member has followed proper due-process and established mechanisms to alert the University of the highly irregular academic conditions and highly inappropriate academic management and investigation conduct supporting the proper actions, the reward of this action was a warning letter by Vice-Chancellor. The ASA wrote to Vice-Chancellor and then Council Chairman to seek clarification of the University procedure that Vice-Chancellor was relying on and the rationale for issuing such a warning letter to a HKU staff.

3. **ASA can only represent ASA members**
   
   The ASA has received grievances reported by ASA members and non-ASA members. We have handled all the cases raised by ASA members. However, due to the ASA constitutions, we are unable to handle cases raised by non-members. It is therefore of paramount importance to join the ASA after start working in the University.

**HKU staff and students in Sassoon Road Campus were injected wrong influenza vaccination**

It has been brought to the attention of ASA concerning the University Health Service (UHS) seasonal influenza vaccination campaign in Sassoon Road Campus that took place on 3-4 October 2014. Staff were injected the trivalent influenza vaccine instead of the quadrivalent influenza vaccine as stated in the consent form that staff required to sign. This incident raised a serious safety issue, as patients were being administered wrong medicine. The ASA wrote Dr MK Cheung, Director of UHS, and asked her how the incident could have happened, and remedies to resolve it in order that similar incident would not recur.

**Survey on Professor Arthur Li Kwok-cheung on his council membership and possible council chairmanship**
Professor Arthur Li Kwok-cheung, was appointed as member of the Council of the University from 20 March 2015 for a period of three years. There are also rumors that he would succeed Dr CH Leong as the new Council Chairman of the University after Dr CH Leong’s term expires in November 2015.

The ASA conducted a survey on Council Member Arthur Li Kwok-cheung to solicit members’ views on whether members were confident that his appointment as Council member, and possibly as Council Chairman of the University would benefit the University. The survey results indicate that 85% and 86% of respondents are not confident that Prof. Li’s appointment as Council member and Council Chairman, respectively, would be beneficial to HKU. These results have been made available to the Honourable C Y Leung, Chancellor of the University, staff and the public.

Council Member Arthur Li Kwok-cheung’s negative comment on HKU professors

Professor Arthur Li Kwok-cheung, Council member of the University, made the remark in a radio interview on 24 March 2015 that the ranking of The University of Hong Kong has fallen due to “港大教授不務正業，導致港大排名下跌”. As this remark is widely published in the press and is extremely damaging to the reputation of academics working in the University, we wrote to him on 26 March 2015 requesting him to substantiate and provide evidences for his statement. If he was unable to do so, we demanded him to retract his remark immediately and apologize to academics in the University.

In his reply on 31 March 2015 that, Council Member Li said that the drop was due to either “some members of the faculty failing to carry out properly their duties in research and teaching” or “the overall calibre of the academic staff having deteriorated and become intellectually incompetent”. He chose to believe the former reason as he believed that “faculty members at the university still possess the intellectual abilities to do their job well.” He said, “If you reject the former which you seem to do, then the latter is a more relevant contributing cause.” He added. “It could only mean that you think staff members are academically not as capable and competent as before.” He questioned, “Which option is less insulting? And how otherwise would you explain the drop in ranking?” The ASA is considering taking legal action against Prof Li.

SW Cheung
22 April 2015
INTERNAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROGRAMMES

Open E-mails copied to HKU Staff

11 August 2014

Professor Paul KH Tam
Pro-Vice-Chancellor

Dear Prof. Tam

Internal Research Support Programmes

Thank you for your letter of 31 July 2014.

We are delighted that the University Research Committee (URC) has kindly considered our proposal to move forward the date of announcing the results of internal research support programmes, and agreed that these results will be announced in February from the 2014/15 exercise onwards.

We wish to thank you and the URC to take on board our proposal, which it will no doubt be helpful for the University to recruit better research students.

Yours sincerely,

S.W. Cheung
ASA Chairman

On 8/27/2014 4:46 AM, The Vice-President and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research) wrote:
Message from The Vice-President and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Research)

July 31, 2014

Dr. S.W. Cheung
Chairman
Academic Staff Association

Dear Dr. Cheung,

With reference to your June 3, 2014 letter to the President, which suggested, inter alia, bringing forward the announcement of the results of internal research support programmes, I write to
inform you that the University Research Committee (URC), at its meeting on July 16, 2014, has agreed to adopt the revised timetable for expedited process of the internal grant applications, as recommended by its Sub-Committee for Internal Support of Research Projects. Under the revised timetable, the results would be made available to the applicants in February with effect from the 2014/15 exercise.

The schedule of announcement of results will be mentioned in the call circular of the internal research support programmes to be issued in mid-September 2014.

Yours sincerely,

Professor P.K.H. Tam
Vice-President and Pro-Vice-Chancellor
Chairman, University Research Committee
REVIEW ON CHANGING THE RETIREMENT AGE TO 65 AND HKU HONORARY DEGREE NOMINATIONS

Open E-mails copied to HKU Staff and/or ASA Members

Professor Peter Mathieson
Vice-Chancellor

16 July 2014

Dear Professor Mathieson

This is to remind you that after a month we still have yet to receive your reply to my email of 16 June 2014, which is attached below.

It would be most appreciated if you can do so very soon.

Yours sincerely,

S.W. Cheung
ASA Vice Chairman

Cc Dr. CH Leong, Council Chairman
    All staff

On 6/16/2014 11:18 PM, Dr. S.W. Cheung wrote:

Professor Peter Mathieson
Vice-Chancellor

16 June 2014

Dear Professor Mathieson

I referred again to your reply email of 3 June 2014, regarding your key remark on the present existing review procedure for "individual cases" of Extension beyond retirement age at 60, which you seem to have endorsed and reaffirmed. In the said email, you remarked that,

“I am fully acquainted with the present arrangements: if there is to be an element of decision making on any future extension proposals in individual cases, that would need to be based on robust evidence in order to be fair to employee and employer, so that a system that reliably assess "contribution" over the years would be in everybody's best interests.”

On the other hand, the ASA and other union leaders have been meeting with the EVP, the HR Direction and a senior HR staff with over 20 year experience on HKU HR matters to discuss about this “extension topic” for several times. Further to your email of 3 June 2014, in the meeting on 10 June 2014, I specifically asked the senior experienced HR staff to elaborate on the present review procedure arrangement for "individual cases" of Extension beyond retirement age at 60 and the criteria for HKU staff to apply for extension of retirement to 65. I
was caught by a surprised that even the senior of the HR Department with over 20 year experience was unsure how it was performed. The senior staff is nowhere near to be considered to have any acquaintance with the present arrangements at all. If her role in the review conducted by the EVP is to help him to understand more fully how the existing system works, she has utterly failed to perform that role. In order to speed up the progress, it seems necessary to replace her with someone more familiar with the current HR procedures. I am sure that you are aware that the University has adopted the performance based HR policy assessing staff’s performance annually. Needless to say, the same policy also applies to staff in the Administration of the University, especially senior staff, as staff look to them as their role model.

To avoid any misunderstanding, we like to ask for your elaboration on the details of your acquaintance with the present review procedure for HKU staff to apply for extension of retirement at 60, which you are supposed to be fully acquainted with as remarked in the email of 3 June 2014. We are sure that member staff would be very pleased to have you sharing your knowledge with them on such.

We look forward for your reply.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

cc All staff

From: Prof. Peter Mathieson
Date: 18 July 2014

SW and colleagues

Thank you for your e-mail of 16 July. I apologise if you were expecting a new reply to your previous message but the position had not changed from our previous discussion on the subject so I am waiting to deal with your concerns once the piece of work being led by the EVP Steve Cannon, taking in issues around retirement age, staff review & development and other HR issues, is complete. You will appreciate that this is a complex and detailed review and it is important that it is done comprehensively and thoroughly. Dr Cannon has not yet reported to the rest of the Senior Management Team, so there has not yet been any change to institutional policies. Of course there will be ongoing consultation with you, the other staff associations and other stakeholders.

With best regards,

Peter Mathieson
Professor Peter Mathieson  
Vice-Chancellor  

24 July 2014  

Dear Professor Mathieson,  

Thank you for your email of 18 July 2014, which I did not receive until I received a copy from the ASA Office, as you were replying wrongly to the bulk email sent by the ASA instead of the one I sent to you personally.  

If you have read my email of 16 July 2014, you would not have made the remark that “a new reply” was expected of you. For your convenience, a copy of that email is attached below, and it would be appreciated, if you can reply to the issues raised there.  

I wish to reiterate that staff now retire at the age of 60, and that there is no review to decide whether or not the staff should retire at 60. Likewise, if the retirement age is changed to 65, no such review would be necessary. However, your reply seems to indicate that you are mixing the change in the retirement age with other HR activities, such as contract renewal, tenure, etc. Please reassure staff that this is not the case, and that you would consider the change of the retirement age to 65 as an issue on its own, and separate from other HR activities.  

I look forward to hearing from you.  

Yours sincerely,  

SW Cheung  
ASA Vice Chairman  

cc Dr CH Leong, Council Chairman  
All staff  

Professor Peter Mathieson  
Vice-Chancellor  

30 July 2014  

Dear Professor Mathieson,  

Thank you for your almost instantaneous reply to my email dated 24 July 2004, which I received without being redirected by the ASA Office. Perhaps, you got it right this time, as you replied to my email sent to you personally instead of the one through bulk email. It may be timely to find out how the bulk email works from the Information Technology Services to avoid any future misunderstanding.  

Unfortunately, in your reply, you only reiterated your previous email without any attempt to reply my emails of 16 June and 24 July. If you have taken a little more time to read through my emails, your reply could have been different. To show staff that the University genuinely
believes in communication with staff, it would be most appreciated if you can reply my emails addressing all the issues raised in them.

In your email dated 18 July, you stated that “Dr Cannon has not yet reported to the rest of the Senior Management Team, so there has not yet been any change to institutional policies. Of course there will be ongoing consultation with you, the other staff associations and other stakeholders.” Presumably the “ongoing consultation” you referred to are the meetings held between staff associations/union and Dr. Cannon on this issue.

However, the “ongoing consultation” was dropped from your email dated 24 July, as you stated that “when the Senior Management Team has received a report for Dr Steve Cannon on issues including (but not limited to) retirement age, we will consult with you, other staff associations and other stakeholders on any proposed changes.” It indicates that the meetings with Dr Cannon on this issue do not exist, and if exist, will not be continued, since consultation with us will only take place after Dr Cannon submits his report. I hope this is not a reflection of your true intention on consultation with staff. Perhaps, it is no wonder that no proposal has ever been tabled for discussion in these “ongoing consultation” meetings, and consequently these meetings are a total waste of our time.

You indicated in your email of 24 July that Dr Cannon is to report on “issues including (but not limited to) retirement age”. However, this brief is different from that requested by the Human Resource Policy Committee (HRPC). It is stated in the letter from the Chairman of the HRPC dated 17 October 2013 that “the HRPC did recommend that that a thorough review be led by the Executive Vice-President (Administration & Finance) so that the financial and operational implications can be studied carefully”. Clearly, there is no mention of “staff review & development and other HR issues” mentioned in your email of 18 July. Therefore, it would be most appreciated, if you can inform staff the full brief of Dr Cannon, and how and why it is different from that requested by the HRPC.

I look forward to receiving your early reply, but not necessary an instantaneous one.

Yours sincerely,
S.W. Cheung
ASA Vice Chairman

cc Dr. CH Leong, Council Chairman
All staff

Professor Peter Mathieson
Vice-Chancellor

19 January 2015

Dear Prof Mathieson,

I would like to draw your attention to the 2015 Policy Address of the CE, the Honourable CY Leung, in which he stated that "the Government has decided to extend the service of civil servants, and will encourage other employers to implement appropriate measures according to the circumstances to extend the working life of their employees." The importance of this
statement is also pointed out by one of our members, a copy of his email has also been sent to you. It illustrates the concern of our members on this important new development.

As a leading institution in Hong Kong, we hope that HKU can take a lead in implementing this new government policy.

We look forward to discuss on the implementation of this Government policy with you very soon.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung & KC Cheung                             Felix Ng
Academic Staff Association                          Univ. of HK Employees Union

Cc Council Chairman
                  All staff

From:           Prof. Peter Mathieson
Date:           19 January 2015

Colleagues

We have noted the CE's comments on this issue and will certainly factor it into our thinking on the retirement age issue. I have forwarded your e-mail to the EVP and Provost who are leading the work on this and other HR issues.

With best regards,

Peter Mathieson

Dr CH Leong
Chairman of Council
The University of Hong Kong

20 January 2015

Dear Dr. Leong

We wish to refer to the email that we sent to the Vice-Chancellor on 19 January 2015, in which we drew his attention to the 2015 Policy Address of the CE, the Honourable CY Leung, on the extension of retirement age: "the Government has decided to extend the service of civil servants, and will encourage other employers to implement appropriate measures according to the circumstances to extend the working life of their employees."

As a leading institution in Hong Kong, we hope that you and the Administration of HKU can take a lead in implementing this new Government Policy.

We look forward to discussing the implementation of this Government Policy with you very soon.
The Honourable C Y Leung  
Chancellor  
The University of Hong Kong

Dear Mr Leung

**HKU honorary degree nominations**

Thank you for your reply dated 9 March 2015 (Appendix I) to my letter of 16 February 2015 (Appendix II) regarding the recent incident on the honorary degree nominations of our University.

The Academic Staff Association (ASA) is glad to learn from your reply that you respect academic freedom.

However, in your reply, you also indicated that as the Chief Executive, you *have been discharging your duties as the Chancellor of The University of Hong Kong in accordance with the relevant ordinance and statues of the University.*

This is further confused when the ASA and the HKU Employees Union (EU) wrote to you, as Chancellor of The University of Hong Kong, on 4 January 2013 to seek your support for the University to change the retiring age to 65, to be in line with our younger sister institutions (Appendix III), you did not discharge your duties as in the case of honorary degree nominations, but passed the matter to the Education Bureau (Appendix IV). Although you indicated that “a reply would be given to us in due course”, we had to write to the Secretary for Education to inquire about the reply to this letter on 29 October 2013 (Appendix V) as no reply was forthcoming from them. Regrettably, their reply on 6 November 2013 indicated that they did not receive our letter that you forwarded to them due to a transmission error (Appendix VI). They also indicated that

> “The University of Hong Kong is an independent and autonomous statutory body governed by The University of Hong Kong Ordinance (Cap 1053) and the Statutes. The University enjoys a high degree of autonomy in formulating policies for and managing its own academic and administrative matters, including staff matters, in accordance with the governance structure stipulated by legislation. The matter you raised falls within the University's institutional autonomy and the Administration is not in a position to interfere in this matter.”
They appear to suggest that changing the retirement age to 65 is vested in the University, and you, as Chancellor of the University, can and should discharge this duty.

We are glad that, as the Chief Executive, you now support extending the retirement age in Hong Kong, as in your 2015 Policy Address, you stated that "the Government has decided to extend the service of civil servants, and will encourage other employers to implement appropriate measures according to the circumstances to extend the working life of their employees." We are writing to you again, as Chancellor of the University, to seek your support for the University of Hong Kong to take a lead in implementing your policy by changing our retiring age to 65.

We request you, as the Chancellor of The University of Hong Kong, to discharge this duty, as you have done in the case of the honorary degree nominations.

We urgently look forward to receiving your early reply and support of this request from thousands of staff in The University of Hong Kong.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung                                                                 Felix Ng
ASA Chairman                                                           Chairman, HKUEU

Cc   Dr CH Leong, Council Chair, HKU
     Prof Peter Mathieson, Vice-Chancellor, HKU
     All staff, HKU
9 March 2015

Mr SW Cheung
ASA Chairman
Academic Staff Association of
The University of Hong Kong
Room 104, Pao Siu Loong Building
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong

Dear Mr Cheung,

Thank you for your letter of 16 February 2015 to the Chief Executive. I am replying on his behalf.

The Chief Executive respects academic freedom which is one of the core values treasured by Hong Kong and the cornerstone of our higher education sector. Whilst we would not comment on individual cases, the Chief Executive has been discharging his duties as the Chancellor of The University of Hong Kong in accordance with the relevant ordinance and statues of the University.

Yours sincerely,

Carlson K S Chan
(Private Secretary to Chief Executive)
Appendix II

The Honourable C Y Leung
Chancellor
The University of Hong Kong

Dear Mr Leung

HKU honorary degree nominations

You are probably aware of the importance of academic freedom which is vital to the life of each and every successful university all over the world and the HK community. As such it is protected by Article 137 in the Basic Law of the HKSAR, which is stated as follows:

"Educational institutions of all kinds may retain their autonomy and enjoy academic freedom. They may continue to recruit staff and use teaching materials from outside the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. Schools run by religious organizations may continue to provide religious education, including courses in religion."

HKU also values academic freedom very much. The University has the following written statements/decisions to protect the academic freedom*:

Freedom to govern its own affairs, in particular, in teaching and research. and

Responsibility to maintain academic standards and independence of judgment; to promote and defend these freedoms.

(*http://www.hku.hk/about/policies_reports/acad_freedom/acad.html)

The Academic Staff Association (ASA) of HKU and many HKU staff are extremely disturbed by the news that your Office had removed or vetoed some of the names on the honorary degrees list recommended by the Honorary Degrees Committee of the University, as such action denies the responsibility of the University to govern its own affairs, and as such action interferes the academic freedom of the University. On behalf of ASA, we urge you to clarify with HKU staff if you, as the Chancellor of HKU, did or did not cross out or remove or veto some of the names on the list as recommended by the honorary degrees committee of HKU.

We look forward to receiving your early reply.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc Dr CH Leong, Council Chair, HKU
Prof Peter Mathieson, Vice-Chancellor, HKU
All staff HKU
Appendix III

4 January 2013

The Honourable C. Y. Leung
Chancellor
The University of Hong Kong

Dear Mr. Leung,

Raising the Retirement Age to 65 at The University of Hong Kong

You may be aware that the retirement age in the newer tertiary institutions in Hong Kong is 65, while that in the older ones is 60. We are concerned about this non-uniformity.

The Academic Staff Association (ASA) conducted a survey to seek our members’ views on whether the retirement age should be raised to 65. It is clear from the attached survey results and comments that the overwhelming majority of staff support that the retirement age should be raised to 65. The increasing manpower requirements arising from changing our curricula from 3 to 4 years gives us the best opportunity to implement this change now.

The ASA and the University of Hong Kong Employees Union (HKUEU) have written to the University requesting them to urgently take steps to raise our retirement age to 65, similar to that already enjoyed by staff in our younger sister institutions. A copy of the letter is attached for your information.

We are writing to you to seek your support for the University to implement a policy of retiring at 65, similar to our younger institutions.

We look forward to receiving your early reply.

Yours sincerely,

K. C. Cheung
ASA Chairman

Ng Kwok Yan, Felix
HKUEU Chairman

Encl.

cc  Dr. CH Leong, Council Chair, HKU
    Prof. Lap-Chee Tsui, Vice-Chancellor, HKU
    All staff, HKU
3 January 2013

Prof. Lap-Chee Tsui  
Vice-Chancellor

Dear Prof. Tsui,

Survey Results on Retirement age

The ASA conducted a survey to seek our members’ views on whether all staff should be given the same treatment to apply for extension of their appointment beyond the retirement age at or any time after 55, similar to that for Chair Professors and Professors, and that the retirement age should be changed from 60 to 65. As clearly shown in the attached survey results and comments, the overwhelming majority of staff support that all staff should be given the same treatment to apply for extension of their appointment beyond the retirement age at or any time after 55, and that the retirement age should be changed from 60 to 65.

We believe this is the best time to change the retirement age to 65, in view of the increasing manpower requirements arising from changing our curricula from 3 to 4 years, and the global trend of increasing the retirement age, such as the increase of retirement age from 65 to 67 in the UK.

The ASA and the HKUEU would therefore like to request the University to urgently take steps to change our retirement age to 65, similar to that already enjoyed by staff in some of our sister institutions in Hong Kong.

We look forward to receiving your early reply.

Yours sincerely,

Ng Kwok, Felix  
HKUEU Chairman

Enc.

cc Dr. CH Leong, Council Chair, HKU  
All staff members
Appendix I

Academic Staff Association of The University of Hong Kong
Survey on Extension of Retirement Age to 65

No of forms distributed: 502
No. of forms received: 205
Response Rate: 41%

Questions

1. The University should change the retirement age from 60 to 65 for all staff.
   
   1 + 2 + 3 = 86%  
   4 + 5 + 6 = 13%  

2. If the university is keeping the retirement age at 60 as it is at present, all staff can apply for extension of their appointment beyond the retirement age at or any time after 55, similar to that for Chair Professors and Professors.
   
   1 + 2 + 3 = 92%  
   4 + 5 + 6 = 9%

Note: The rounding errors in these results are less than 0.5%
Appendix II

Suggestions/comments from members on Survey on Extension of Retirement Age to 65

The followings are comments made by members responded to the survey. Please note that these comments do not necessarily represent the views of the ASA of the University of Hong Kong. Please also note that the ASA does not accept any responsibility for errors made during the transcription process, as it is sometimes difficult to read handwriting.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Point 1: This is a global trend and world experience that HKU should follow! The University if not run, teach, research by Chair Prof. and Prof and it's parity and equal opportunity issue regarding Point 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Actually, like many civilized countries these days, there should be <strong>no retiring age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The University needs a mechanism for removing underperforming tenured staff at 60 to release funding for recruitment of younger generation with more energy and more ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I strongly agree that any retirement policy should apply to all staff. Otherwise it is discrimination. In my opinion, extension of retirement age to 65 should be automatic and an entitlement. There had been too much mention of this issue in the past years but the outcome has been disappointing, discriminatory, and demoralizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The option of retirement earlier than 65/or 60 should be kept open for all staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There should be no unfair treatment. Retirement at 65 and <strong>no</strong> extensions for SMT and other senior administration. SMT can raise the retirement age if they want to stay on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A good idea!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>There needs to be a balance between retention of talents and turn over of staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am in agreement that no one should have to retire at age 60. However option No. 2 just creates more paper work, more bureaucratic hoops to jump through -- no point in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>In any case, staff should have the right to take early retirement at the age of 55 or above, provided that a notice of say 1 to 2 yeas is given for the relevant department to plan ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Extension from 60 to 65 should be nearly automatic, subject to normal satisfactory performance. Even now for professor, the extension is mean-spirited and reluctant, with some excellent performers getting 3 years and other getting 5 years. Typical HKU HR management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I cannot claim my pension until there age of 67, so even extending the retirement age to 65 leaves me having to find employment for a further two years, an almost impossible task. Why is HKU one of the last top-class universities to cling to outdated and ageist HR Policies? It is a disgrace that good teachers are forced to retire at 60 -- it is a well-known fact that very few associate professors are extended beyond the age of 60!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Point 1 - This is the preferred option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For point 2 - No discrimination should be made against academic staff not promoted to full professors. Any decision on extension should be based on the individual's merit and the need of the Department.

Staff members should be given the choices which currently are limited to professors.

Being able to only apply for extension 12 months before retiring makes forward planning very difficult, especially for staff intending to leave Hong Kong upon retirement from HKU.

Staff on extension should have the same status as other staff before reaching retirement age and be eligible for promotion. The University should follow strictly the principle of equal opportunity without depriving staff on extension of promotion prospect.

Should have a milestone regarding the issue.

Extension of retirement age to 65 only should consider academics.

Why only chair professors can enjoy this privilege? Does that imply university considers others' contribution insignificant compared to Chair Professors.

There should be only one policy for all and not preferential treatment for one small group (i.e. chair prof. and prof.). This is discrimination. Could you please check whether such a preferential policy violates the Equal Opportunity Ordinance in HK? In any case, it is a policy on cronyism.

I cannot speak for all staff but I am sure that there will be some staff like myself who would prefer to retire at the age of 60. If the retirement age is changed to 65 and I retire at 60, then I cannot acquire the status and benefits of retired staff. I would like to suggest that flexibility be built into the system so that staff could choose to retire between 60 and 65 so that staff who enjoy a longer working life could automatically do so without the need to apply and staff who prefer to retire at 60 (or a little beyond 60) could choose to do so without losing the status and benefits of retired staff. To enable manpower planning of the University, staff are invited to indicate their choice of retirement age in advance.

Point 1 - But: There must be some transparent of productivity - unproductive staff who are not doing their job can't expect extension. This should apply also if staff need to apply for extension - it can be assured that Professors may be active since they've been promoted to that rank, but all staff should show they are productive to gain extensions. The University doesn't necessarily extend professors for the full 5 years by the way.

HKU should address this issue which has been dragged on for years.

To make HKU more competitive in faculty recruitment in HKU and the region, it is necessary for HKU to change its Retirement Age policy. This is also consistent with worldwide movement on increasing the retirement age.

The way of working at present is very good. Point 2 suggests that you should continue in this way.

The current practices of extending retired age beyond 60 and 65 are seriously abused, by simply looking at the retirement ages of those holding head positions of HKU and its administration.

Point 2 - not considered as appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Having Chair Prof. &amp; Prof. retirement extension to 65 and other staff at 60 is a form of discrimination and is against the principle of equality and equity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>No extension beyond 60, it's time for retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>HKU is keen to promote the idea of HKU family. Extending the retirement age to all would do a great deal to develop this concept in the minds of many staff who feel disenfranchised/not one of the &quot;club&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The life expectancy of Hong Kong people is going up, and the burden of young labour to support the elderly become more obvious. By postpone the retirement age, the University not only retain good employees, but help to alleviate the social burden and welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I agree that it is convincing to urge for the same arrangements of retirement age at other institutions such as HKUST, City U and Lingnan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I think the University needs new blood and younger staff. Colleagues whose performance is outstanding will get the extension anyway. If we allow everybody to retire at 65, the University may be filled with staff who did not perform as expected due to high job security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>If the University continues to allow its academic staff to apply for extension beyond the retirement age, then the same rules should apply to all. But retirement should really be mandatory at the age of 60. There are plenty of young people at there who should be given the opportunities which many of us have enjoyed for such an extensive period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The current system is very elitist, with only Chair Professors and Professors allowed to apply at age 55, and their applications virtually assured. Many other staff denied these rights/privileges will leave HKU early before age 60, to ensure they can obtain a job that will allow them to work beyond age 60. The problem carries over into other non-HKU areas. HK banks will not give long term mortgages to staff with a prospect of only working until age 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>A health check mandatory way apart from 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>It should be 70 or no limit as it is in many countries. With its extremely low birth rate HK is ageing fast. It is also losing enormous talent in asking highly skilled and productive citizens to &quot;retire&quot; when the world is moving toward no retirement for productive individuals. HKU should too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>There should be no retirement age - as in other countries such as Australia where &quot;retirement&quot; of staff is based on their performance. If staff perform satisfactorily in teaching, research and service, their employment should be continued, until such time as they wish to retire or when their performance, annually rated is below satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>University should have a consistence mechanism to treat all grades of staff member. The current extension of retirement age system for teaching/non-teaching staff will establish an unfair situation, and the University should explain why Chair Professors/Professors can apply the extension of retirement age to 65!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>HKU is seriously behind the times here. The discretion re extension works against e.g. those active in ASA (as with previous Chairman) and those conduction non-mainstream research e.g. Dr. Sam Winter. We love an ageing workforce. Retirement at 65 is obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I think Chair Professors/Professors should be treated the same as other staff i.e. retirement at 60 and apply to extend beyond 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>We lose talent due to early retirement. We should treat all ranks of staff equally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Retirement at 65 is becoming more common and acceptable. Retiring at 60 makes HKU less competitive to recruit academic staff. As a good employer, the University should consider the morale and feelings of its staff. ASA should exert more pressure to the University administration on this very important issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Staff should also be given the opportunity to retire early and to enjoy the retirement benefits such as medical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>The retirement age at 60 is too early since in science research, we discover new and great things after spending 10-15 years in our career. When we reached 55 years old, we lack time to complete our research in 5 years. The equal opportunity law protects sex and race but why not address the issue of age. HKU should set the leading role in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>It is NOT fair for HKU staff if other UGC funded institutions set the retirement age at 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>At least the University should take the first step: Let the retirement age of Chair Prof. and Prof. be 65, HKU is a highly ranked world class university, but its retirement age is not standard compared with other leading universities in the world. It is even behind other UGC funded institutes. What a shame! Hong Kong has the highest life expectancy in the world. The retirement age is too low. People in their 60s are not only still healthy and full of energy, but their knowledge and experience are incomparable. These academic staff members are a precious human resource for the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>As some of the UGC Funded University automatically granted their staff the retirement age to 65, why HKU staff cannot enjoy the same appointment term. In term of fair, it is no say for the University to reject this requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 50 | 1. Why staff at high ranking can always get extension beyond retirement and sometimes more than once, and some even got over 65, while many other university staff at low ranking even with good records fail to get any extension? The criteria are unknown and there is absolutely no transparency on this. The University has not ratified this unfair treatment. The VC is leaving and I don't expect he will do anything about this. The DVC MUST do something about this by setting clear and transparent criteria for staff to apply for extension.  

2. Why associate Professors, Assistant Professors can apply for an extension only about twelve months before his is due to retire? How can they plan with just about 12-month time? VC and DVC, please be more considerate! |
Dear Dr Chung and Mr Ng,

Thank you for your letter of 4 January 2013 to the Chief Executive. I am authorised to reply on his behalf.

We have relayed your letter to the Education Bureau. A reply will be given to you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

(Miss Karmen Choi)
for Private Secretary to Chief Executive
29 October, 2013

Mr. Ng Hak-kim  
Secretary for Education  
Education Bureau  
15/F, Wu Chung House  
213 Queen's Road East  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong

Dear Mr. Ng,

**Raising the Retirement Age to 65 at The University of Hong Kong**

We wrote to the Chancellor of The University of Hong Kong, the Honourable C.Y. Leung on 4 January 2013 seeking his support for The University of Hong Kong to adopt a retirement age of 65, similar to that in other younger universities in Hong Kong. He, as the Chief Executive of HKSAR, forwarded our letter (attachment 1) to you on 14 January 2013 and indicated that you would reply in due course (attachment 2). However, after almost a year, we still have not yet received any reply from you.

It would be most appreciated if you can reply to us as soon as possible. We hope that you would support a uniform retirement age of 65 in the universities in Hong Kong.

Yours sincerely,

K.C. Cheung
Chairman
Academic Staff Association

Ng Kwok Yan, Felix
Chairman
HKU Employees’ Union

cc. Mr. C.Y. Leung, Chancellor, HKU  
Dr. C.H. Leong, Council Chairman, HKU  
Prof. Lap-Chee Tsui, Vice-Chancellor, HKU  
All staff, HKU  

w/o attachments
6 November 2013

Dr K C Chung
ASA Chairman

Mr Ng Kwok Yan, Felix
HKUEU Chairman

Academic Staff Association of the University of Hong Kong
Room 10-15, K K Leung Building
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong
(Fax: 2859 1073)

Dear Dr Chung and Mr Ng,

Raising the Retirement Age to 65 at The University of Hong Kong

Thank you for your letter of 29 October 2013 to the Secretary for Education concerning the above subject.

The University of Hong Kong is an independent and autonomous statutory body governed by The University of Hong Kong Ordinance (Cap 1053) and the Statutes. The University enjoys a high degree of autonomy in formulating policies for and managing its own academic and administrative matters, including staff matters, in accordance with the governance structure stipulated by legislation. The matter you raised falls within the University’s institutional autonomy and the Administration is not in a position to interfere in this matter. We understand that you have also raised the matter with the University management separately.
Mr SW Cheung, ASA Chairman
Academic Staff Association of
The University of Hong Kong

Mr Felix Ng, Chairman, HKUEU
Employees Union of
The University of Hong Kong

Room 104, Pao Siu Loeng Building
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong

Dear Mr Cheung and Mr Ng,

Thank you for your letter of 17 March 2015 to the Chief Executive, which was addressed to him in his capacity as Chancellor of the University. I am replying on his behalf.

Regarding your proposal of changing the retirement age to 65 in The University of Hong Kong, we note that the Education Bureau has replied to you on 6 November 2013. We have nothing to add.

We have also looked into the case where the subject division of the Education Bureau did not receive your letter of 4 January 2013 due to an internal transmission error. We have reminded the Education Bureau to take steps to prevent recurrence of similar incident in future.

Yours sincerely,

(Miss Linda So)
Acting Private Secretary to Chief Executive
COMMITMENT TO THE HKU-SHENZHEN HOSPITAL

Professor Mathieson
Vice Chancellor

11 August 2014

Dear Professor Mathieson,

I wish to refer to your email “Reaffirming our commitment to the HKU-Shenzhen Hospital” that you sent to staff, students, alumni and friends on 26 July 2014.

You stated in your email that the University has incurred expenditure to date in the order of HK$200 million, and that it is expected that the amount will be reimbursed to HKU by the Board of the Hospital, in accordance with the collaboration agreement with the Shenzhen Municipal Government. However, you did not provide any information as when and how the Shenzhen Government would reimburse HKU this sum of money after they apparently had not done so in the past two years. More importantly, you did not mention the future financial liabilities to HKU, such as the expenditure of about HK$150 million incurred this year as reported in the media. It would be most appreciated, if you can provide staff full and detailed information on the current and future financial liability of the project to HKU.

Your statement that “the Council unanimously supported the further development of the HKU Shenzhen Hospital project” is of great concern to staff, as this further development can increase further the financial liability of HKU in the project before resolving the current one. It would be most appreciated, if you can inform staff what this further development is, and how it is financed.

The sum of HK$200 million and more after taking into account current and future liabilities is by no means a small sum to HKU. Indeed, it is a large portion of HKU non-subvented income, a fraction of which would be more than enough to finance the transition of changing our retirement age to 65. For this reason, it would be most appreciated, if you can inform staff where this large sum of funding comes from, and how funding for teaching and research from this source would be affected, if HKU could not recover the expenditure from the Shenzhen Municipal Government.

I hope that you can provide full and detailed information on the issues raised here, as otherwise staff may as well receive information from the media instead of directly from the University management.

I look forward to receiving your reply.

Yours sincerely,

S.W. Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc All Staff
CLARIFICATION OF UNIVERSITY PROCEDURES ON VICE-CHANCELLOR ISSUING WARNING LETTER TO STAFF

Dr CH Leong  
Chairman of Council  
The University of Hong Kong  

25 September 2014  

Dear Dr Leong  

It has come to ASA’s attention that VC recently issued a warning letter to an ASA member. Coincidentally, the member had followed proper due process and established mechanisms to alert the University to highly irregular academic conditions and highly inappropriate academic management and investigation conduct.  

ASA is not aware of University procedural requirements/basis for authorizing VC to do such a thing, which side-steps ASA’s expectation of the fulfillment of due-process.  

Since this matter concerns all HKU staff, ASA seeks your clarification of the University procedure that VC is relying on and the rationale for issuing such a warning letter to a HKU staff.  

Yours sincerely  

SW Cheung  
ASA Chairman  

Cc VC, HKU  
All staff  

Dr CH Leong  
Chairman of Council  
The University of Hong Kong  

1 December 2014  

Dear Dr Leong  

I refer to your reply letter of 17 Oct 2014 in response to the ASA email of September 26, 2014 alerting to your attention about VC’s issuance of a warning letter (as attached) to an ASA member, which was coincidentally seemed related to actions taken by the member who had followed proper due-process and established mechanisms to alert the University to highly irregular academic conditions and highly inappropriate academic management and
investigation conduct. The ASA email stated also that ASA was not aware of corresponding University procedural requirements/basis for authorizing VC to do such a thing, which had side-stepped ASA’s expectation of the fulfillment of due-process. Since the matter concerns all HKU staff, ASA then seek your clarification of the University procedure that VC was relying on and the rationale for issuing such a warning letter to a HKU staff.

Regarding your concern in your reply letter about the special attention should be paid to the requirements of the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance for any discussions involving the personal data of a data subject, you can rest assure that ASA has secured the consent from that particular data subject, who is an ASA member, to pursue the matter for him with top management and/or external regulating authorities.

Attached please find the supplement information about this case regarding the ASA member who had followed proper due-process and established mechanisms to alert the University to highly irregular academic conditions and highly inappropriate academic management and investigation conduct supporting the proper actions raised by the ASA member. Additionally, please also find the subsequent VC’s warning letter issued to the ASA member, which had made no reference of underlying principles/procedure/policy that authorized VC in the issuance of such a warning letter to the ASA member.

In view of these supplementing information, ASA write to seek again your clarification of the University procedure that VC was relying on and the rationale for issuing such a warning letter to a HKU staff.

Since warning letter is an important matter concerning all HKU staff, this letter will copy to all HKU staff.

I look forward to receiving your reply.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc VC, HKU
   All staff (without supplement information)

For the attached warning letter, please refer:
SEASONAL INFLUENZA VACCINATION IN SASSOON ROAD CAMPUS

From: Dr. S.W. Cheung [mailto:swcheung@eee.hku.hk]
Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2014 9:36 AM
To: Man-kuen Cheung
Cc: 'CH Leong'; Peter Mathieson; evpadmin
Subject: Influenza Vaccination by HKU UHS

Dr MK Cheung
Director of UHS
The University of Hong Kong

5 November 2014

Dear Dr Cheung

It has been brought to the attention of ASA concerning the UHS seasonal influenza vaccination campaign in Sassoon Road Campus that took place on 3-4 October 2014. Staff were injected the trivalent influenza vaccine instead of the quadrivalent influenza vaccine as stated in the consent form that staff required to sign. It would be most appreciated, if you can inform us how this incident could have happened.

This incident raises a serious safety issue, as patients were being administered wrong medicine, apart from the UHS overcharging them.

I look forward to receiving your urgent reply.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

cc Council Chairman
Vice-Chancellor
EVP
All staff

On 11/7/2014 5:42 PM, MK Cheung wrote:

7 November 2014
Dr. S.W. Cheung
Chairman
Academic Staff Association of the University of Hong Kong

Dear Dr. Cheung,
Thank you for your email of 5 November 2014.

All recipients concerned have been informed of the situation. Both trivalent and quadrivalent seasonal influenza vaccines are recommended for use in Hong Kong by the Scientific Committee on Vaccine Preventable Diseases of the Centre for Health Protection (CHP). The UHS prefers quadrivalent influenza vaccine this year. However, during the influenza vaccination campaign on Sassoon Road Campus, only trivalent influenza vaccine was available. Please be assured that trivalent vaccine is also recommended by CHP. Patient safety has not been compromised.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. MK Cheung
Director,
University Health Service

cc Council Chairman
       Vice-Chancellor
       Executive Vice-President
       All Staff

Dr MK Cheung
Director of UHS
The University of Hong Kong

11 November 2014

Dear Dr Cheung

I refer to the email that you sent to me on 7 November 2014, a copy of which was sent to staff on 8 November 2014.

It is most disappointing that you have failed to address all the key concerns raised in my email dated 5 November. It would be most appreciated, if you can confirm whether staff in Sassoon Road Campus were injected the trivalent influenza vaccine instead of the quadrivalent influenza vaccine as stated in the consent form that staff have signed on 3-4 October 2014. If as suggested in your email that “all recipients concerned have been informed of the situation”, what actually is the “situation” and when they were informed, before or after the injection?

Administering wrong medicine to a patient is very serious indeed, and should be properly investigated. However, it is not clear from your email that you intended to do so, in order to avoid the problem from recurring.

This incident is a serious case of mishandling of medicine. UHS injected the wrong kind of substances to HKU staff who did not give their consent to UHS. Have you reported this incident to Hospital Authority?

If what you indicated in your email that “during the campaign on Sassoon Road Campus, only trivalent influenza vaccine was available” is true, then why you increased the charge of the
annual influenza vaccination by 76%? Now that the trivalent influenza vaccine is being used instead of the quadrivalent influenza vaccine, staff should only be charged at $80. Those who have paid $140 are entitled to a refund of $60. Have you refunded $60 to them?

I look forward to receiving your urgent reply.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

cc Council Chairman
   Vice-Chancellor
   Executive Vice-President
   All Staff

Dr MK Cheung
Director of UHS
The University of Hong Kong

20 November 2014

Dear Dr Cheung

This is a gentle reminder of my email sent to you on 11 November 2014, more than a week ago. As the issues raised in my email concern all staff and many staff are worrying about this incident, we urge you to clarify these issues as soon as possible for all staff.

We look forward to receiving your reply urgently.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

cc Council Chairman
   Vice-Chancellor
   Executive Vice-President
   All Staff
SURVEY ON CONFIDENCE IN PROFESSOR ARTHUR LI KOWK-CHEUNGS APPOINTMENT IN HKU COUNCIL

21 April 2015

The Honourable C Y Leung
Chancellor
The University of Hong Kong

Dear Mr Chancellor

Survey Results: Confidence in Professor Arthur Li Kwok-Cheung's Appointment in HKU Council

As there are numerous unquiet voices after the announcement of the appointment of the Honourable Professor Arthur Li Kwok-cheung as a member of the Council of The University of Hong Kong for a period of three years from 20 March 2015, and the rumour that he would succeed Dr CH Leong as the new Council Chairman of the University on the expiry of Dr Leong’s term in November this year, the ASA conducted a survey recently to solicit views from members on these issues. A copy of the survey form is attached in Appendix I for your information.

We have now finished the survey and the results are shown in Appendix II, and our members’ comments in Appendix III. The survey results show that 85% of the respondents do not have confidence that Prof Li’s appointment as Council member would be beneficial to HKU, and 87% of the respondents do not have confidence that Prof Li’s rumoured appointment as Council chairman would be beneficial to HKU.

We hope that Professor Li would take note of this survey results, and resigns from Council. We would very much like to draw your attention to this survey results also, as it indicates that it would not be appropriate to appoint him in any capacity to our Council in the future.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc All staff
SURVEY - CONFIDENCE IN PROFESSOR ARTHUR LI KWOK-CHEUNG’S APPOINTMENT IN HKU COUNCIL

Dear Members

It was published in the HKSAR Gazette last Friday, 20 March 2015, that Professor the Honourable Arthur Li Kwok-cheung, has been appointed as member of the Council of the University from 20 March 2015 for a period of three years. There are also rumors that he would succeed Dr CH Leong as the new Council Chairman of the University after Dr Leong’s term expires in November this year*.

Professor Li served as Vice-Chancellor of Chinese University until he took up the post as Secretary for Education and Manpower for one term from 2002 to 2007. During his tenure, Professor Li was alleged to have put pressure on the Institute of Education to merge with Chinese University and was accused of saying the Institute would be "raped" if it refused to agree*. He also demanded a merger between Chinese University and the University of Science and Technology. When asked by reporters what he would do if the two universities refused to merge, he replied: "The power is in my hands."*

When students planned for class boycott during the Occupy Central movement last year, Professor Li said, “Who cares!”* and suggested that students should quit university to show their commitment to democracy, and "If they're not willing to quit school, then the class boycotts are all just for show." *

These incidences clearly highlight his stance on higher education matters. We would like to solicit your views on whether you are confident that his appointment as Council member, and possibly as Council Chairman of the University would benefit the University. The results will be made available to the Honourable C Y Leung, Chancellor of the University, staff and the public.

Please complete the following form by circling the entries that represent your view, and return it to the ASA office as soon as possible, preferably before 7 April 2015. Thank you.

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman
24 Mar 2015

[*] See email for sources.

Note: Please answer the following two questions by circling the entries that represents your view. After completing the form, please cut off the top part along the dotted line where your name is. Fold the form with the ASA address on the outside. Staple it and return it to the ASA Office by internal mail as soon as possible, preferably before 6 April 2015.

| 1. Do you have confidence that Prof. Li’s appointment as Council member would be beneficial to HKU? | Yes | No | No Opinion |
| 2. Do you have confidence that Prof Li’s rumored appointment as Council chairman would be beneficial to HKU? | Yes | No | No Opinion |

Suggestions/comments?
Appendix II

Survey Results: Confidence in Professor Arthur Li Kwok-Cheung's Appointment in HKU Council

No of forms distributed: 466
No. of forms received: 152
No. of forms voided: 3
Response Rate: 33%

Questions
1 Do you have confidence that Prof. Li's appointment as Council member would be beneficial to HKU?

2 Do you have confidence that Prof. Li's rumored appointment as Council chairman would be beneficial to HKU?

Note: The rounding errors in these results are less than 0.5%
### Appendix III

**Suggestions/comments from members in the Survey on Confidence in Professor Arthur Li Kwok-Cheung's Appointment in HKU Council**

The followings are comments made by members responded to the survey. Please note that these comments do not necessarily represent the views of the ASA of the University of Hong Kong. Please also note that the ASA does not accept any responsibility for errors made during the transcription process, as it is sometimes difficult to read handwriting.

|   | 1. Arthur Li's opinions expressed when he was Secretary for Education and manpower are really worrying.  
    | 2. What he said on DBC radio on 24 March makes no sense at all. |
|---|---|
| 2 | I haven't been in HK long, and at HKU even less, so I don't feel sufficiently informed given his comments, however, I feel he should account for them and be invited to revise his views. These comments do not suggest he is of a subtle mind. |
| 3 | I see this as punishment for the umbrella movement and worry about freedom of thought and education in HKU and in HK. |
| 4 | Be more constructive, for a change. |
| 5 | I have serious reservation on Mr. Li's attitude as an administrator for a higher educational institute. Please voice out this on our behalf!!, or this is going to be disastrous! |
| 6 | Professor Arthur Li is making negative comments publicly, on HKU and HKU staff members, and on students. He would need to show that he is fair on the judgement and comments. |
| 7 | This man will destroy HKU. He’s up to no good. |
| 8 | Based on his past record, I don't think he would be a fair, team-building leader. |
| 9 | Even the survey cannot influence the decision maker, every staff of this University should voice out to defend our core-values. Thank you. |
| 10 | It will be a disaster to HKU. |
| 11 | He is not a suitable person for the position! |
| 12 | He shows shocking disregard for the benefit of students and the importance of higher education. |
1. King Arthur is a bully. He should not be overseeing HKU.
2. Doesn’t he have enough Li brothers looking after HKU.
3. The only plus would be that he'd find it difficult to argue against raising the retirement age. He is ancient.

14 This is all speculation.

15 A lot hinges on how you define "beneficial". And, of course, whether you trust rumours.

16 He has a failed track record for impartiality. He is also a bully which does not fit with an open and free thinking organisation like HKU.

17 Prof. Li is a very poor candidate for HKU Council Chairman. He has no vision in education and is unpopular amongst university teachers and students. He is arrogant and has very poor reputation in education sector. It will be a disaster if he is appointed as the Council Chairman of this university in the future.

18 Selection (and election) of council members should be reformed. Better be elected (by certain public sectors, government, staff and students, etc.) than appointed with no transparency.

19 I am 150% opposed to Prof. Li being on HKU council. He has expressed significant antagonism towards HKU both to me personally and more generally. His appointment would be highly inappropriate. Moreover, the close involvement is the STBS of his brother's bank is a conflict of interest.

20 Arthur Li is a bombastic, unreflective loose cannon who can be expected to exacerbate tensions and create resentment. He is not known for creative or constructive ideas with respect to improving higher education.

21 Academic freedom is crucial to the university (development). Integrity is important to a council member.

22 I would strongly oppose having him serve in any capacity on the council. His track record and statements clearly show that he does not value academic freedom or university autonomy.

23 One should give him the benefit of doubt. Should not based ??????. Also, he is one of the many in council and he has a wealth of experience in the education sector.

24 Judging from his recent remarks (24/3/2015) on some professorate staff of HKU, his appointment as Council member/Chairman would mean the demise of HKU’s academic freedom that all of us treasured over the years.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Li Kwok Cheung was a director who is autocratic and could not take opinions. He has notorious history in CUHK as well as in EDB. He played computer games when attending Legco. His appointment is harmful to HKU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>According to my limited impression on what he said and did before, not the rumor above, I think he can help HKU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>His nickname &quot;King Arthur&quot; tells everything about him. With his age, whatever he does, he has got nothing to lose but gain, the way to CE of Hong Kong. His appointment as Council member or Council Chairman of HKU will bring negative impact to CY Leung who should think not just twice but three times before making the appointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Given the track record of Professor Li's interference in academic freedom, it is very inappropriate to appoint him in university council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Arthur Li's appointment to HKU will be a disaster to both HKU &amp; Hong Kong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>We should change the system of allowing CE as chancellor of HKU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Very angry indeed!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Prof. Li is biased against teaching staffs of HKU, judging from his words in TV and radio news.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Li has been overtly hostile to HKU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A disaster to HKU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>In view of his biased and negative comments against our academic staff, I don't think he is suitable to serve as Council member, let alone the Council Chairman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Professor Arthur Li is a well-known conservative person who will not stand firm on academic freedom and university autonomy. His political stance is strongly pro-government and anti-democratic. He does not have the open-mindedness to accommodate different views. It is doubtful that he will defend the cores values of HKU. His appointment will damage the reputation of HKU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>What a disaster for HKU if this bully-boy is allowed to take up his appointment on our Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Academic freedom and autonomy of HKU must be honoured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>It is not fair that you prompt us with your views as you collect the opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Prof Li is clearly NOT a suitable candidate for either of these positions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr SW Cheung, ASA Chairman
Academic Staff Association of
The University of Hong Kong
Room 104, Pao Siu Loong Building
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong

Dear Mr Cheung,

Thank you for your letter of 21 April 2015 to the Chief Executive, which was addressed to him in his capacity as Chancellor of the University. I am replying on his behalf.

Whilst we would not comment on individual cases, we wish to reiterate that the Government upholds the principle of meritocracy and make appointments of the members of the HKU Council in accordance with the relevant ordinance.

Yours sincerely,

( Carlson K S Chan )
Private Secretary to Chief Executive
ARThUR Li KOwk-CHeUNG'S NEGATIVE COMMENT ON HKu PROFESSORS

26 March 2015

Professor the Honourable Arthur Li Kwok-cheung
Council member
The University of Hong Kong

Dear Professor Li

It has been brought to our attention of your negative comments made against the professors in The University of Hong Kong in a radio interview on 24 March 2015 and similar news reports in different newspapers. In that interview, you remarked that The University of Hong Kong fell in the university ranking was due to 港大教授不務正業，導致港大排名下跌. Your remark is extremely damaging to the reputation of the professors working in HKU.

We request you to substantiate or provide evidences for your statement, as it seriously damages not only the reputation, but also the moral of academics in the University of Hong Kong and our sister institutions.

If you are unable to do, we demand you to retract your remark immediately and apologize to HKU professors.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc All staff (for those who cannot read Chinese, please ask your colleagues to translate the Chinese”港大教授不務正業，導致港大排名下跌” for you)
Ref: 1392/15

Mr S W Cheung
ASA Chairman
Academic Staff Association of The University of Hong Kong
Room 104, Pao Siu Loong Building
Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong

Dear Chairman Cheung

Thank you for your letter of 26 March 2015, which I have only just received. I shall be delighted to elaborate on my statements.

In case you do not know, the criteria on which the ranking of the Times Higher Educational Supplement is based comprise the following, with different weightings:

i) Teaching and learning environment 30%

ii) Number of publications 30%

iii) Impact of publications (citation rate) 30%

iv) Industrial income and

v) International reputation (no. of exchange students) 10%

As you can see, some 90% of the total weighting goes towards research, publications and teaching. So if the ranking of a university falls, it should be due largely to:-

(a) some members of the faculty failing to carry out properly their duties in research and teaching; or

(b) the overall calibre of the academic staff having deteriorated and become intellectually incompetent.

I choose to believe in (a), the underlying premise of which is that faculty members at the university still possess the intellectual abilities to do their job well. If you reject (a) which you seem to do, then (b) is a more relevant contributing cause. It could only mean that you think staff members are academically not as capable and competent as before. Which option is less insulting? And how otherwise would you explain the drop in ranking?

.../2
Ref: 1392/15

Mr S W Cheung
ASA Chairman
Academic Staff Association of The University of Hong Kong

Dear Chairman Cheung

Irrespective of what we believe to be the reason, surely our goal must be to restore the glory of the University of Hong Kong by raising its standard, to its former level at least.

Yours sincerely

Arthur K C Li
LACK OF TRANSPARENCY AND COMMUNICATIONS IN ENGINEERING FACULTY

Open emails copied to members

Professor Peter Mathieson
Vice-Chancellor

2 February 2015

Dear Professor Mathieson,

We have received numerous complaints about the ways that Prof Norman Tien, Dean of Engineering, manages the Faculty of Engineering. In particular, there is a lack of transparency and communications to the faculty members.

As an Appointed Executive Dean, Prof Tien initiated a project called “Advanced Robotics Initiative” and spent more than $15 million to purchase a robot from the US and large sums to recruit new Chair Professors to work on this new project and ship the robot to the US for competition. This is a totally new area in the Faculty in terms of research and teaching. Staff of the Faculty were not aware of Prof Tien’s specialism in the robotics arena. However, this project was never discussed with the Faculty members. This is a clear indication of lack of transparency and poor communications. With so much Faculty fund spent on this project, departments' teaching and research resources are surely affected as a result.

The Dean has never disclosed to the Faculty how much has been spent on the project. Since there is no check-and-balance on how the Dean spends the Faculty money (i.e. tax payers' money) on this project, many colleagues of the Faculty are worrying about how much more money will be spent on this project.

Bad practice, poor communication and poor transparency like this hurt staff's morale. The University should have policy to ensure that transparency be upheld in departments, faculties and the University. The ASA urges the University to look into this urgent matter.

I look forward to receiving your prompt reply.

Yours sincerely

S W Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc Council Chairman
Pro-Vice-Chancellor
ASA members

From: Peter Mathieson
Sent: Wednesday, February 18, 2015 10:41:27 AM
To: asahku; swcheung
Cc: Council Chairman; paultam; Roland Chin; Norman Tien
Subject: RE: Lack of transparency and communications In Engineering Faculty

SW

My apologies for the delay in my reply, which arose because I asked colleagues to look into your concerns. I have now received replies that reassure me that there was indeed extensive consultation within the Faculty of Engineering about the robotics initiative, including at the Engineering Retreat and in the Faculty Board. Documentary proof of this is available including attendance records.

May I take this opportunity to wish you and all your members the very best for the New Year of the Goat.

Peter Mathieson

Professor Peter Mathieson
Vice-Chancellor

9 March 2015

Dear Professor Mathieson,

Thank you for your reply.

Your reply brings even more concerns and worries to the colleagues in the Faculty of Engineering. It appears that Prof Norman Tien, Dean of Engineering, has the view that there had been “extensive consultation” within the Faculty of Engineering about the robotics initiative. However, many colleagues in the Faculty of Engineering hold a different view on this. Clearly, there are serious management and communication problems in the Faculty of Engineering. Colleagues have also pointed out that meaningful discussion and serious consultation would happen only when sufficient background information was made available to participants beforehand. Brainstorm in a retreat or the Dean’s brief report in a Faculty meeting could not constitute as extensive discussion or extensive consultation. Since Prof Tien has documents to prove that the project has been extensively discussed and consulted within the Faculty, many colleagues would request Prof Tien, Dean of Engineering, to produce documentary proofs of the followings:

1. The Dean, Prof Tien, has spent so much money on the Robotic Project. Many colleagues in the Faculty of Engineering have the view that the Dean has never discussed with Faculty members regarding how much money should be spent on the project. Colleagues would like to see documentary proof that past, present and future funding requirements of the Robotic Project have been extensively discussed and consulted in the Faculty.

2. Prof Tien has allegedly never disclosed to the Faculty how much money has already been spent on the Robotic Project and how much more money will be spent on it. To many colleagues, the Robotic Project is like a black hole sucking a lot faculty funds. This has caused great concerns to the members of Engineering Faculty. Colleagues would like to see documents proving the budget of the project has been informed to the Faculty.
3. It is told that since Prof Tien took up the Deanship of Engineering Faculty few years ago, he has never disclosed to the Faculty the faculty finance budget. It is told that even heads of departments do not get the full picture of it, but just their shares of the budget. Colleagues would like to see the documentary proof of transparency of such within the Faculty.

4. It is learned that the Faculty of Engineering spent more than $15 million to purchase a robot from the US and large sums to recruit new Chair Professors to work on this new project. Colleagues would like to see the documentary proof of these arrangements were well discussed and consulted extensively.

Furthermore, many colleagues have also complained another incidence of lack of transparency and communications in the Engineering Faculty. The office of Engineering Faculty was renovated not long ago by the previous Dean, Prof WC Chew. Suddenly, on 19 August 2014, the Faculty sent out an email saying that the Faculty General Office of Engineering would be temporarily accommodated in the Main Building during renovation of the existing office. The size of the new Faculty General Office is much bigger than the old one. It is told that this was never discussed in the Faculty, so colleagues do not know the reasons for such expansion in terms of office size and manpower and the budget of the renovation. Colleagues would also like to see documentary proof of this having been discussed/consulted in the Faculty.

look forward to receiving your reply.

Yours sincerely

S W Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc Council Chairman
Pro-Vice-Chancellor
ASA members

Professor Peter Mathieson
Vice-Chancellor

8 June 2015

Dear Prof Mathieson

Following my email of 9 March 2015, concerning about the lack of transparency and communications in Engineering Faculty, the ASA has been brought to the attention of another event incident of the lack of transparency and communications in Engineering Faculty.

It is known that, Prof Norman Tien, Dean of Engineering, the Faculty of Engineering, initiated the Robotics Team of The University of Hong Kong (HKU) which participated in the competition, the DARPA Robotics Challenge (DRC) [1]. Yesterday, Team KAIST of Daejeon, Republic of Korea, eventually won the final [2].

On 20 and 21 December 2013, Team HKU participated in Phase 1 of the competition in Florida. Amongst the 16 teams, HKU Team scored 3 points out of a total 32 points and ranked 9th in
the overall 10 positions and ranked 6th or last in track B in the actual competed track [1]. However, it is shockingly to learn that Team HKU was a merge of two teams, Team K from Japan and Case Western University, which adopted the name Team HKU and used the ATLAS robot generously donated by The Hong Kong University to participate in the competition [3-11]. The donated ATLAS robot had cost a lot of HKU money, about $15 million, to purchase. The justifications of donation were never discussed in the Faculty. This large amount of money is also the HK tax payers’ money. We would like to know

1. whether the donation had followed HKU proper procedure;
2. the justifications behind such a large amount of donation to some foreign entities; and
3. the role of HKU in the competition, as most public links of the events only report, indicate and recognize HKU as a generous donor of an ATLAS robot to two foreign teams who did not use their own money to purchase an ATLAS robot for themselves [7-11]; these public links do not report any recognition of HKU’s participation or involvement with the Team HKU in the competition.

We look forward to receiving your prompt reply.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc Council Chairman
    Pro-Vice-Chancellor
    ASA members

[8] http://www.pcmag.com/article2/0,2817,2421106,00.asp

Professor Roland Chin
Deputy Vice-Chancellor

9 June 2015

Dear Prof Chin
I am writing in reference to my email to Vice-Chancellor on 8 June 2015, regarding the donation of the ATLAS robot from The University of Hong Kong to two foreign teams, Team K from Japan and Case Western University. As a result, the two foreign teams did not need to use their own money to purchase an ATLAS robot to participate in the DARPA Robotics Challenge (DRC) [2-11] competition. The robot cost about $15 million of Hong Kong Tax Payer’s money.

For the record, this incident occurred in year 2013 during the time when you, as the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Provost, were the reporting manager of all deans of faculties and before Professor Peter Mathieson resumed his duty as Vice-Chancellor of HKU in April 2014. Therefore, in view of the actual responsibility and accountability, it is more appropriate to seek answers from you to the following questions:-

1. Had this large donation follow HKU proper procedure?
2. Why would you approve such a large amount of donation to the two foreign teams in the competition and what were your justifications?
3. What was the role of HKU in the competition, as most public links of the event only report, indicate and recognize HKU as a generous donor of an ATLAS robot to the two foreign teams so that the two teams did not need to purchase an ATLAS robot for themselves [2-11]? These public links do not report any recognition of HKU’s participation or involvement with Team HKU in the competition.
4. Why would you approve Prof Norman Tien, Dean of Engineering, to use the Faculty CBA account in this project? The CBA account is supposed for use to recruit teaching staff for departments.

Since you are leaving HKU soon for good, we look forward to receiving your urgent reply.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc Council Chairman
Vice-Chancellor
Pro-Vice-Chancellor
ASA members

Professor Roland Chin
Deputy Vice-Chancellor

15 June 2015

Dear Prof Chin

This is just a gentle reminder of my email of 9 June 2015 for you. For reasons of accountability and responsibility, the ASA urges you to answer these questions in our previous email as soon as possible since you are still the DVC of HKU and drawing high salary as DVC.
We look forward to your urgent reply. Thank you for your attention!

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc Council Chairman
Vice-Chancellor
Pro-Vice-Chancellor
ASA members
OCCUPY CENTRAL

Open E-mails to HKU Staff and/or ASA Members

From: Dr. S.W. Cheung
To: ASA Members
Subject: ASA stance on students’ demonstration

28 September 2014

Dear Members

ASA, as academics in an educational institution, supports for academic freedom and believes it should not stay quiet in this matter.

ASA is concerned very much about the safety and welfare of the students who made sacrifice in their time, study and personal well beings in exercising their basic rights in freedom of assembly and demonstration peacefully for what they are believing in. I believes HKU students, colleagues and ASA members have independent and critical thinking.

Unconfirmed news have reported that some HKU students were arrested in the peaceful demonstration of yesterday and today. I have total confidence in the students that they would not behave violently in normal circumstances such as peaceful demonstration.

As ASA does not support factual and actual violence behaviors, it urges all parties not to act in a provoca tive manner. ASA dithery urges all members, colleagues and HKU to render help to the students if needed.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc Dr CH Leong, Council Chairman
VC, HKU

From: Dr. S.W. Cheung
To: Vice-Chancellor
Subject: University stance on teacher strike called for by HKPTU

Professor Peter Mathieson
Vice-Chancellor
The University of Hong Kong

29 September 2014

Dear Professor Mathieson:
University stance on teacher Strike called for by HKPTU

Witnessing the Hong Kong police exercising excessive brutal and violent force to unarmed peaceful demonstrators on the news and in response to the call for teachers Strike by the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union (HKPTU) to condemn the violent actions by the Hong Kong Police and the Hong Kong Government, many students, colleagues and ASA members requested us to enquire on the University Management's arrangements for and stance on students and colleagues who honor the call for this Strike by the HKPTU.

We appreciate much for a prompt response from the University Management.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

cc All members

From: Dr. S.W. Cheung
To: Vice-Chancellor
Subject: University stance on teacher strike called for by HKPTU

29 September 2014

Dear Prof Mathieson

Thank you for asking Ms Mable Chiu, Senior Assistant Registrar, to send to me the email which was issued by the Provost to the Deans, as a reply to my email today.

HKU student union, students and the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union (HKPTU) are calling for teachers Strike to condemn the violent actions by the Hong Kong Police and the Hong Kong Government. ASA Members and colleagues would like to know that, if the teachers in HKU strike a) with and b) without taking leaves, will they be punished in the future?

We appreciate much for a prompt response from the University Management.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

cc All members

From: Vice-Chancellor’s Office
To: ASA
Subject: University stance on teacher strike called for by HKPTU
Dear Dr. Cheung,

Professor Mathieson has asked me to send to you the email below which was issued by the Provost to the Deans for your information, please.

Best regards,
Mable

Mable Chiu (Mrs)
Senior Assistant Registrar
President’s Office

---

From: Roland Chin <RolandChin@hku.hk>
Date: Mon, Sep 29, 2014 at 8:17 AM
Subject: Class boycott

Dear All

In the midst of the current sad and disturbing situation, I would like to reiterate our position that HKU classes will be held as usual. Some might have called for strike and continuous class boycott. These are all individual decision which we respect. But HKU's position remains the same: Classes as usual.

Best and take care.
-roland

---

From: Dr. S.W. Cheung
to: ASA Members
Subject: ASA Stance on Class Boycott and Teachers Strike in HKU

Dear Members,

In response to the calls for class boycott by the HKU Students' Union and Teachers Strike by the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union (HKPTU) to condemn the violent actions by the Hong Kong Police and the Hong Kong Government, ASA is calling members to support these calls. For members who wish to offer their supports, ASA suggests the following three options:

1) Offer special arrangements to students who boycott the classes.

2) Apply for leave in advance according to the normal procedures, as DVC pointed out in his email of 29 September 2014.

3) Go to teaching venues as usual, but do not teach.

For options 2) and 3), members please inform students in advance and have makeup arrangements with students.

Yours sincerely,
From: ASA & HKUEU  
To: HKU Staff  
Date: 30 September 2014  
Subject: ASA and HKUEU declaration on the police violence taken place on 28 September 2014

Academic Staff Association (ASA) of The University of Hong Kong strongly condemns the use of pepper spray and tear gas by the police against unarmed peaceful demonstrators, civilians, students and colleagues on 28 September 2014. The scale of force used by the police is both unnecessary and excessive. Those in the Hong Kong Police Force and the Hong Kong SAR Government who made such decisions must be held responsible.

香港大學教師及職員會強烈譴責警方在2014年9月28日對手無寸鐵的和平示威者、平民、學生和同事使用胡椒噴霧和催淚彈。所動用的武力絕不適當。香港警察和香港特區政府的主事者必須為此負責。

S. W. Cheung & K. C. Cheung                           Ng Kwok Yan, Felix
Academic Staff Association                               Univ. of HK Employees Union

From: Dr. S. W. Cheung  
To: ASA Members  
Date: 1 October 2014  
Subject: Open lectures for HKU students

Dear Members

HKU students are inviting university professors to give open lectures, so they may continue to learn while boycotting classes (罷課不罷學). We would like to invite you or your colleagues to spend 30-60 minutes at Admiralty or Causeway or Mongkok on 1/10 or 2/10 (or possibly 3/10) to give open lectures to students anytime as you wish or are available. The lectures could be related to Hong Kong society, human rights or democracy.

Kindly contact HKU student Yina Chan at chanyina@gmail.com if you are interested in giving an open lecture to support our students. Alternatively, you can text 61079009 Yina or 67794669 Christy.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung  
ASA Chairman
GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF MAIN POOL RPG PLACES ALLOCATION IN ENGINEERING FACULTY

Open emails copied to members

Professor Norman Tien
Dean of Faculty of Engineering

27 Oct 2014

Dear Prof Tien

1. We are seriously concerned with the recent circulated document E38/1014 (Guiding Principles of Main Pool Research Postgraduate (RPg) Places Allocation) which was recommended and approved by the Engineering Faculty’s Faculty Higher Degrees Committee (FHDC) with Prof E Wu from the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering appointed as the Chairman.

2. In point 2a) of the said document, it states “Within Each Department: Allocation of RPg quota should be informed by staff’s research performance (especially their external research grant records such as GRF, CRF, TBRS, ITF, etc.).” This Principle appears to imply that research performance and research contribution is measured and weighed mainly by resources input to staff, which is highlighted by the emphasis of the external grant records of staff. However, this is inconsistent and inconsequential with the outcomes-based/outputs measure as concerned by the University Grant Council (UGC) at all. In reality, obtaining research grants is only the starting points of research projects and available resources input to staff, which should not be confused with research performance and research contribution. Staff’s research performance and research contribution should be measured based upon the resulting outcomes as spelled out by UGC. Any external grants which were not warranted with valid research outcomes as spelled out by UGC should be fully disregarded by the University as well as UGC. The FHDC should not mix up the input factors with the output factors to measure staff’s outcome/contribution. In our opinion, the research outcome/contribution of each staff should be normalized by combining the total amount of research grants obtained and the allocated RPg places, instead of singling out the amount of external grants obtained as highly regarded as suggested. As a matter of fact, UGC also concerns much about “outcome-base” and “outputs” as it clearly states in its letter to Vice-Chancellor and copied to Council Chairman on 29 July 2014 about “The 2016-19 Triennium Academic Development Proposal Exercise” that “Allocation of the research postgraduate RPg places by the "outcome-based" approach...... by the 2016/17 academic year, half of the RPg places will be allocated to the institutions by the various competitive methods....... One of the agreed measures are to allocate 600 places through an "outcome-based" approach.”

One of the three measures of outcome specified by UGC in the letter is

"Strategies for encouraging students to publish and produce their own journals and/or contribute to conferences during their course of study".

Obviously publications and/or contribute to conferences are measures of valid outcomes according to UGC. Ironically the Guiding Principles recommended and approved by the FHDC in the Engineering Faculty has completely neglected this measure of outcome suggested by UGC but mandated an input-based approach (research grants) to assess teachers’ research performances. The FHDC chaired by Prof E Wu should give a full explanation on why it recommended a different measure of research performance from that of UGC. In fact, if the Guiding Principles is adopted, colleagues having excellent grant records recognized by the FHDC but no outcome in terms of publication recognized by UGC will still be highly regarded and rewarded by the FHDC even though they might be using the grants ineffectively to produce
poor outcomes recognized by UGC. What good is a grant if it is not outcome-based and produced poor outcomes? We believe the outcomes but not the amount of the grants should be weighed and counted towards staff’s research performance. On the contrary, if a colleague is able to produce an excellent research outcome (in terms of publications) recognized by UGC without the need of using any external research grant, which means that he/she uses the scarce RPg places and fund very effectively, the Guiding Principles will still panelize him/she by funneling the RPg places to the less effective research contributors who have obtained external grants but produced poor outcomes.

In fact, colleagues with excellent grant records will already be rewarded in their contract renewals or tenure and promotion applications. With grants on hand being used effectively, they should need less support from the University. Meanwhile, colleagues with poor external grant records shall need more support from the University, so that they may still be effective researchers and may also obtain external grants in future to apply their effective skills on using such grants. However, the Guiding Principles in effect allows those who obtained external grant to pre-empt or displace the available resources from the rest who did not. The Guiding Principles has completely ignored these facts and will only make those with poor resources poorer but rich richer without regarding to the research outcomes. With the Guiding Principles in place, all RPg places resources will likely be shifted to only the few of those who have currently obtained external grants. The rest will be left without even the minimal UGC funded RPg places from the University to produce their outcomes recognized by UGC. So the Guiding Principles will likely damage the outcomes measured by UGC. Here I strongly suggest Prof E Wu, the Chairman of FHDC in the Engineering Faculty, to read and understand the letter from UGC to VC carefully before implementing any of the recommended Guiding Principles of RPg Allocation in the Engineering Faculty, instead of using the beautiful minds to dream up something extraordinary.

Obviously, Prof E Wu, the Chairman of FHDC in the Engineering Faculty, should have agreed that publication is a good measure of research performances, as he had produced an amazing record of 19 publications in a single conference and yet another 21 publications in another single conference. I wonder if he has set a University record in terms of most papers, the highest percentage of papers and number of University students in a single conference.

3. In the same point, 2a), of the said document E38/1014, it further states “only teachers who submitted GRF applications and scored 3.0 or above in previous academic year are eligible for allocation of RPg quotas”. This statement has again neglected the UGC concern and the fact that GRF is only known locally and has no international recognition. The FHDC in the Engineering Faculty should clarify for us the followings:
   i. Why GRF applications of colleagues should be given so much weighting in RPg allocation?
   ii. How many staff in the Engineering Faculty have/have not submitted GRF applications and scored 3.0 or above in previous academic year?
   iii. How many staff in the FHDC have/have not submitted GRF applications and scored 3.0 or above in previous academic year?

The rule of a game should be set before the game is played. If this Guiding Principle is to be adopted and implemented, colleagues of the Engineering Faculty should be informed well in advanced so that colleagues will have enough time to prepare for it.

4. In the same point, 2a), it states that “The departmental quota allocated to teachers should be in the value of “Type B” to encourage teachers to cover the remaining portion of the PGS from their research grants. Department only considers making exceptions in case of genuine needs.” This Guiding Principle seems to imply that the Faculty of Engineering intends to micro-manage the departments. We like to ask you to provide us with the “terms of reference” which authorizes the Faculty to manage the departments.

Currently, a “Type-B” quota needs about $22,400 to support a PhD student for four years. Without the support from the Department, it will be very difficult for a teacher to find this
amount of money to support a PhD student even he is allocated a RPg place. This will end up with many unfilled quotas. The question is who will get the unfilled quotas. We can only think of that colleagues with large amounts of research grants will be able to take up these quotas. But these colleagues have already got so much in research grants, they should not need or be allowed to tap on these quotas! So again this Guiding Principle will make the poor poorer and rich richer. As a result, the staff suffer, faculty suffers and University suffers.

5. In point 2c), it states “The top-slicing percentage of the Main Pool be increased (from 10%) to 20% for teachers’ bidding in 2015-2016 to further drive research excellence. To make the bidding mechanism more transparent, a credit-based system is set up to guide the RPg places distribution based on teachers’ external research grant performance in the past 3 years.”

It has been brought to ASA’s attention that many colleagues in the Faculty of Engineering did not know the Faculty had been top-slicing 10% of the Main Pool RPg allocation. Here come the questions for the FHDC to clarify for us:

i. Why were colleagues not informed about this?
ii. Where did this 10% of Main Pool RPg go in the past, i.e. its distribution?
iii. Why were colleagues never informed about how and when to bid for these 10% quota?
iv. Why the top slicing should be increased to 20% from next year?

There is indeed a lack of transparency in the Engineering Faculty. Since this is about the usage of tax-payers money, we demand you to give full explanations/justifications on these questions.

Although in the document E38/1014, the FHDC has designed “a credit-based system” for colleagues of Faculty Engineering to bid for the top-slicing quota, the criterion is again based on the performance of the teachers in obtaining external research grants, i.e., permitting an input-based approach, which is not the measure suggested by UGC. The FHDC must revise this to suit the outcome-based measure suggested by UGC instead of tailor-making it to reward those who have obtained input resources and have timely information ahead of others.

As this could well happen to other faculties, I copy this email to all ASA members.
I look forward to your prompt written reply.

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc    Council Chairman
      Vice- Chancellor
      Pro-Vice-Chancellor
      ASA members

Professor Peter Mathieson
Vice-Chancellor

29 Oct 2014

Dear Professor Mathieson

I refer to my email of 27 Oct 2013 to Prof Norman Tien, Dean of Engineering Faculty. I have just received the following response from Prof F Lau, an Acting Dean of Engineering Faculty for this week. Particularly, this acting dean position was never informed to the Faculty members. As Prof Tien
is holding a key management position as Dean of Engineering Faculty, it is a bad practice not to inform Faculty members when an acting dean has been appointed and yet another clear evidence of the lack of transparency in the Faculty of Engineering.

Bad practice and poor transparency like this hurt staff's morale. It is important to have a University policy to ensure that better practice and transparency could be uphold in the faculties as well as the University. Is there a University policy to sure these?

I look forward to receiving your prompt reply.

Yours sincerely

S W Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc    Council Chairman
      Pro-Vice-Chancellor
      ASA Members

From:  Prof. Peter Mathieson
To:      S.W. Cheung
Date :  29 October 2014  11:41 AM

SW
As I understand it, there is always an acting Dean appointed during any Dean's absence from Hong Kong, in the same way that there is an acting President appointed when I am away. The relevant offices know who is in these acting appointments but they are not each communicated to all staff.
With best regards,
Peter

Professor Norman Tien
Dean of Faculty of Engineering
7 November 2014

Dear Prof Tien

This is a gentle reminder of my email sent to you on 27 Oct 2014, nearly 2 weeks ago. As Dean of Faculty Engineering, we urge you to clarify the issues raised in my email.

We look forward to receiving your reply urgently.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc    Council Chairman
      Vice-Chancellor
      Pro-Vice-Chancellor
      ASA members
Professor Norman Tien
Dean of Faculty of Engineering

14 November 2014

Dear Prof Tien

It is most disappointing that after sending you the email on 27 October 2014, nearly 3 weeks ago, followed by a reminder on 7 November 2014, a week ago, we still have not received your reply addressing the issues raised in my email.

We look forward to receiving your urgent reply.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc Council Chairman
Vice-Chancellor
Pro-Vice-Chancellor
ASA members

Professor Peter Mathieson
Vice-Chancellor

25 November 2014

Dear Professor Mathieson,

It has been almost a month since ASA wrote to Professor Norman Tien, Dean of Engineering, for his clarification on the captioned Guiding Principles. Despite repeatedly email reminders, it is most unfortunate that Professor Tien has still not replied to our email. As the Guiding Principles have a serious impact on the research performances of the Departments in the Faculty, and hence a direct impact on the overall research performance of the University, it would seem necessary for you to adjourn this Guiding Principles.

We look forward to receiving your reply.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

Cc Council Chairman
Pro-Vice-Chancellor
ASA members

Professor Peter Mathieson
Vice-Chancellor
17 December 2014

Dear Professor Mathieson,

This is a gentle reminder of my email dated 25 Nov 2014. As the Guiding Principles have a serious impact on the research performances of the Departments in the Faculty, and hence a direct impact on the overall research performance of the University. We have also received similar complaints from other faculty. Therefore, it would seem necessary for you to take action to adjourn the implementation of this Guiding Principles throughout the University.

We look forward to receiving your urgent reply.

Yours sincerely,

SW Cheung
ASA Vice Chairman

Cc Dr CH Leong, Council Chairman
    Pro-Vice-Chancellors
    ASA Members

From:  Prof. Peter Mathieson
To:       S.W. Cheung
Date:   17 December 2014 5:51 PM.

SW
I will check with Norman Tien whether he is intending to reply to your earlier messages.
With best regards to you and your members for the festive season and for 2015,
Peter

From: Dr Norman Tien
Date: 19 December 2014 12:47 PM.

Dear SW,

The document (E38/1014) which you are referring to is an internal document of the Faculty Higher Degrees Committee. Your comments on the Faculty’s proposed guiding principles for RPg allocation has been noted and discussed at the Faculty Higher Degrees Committee as well as at the departmental level. The guiding principles were proposed after having taken into account the spirit of the University’s RPg allocation principles and mechanisms.

With Season’s Greetings,

Norman

Professor Norman Tien
Dean of Faculty of Engineering

29 December 2014
Dear Professor Tien

Many thanks for your email of 19 December 2014 replying to my email dated 27 October 2014 after reminders being sent to you on 7 and 14 November 2014.

It is most disappointing that you have not responded to most of the issues raised in my email. There is indeed a lack of transparency in the Engineering Faculty. Since this is about the usage of tax-payers money, we demand you to give full explanations/justifications on these questions.

It is stated in your email that "the guiding principles were proposed after having taken into account the spirit of the University’s RPG allocation principles and mechanisms." Unfortunately, this is misleading. The University allocates in 2015-16 the Main Pool of RPGs based on 'Students throughput' (40%), 'Research performance' (43%) and 'Input profile' (17%). The factor of external research grants has not been considered as a factor in allocating RPGs to faculties. However, the RPGs allocated in your Faculty is based solely on external research grants such as GRF. It is clear that the 'Guiding Principles' proposed by your Faculty has not followed the spirit of the University RPGs allocation principles and mechanism.

Therefore, it would be most appreciated if the proposed RPG allocation system in your Faculty be replaced immediately by one that follows the spirit of the University RPGs allocation principles and mechanism.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman
Cc Council Chairman
Vice-Chancellor
Pro-Vice-Chancellor
ASA members

Professor Norman Tien
Dean of Faculty of Engineering

12 January 2015

Dear Prof Tien

This is a gentle reminder of my email sent to you on 29 Dec 2014, nearly 2 weeks ago. Since this is about the usage of tax-payers money, we demand you to give full explanations/justifications to clarify the issues raised in my emails of 27 October 2014 and 29 December 2014.

We look forward to receiving your reply urgently.

Yours sincerely

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman
Cc Council Chairman
Vice-Chancellor
Pro-Vice-Chancellor
ASA members
REMOVAL NOTICE

Dear Members

Removal Notice

We are pleased to inform you that the Academic Staff Association (ASA) of The University of Hong Kong has moved to a newly renovated building at the below address. The new office has a large area and would allow us to serve you better. Our email address remains unchanged, but phone and fax numbers are changed. We are committed to continuously serve you.

Rm. 104,
Pao Siu Loong Building
The University of Hong Kong
Pokfulam,
Hong Kong

Telephone No.: 391 71073
Fax No.: 3007 0673
Email: asahku@hku.hk
Website: www.asahku.hku.hk

Regards

S W Cheung
ASA Chairman
Minutes of the 7th Annual General Meeting held on Wednesday, 22nd April 2015 at 12:45 p.m. at Room G06, Pao Siu Loong Building, The University of Hong Kong.

Present: Dr S W Cheung (Chairman)  
Dr K C Cheung (Secretary)  
and 21 other ordinary members

1 Confirmation of Minutes for 2014  
The 2014 Annual General Meeting Minutes were tabled before the meeting. No comment was received. A motion to accept the minutes as presented was moved by Dr. Albert Yeung and seconded by Prof. S.H. Lo. All members were in favour. The motion to confirm and accept the Minutes was passed unanimously.

2 Report from the Chairman  
2.1 The Chairman presented the Chairman’s Report 2014/2015.

2.2 Dr. H.J. Pam moved to accept the Chairman’s Report as presented and Prof. G. Biddle seconded it. All members were in favour. The motion to accept the Report was passed unanimously.

3 Financial Report from the Chairman  
3.1 The Chairman, before presenting the draft Financial Statement for 2014, informed the members that the Treasurer had resigned, and that he had signed the draft Financial Statement in lieu of the Treasurer.

3.2 Upon the enquiry from members on the sources of income of the Association, the Chairman replied that membership fee would be the major source and he was of the opinion for letting the facility rooms to other departments at a charge. The Chairman invited members to contribute ideas on exploring other income sources.

3.2 A motion to accept and to rectify the signing by the Chairman of the Financial Statement was moved by Dr. Roger H.F. Wong and seconded by Dr. L.K. Chu. The motion was passed unanimously.

4 Amendments of the Constitution  
4.1 The Chairman briefed the proposed amendments of constitution as per the notice convening the meeting;

4.2 A secret ballot was then conducted and scrutinised by Mr. W.K. Kwan and Dr. Michael Z.Q. Chen.

4.3 The Chairman announced the voting results as scrutinised, a copy of which was attached and formed an integral part of the minutes.

4.4 The Chairman declared that the motions for amendments of the Constitution were carried with more than 2/3 majority.
5 Appointment of Hon. Auditor
A motion for Re-appointment of the Hon. Auditor, Y. H. Lai & Co, Certified Public Accountants (Practising), until the conclusion of the next Annual General Meeting, was moved by Dr. Roger H.F. Wong and seconded by Dr. T.N. Wong. The motion was passed unanimously.

6 Election of Executive Committee Members
6.1 The Chairman made a brief account on the resignations of the executive committee members last year and introduced the nominees for election of the executive committee members for the coming year.

6.2 A secret ballot under the scrutiny of the scrutineers, Mr. W.K. Kwan and Dr. Michael Z.Q. Chen, was carried out for election of the executive committee members with the voting results listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No. of Votes</th>
<th>Terms / expiring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman</td>
<td>Dr Cheung, Kie Chung</td>
<td>21 votes</td>
<td>2 years/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate A:</td>
<td>Dr Yeung, Tak Chung Albert</td>
<td>12 votes</td>
<td>1 year /2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate B:</td>
<td>Dr Wan, Jennifer Man-fan</td>
<td>9 votes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Dr Wong, Hoi Fung Roger</td>
<td>21 votes</td>
<td>2 years/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 The Chairman announced that Dr. Cheung, Kie Chung, Dr. Yeung, Tak Chung Albert and Dr. Wong, Hoi Fung Roger were elected for the respective terms.

6.4 Without prejudice to the validity of the offices of the existing executive committee members, it was noted that the full list of the executive committee members was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Remaining Terms/ expiring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Dr Cheung, Sing Wai</td>
<td>1 year /2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairman</td>
<td>Dr Cheung, Kie Chung</td>
<td>2 years/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Dr Yeung, Tak Chung Albert</td>
<td>1 year /2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Dr Wong, Hoi Fung Roger</td>
<td>2 years /2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.
Summary of voting results on changes to the Constitution passed in the 2015 AGM on 22 April 2015 (Attachment to minutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>No. of Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Update of the change of registered office    | 1.2 The registered office and postal address of the Association shall be at Room 1015, K.K. Leung Building, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, in Chinese “香港薄扶林道香港大學梁鈺琚樓 1015室”, or such other place as may be decided upon by the Executive Committee.                                                                                     | 1.2 The registered office and postal address of the Association shall be at Room 104, 1/F., Pao Siu Loong Building, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, in Chinese “香港薄扶林道香港大學包兆龍樓 1 樓 104 室”, or such other place as may be decided upon by the Executive Committee.                                                                 | For 23  
Against  
Abstained  |
| Deletion of the Editor from the officers     | 5.1 The officers of the Association shall be the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Treasurer, Secretary and Editor of the Newsletter, and they shall be elected in accordance with the provisions of Article 8.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 5.1 The officers of the Association shall be the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Treasurer and Secretary, and they shall be elected in accordance with the provisions of Article 8.                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | For 22  
Against 1  
Abstained 1|
| Deletion of the Editor                       | 5.6 EDITOR  
a) There shall be an Editor of the ASA Newsletter elected in accordance with Article 8.  
b) The Editor shall produce and manage the ASA Newsletter in accordance with the provisions of Article 7.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 5.6 Deleted                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | For 22  
Against 1  
Abstained 1|
| Reduction of number of Executive Committee members from six to ten to four to eight | 6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
6.1 There shall be an Executive Committee composed of six to ten members including officers listed in Article 5.1. A list of all the members of the Executive Committee and their office titles shall be displayed at the registered office of the Association.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
6.1 There shall be an Executive Committee composed of four to eight members including officers listed in Article 5.1. A list of all the members of the Executive Committee and their office titles shall be displayed at the registered office of the Association.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | For 23  
Against  
Abstained  |
| Deletion of the relative responsibility of the editor in relation to the newsletter | 7. NEWSLETTER  
7.2 It shall inform Members of the Association of current news of the Association and such matters as decided upon by the Editor.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 7. NEWSLETTER  
7.2 It shall inform Members of the Association of current news of the Association.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | For 22  
Against 1  
Abstained 1|
Message from Academic Staff Association

Nepal Earthquake Disaster – Fund Raising for HKU Relief Effort

Dear Colleagues,

A massive earthquake measuring 7.9 on the Richter scale shocked Nepal on April 25, 2015. The shallow quake caused severely devastation to northwest Kathmandu and its surrounding areas. The initial death toll is approaching 4,300. Millions of people have lost their homes and in dire need of food, water, shelter, warm clothing and hygiene kits.

Donations are needed to support immediate relief activities for the devastated areas, and more importantly, the reconstruction of these areas in due course. To raise as many donations as possible, the HKU ASA & EU Benevolent Fund Ltd. (a charitable organization founded by the Academic Staff Association and the Hong Kong University Employees Union) has decided to help collect donations from the University community, and then forward the received donations to Oxfam (樂施會) in the name of “The Community of The University of Hong Kong”.

The University administration is fully supportive of this action and will help to collect donations by deducting such donations from staff salaries, provided you give your approval in the following form. You are also welcome to donate by sending a cheque made payable to “HKU ASA & EU Benevolent Fund Ltd.” to the ASA or HKUEU offices.

We appeal to the University community for your generous support, and please act now to help those suffering from the massive earthquake.

Yours sincerely
Management Board

April 30, 2015

Message from Academic Staff Association

HKU ASA & EU BENEVOLENT FUND LIMITED
香港大學教職員職工會緊急援助基金有限公司

Dear Colleagues,

We are pleased to report that up to the end of May, the HKU ASA & EU Benevolent Fund Ltd. (Fund) has received 86 donations totalling HK$67,460. This amount will be forwarded to Oxfam (樂施會) in the name of “The Community of The University of Hong Kong” as stated in our appeal letter for donations. Receipts for donations will be sent to the respective donors in these few weeks.

We would like to thank all donors for their generous contributions and look forward to receiving wider and continued support of the Fund from our members and colleagues. Your participation will certainly help to promote the culture of helping others in the university community.

Yours sincerely,
Management Board
June 9, 2015
Our Ref: BLgt/91.1; 93.1.1

By E-mail

Chairman
Academic Staff Association

President
The University of Hong Kong Staff Association

Chairman
University of Hong Kong Employees Union

Staff Terminal Benefits Scheme & Staff Provident Fund

I list below the information for dissemination to your members if necessary:

(I) Staff Terminal Benefits Scheme (1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This month</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Year to date</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvency (%) at 1st day of the month</td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>128.4</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>132.1</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Factor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Payment (%)</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>26.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Actuarial valuation being withheld for the time being, due to possible pay adjustments normally effected from April 1st in the past.

(II) Staff Provident Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th></th>
<th>Past 12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase/Decrease (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per month)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Money Market Fund</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Absolute Return Fund</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(since May 3, 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capital Stable Fund</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Balanced Fund</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>12.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Growth Fund</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>16.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cc: Ms. Polly Lee
Secretary to Trustees of the STBS and SPF

(Ms.) Lydia S.Y. Cheung
Assistant Director of Finance

FINANCE AND ENTERPRISES OFFICE 財務及企業管理處

ASA Newsletter - June 2015
How to prepare the first dental visit for your child?

To prepare for the first dental visit, parents are recommended to explain to their child what to do and be expected in the dental clinic. A role-play at home can help the child get ready for dental visit. In the first visit, simple procedures such as examination, oral hygiene instructions and dietary advices will be delivered. This is to prevent induce unnecessary stress on child which may end up with dental fear in future visits.

Dentist always encounter the enquiries from parents, “When should I bring my child for the first dental visit?”

In fact, young child starts teething normally at 6 months up. We would expect 20 baby teeth erupted at aged 30 to 36 months. Parents are recommended to bring their children for oral examination within 6 months after the eruption of first tooth. It is important to keep regular check up twice yearly to maintain good oral health for baby teeth.

What will dentists do in the first visit?

Dentists will perform an oral examination with the help of parents in the first visit. We count the number of teeth and look for any decayed teeth. The clinic environment and dentist’s face are new to them. Most of the children will be very nervous and may develop “fear” once walk-in the dentist’s room.

Dentists will share dietary advices with parents so as to reduce the chance of getting tooth decay e.g.

1. Avoid putting your child with nursing bottle to bed
2. Avoid frequent intake of sugary food or drinks
3. Limited meals, minimize sugary snacks and shorten meals intake time.

Parents are recommended to let their child mouth-rinsing with water after meals to reduce sugar or acidic content staying inside mouth. For age 1 or below, it is important for parents to gently wipe the gums/teeth with a clean baby washcloth. Dentists will advise on the proper toothbrushing technique for parents who assist the child to practice toothbrushing at home. It is recommended toothbrushing without fluoride toothpaste for child aged 2 or below. If the child manages to spit out water, he/she should start to use child’s toothpaste contained fluoride which can prevent decay. When the child gets older, parents are recommended to show guidance on how to improve their toothbrushing technique.

A set of good baby teeth can preserve space preparing for the eruption of permanent teeth in future.
Oral Health for Children Aged 6 or Above (Part II)

At the age of 6, child will have permanent tooth erupted to replace the loosen baby tooth. Baby tooth was loose due to resorption of its buried root. As the root is resorbed, usually only the crown of the shed tooth is left and with gum tissue attached. For some occasions, parents may need to use a clean gauze or handkerchief to grip the loosen tooth and removed it with a quick snap if the loosen baby tooth cannot be shed by itself. If this is not success, parents can bring the child to see dentist.

The baby teeth are replaced by permanent teeth in an order as shown below (Table 1). For some reasons of tooth lost due to decay or trauma other than natural shedding, the permanent teeth eruption would be interfered. It may lead to inadequate space for succeeding tooth eruption or failed to erupt. If so, your child will need to consult specialists in children dentistry (paedodontist) and/or orthodontic specialist (orthodontist) in case of eruption problem.

A regular check up twice annually is recommended to maintain for a good oral health during the transition from baby to permanent dentition. Healthy diet and oral hygiene maintenance are helpful to prevent teeth decay and gum problems. It is common to have collaborations with paedodontist and orthodontist for some special situations. The permanent dentition is to be preserved for lifetime and worth for caring since early days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Eruption sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Number of Teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby Teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7−9 years</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9−11 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10−12 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11−12 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12−13 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 or above</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMBERS’ WELFARE AND BENEFITS

Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union (HKPTU)
Members are allowed to use the facilities and services provided by the HKPTU in their Causeway Bay Service Centre upon presentation of our ASA membership card. Valid until 31/7/2016
www.hkptu.org

Ming Xing Investment Company Limited (MX)
ASA members and also their family members, who have never applied Star Card OR StarCard holders who had no transaction record in the past six months, are offered the following discount in Caltex gasoline purchases:
Gas: Reduce HK $1.8 per litre
Diesel: Reduce HK$3.4 per litre
www.mxi.com.hk

Panevino Cucina Italiana
• valid with presentation of HKU staff ID card
• 10% discount on regular menu items (food only)
• valid for lunch and dinner service
• not applicable to any promos/ special offers
• not valid on public holidays
www-panevino.com.hk

Le Meridien Cyberport
HKU Staff are offered a 30% discount on food at Prompt and Nam Fong on every Monday to Friday in year 2015.
For more information, please contact Eva Loh at eva.loh@lemeridien.com, tel. no. 29807808

Best Western Hotel Harbour View – Terrace Cafe
HKU staff are offered a 10% off for:
Semi lunch buffet (Monday – Friday);
Weekend lunch set (Saturday & Sunday);
Set dinner (Monday – Sunday)
Valid until 31/12/2015
For more information, please call their F&B staff @ Tel: 2599 9843
From now until 31 December 2015, all The University of HK Staff and their dependants (including spouse, children and parents) are eligible to enjoy exclusive discounts if they successfully purchase the following insurance products offered by Prudential General Insurance Hong Kong Limited through Mr Andy Leung.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Original Price (per annum)</th>
<th>Special Offer (per annum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) PRUchoice Travel - travel insurance</td>
<td>a) 7 days tour to China/South East Asia countries</td>
<td>HK$156.00/trip (20% discount)</td>
<td>HK$124.80/trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) 7 days tour to Worldwide (excluding USA)</td>
<td>HK$245.00/trip (20% discount)</td>
<td>HK$196.00/trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) 7 days tour to Worldwide</td>
<td>HK$343.00/trip (20% discount)</td>
<td>HK$274.40/trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Fire Insurance for private dwelling</td>
<td>Sum Insured of HK$1,000,000</td>
<td>HK$600.00 (20% discount)</td>
<td>HK$480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect the building structure against the damage caused by fire, explosion, malicious damage, typhoon and water damage etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) PRUchoice Home - home insurance</td>
<td>Premium is based on the gross floor area of your home (Harmony Plan): a) 500 or below square feet</td>
<td>HK$650.00 (25% discount)</td>
<td>HK$487.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) 501-600 square feet</td>
<td>HK$750.00 (25% discount)</td>
<td>HK$562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) 601-700 square feet</td>
<td>HK$850.00 (25% discount)</td>
<td>HK$637.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) 701-800 square feet</td>
<td>HK$950.00 (25% discount)</td>
<td>HK$712.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) 801-900 square feet</td>
<td>HK$1,050.00 (25% discount)</td>
<td>HK$787.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) 901-1,000 square feet</td>
<td>HK$1,150.00 (25% discount)</td>
<td>HK$862.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) 1,001-1,100 square feet</td>
<td>HK$1,250.00 (25% discount)</td>
<td>HK$937.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) 1,101-1,200 square feet</td>
<td>HK$1,350.00 (25% discount)</td>
<td>HK$1,012.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) PRUchoice Maid - maid insurance</td>
<td>a) Employees' Compensation Only</td>
<td>HK$300.00/one year HK$550.00/two years (25% discount)</td>
<td>HK$232.30/one year HK$425.90/two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Comprehensive Protection Package</td>
<td>HK$660.00/one year HK$1,170.00/two years (30% discount)</td>
<td>HK$465.30/one year HK$825.50/two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) PRUchoice Personal Accident - accident insurance</td>
<td>Sum Insured of HK$1 million for Accidental Death &amp; Permanent Disablement (Double Indemnity Benefit) (Occupation Class 1) Optional benefit for Temporary Disablement, Medical Expenses - include Bonesetter and Hospital Cash can also be chosen at your choice. **An extra 10% discount will be given for insured together with your family member</td>
<td>HK$900.00 (25% discount)</td>
<td>HK$675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) PRUchoice Medical - inpatient medical insurance</td>
<td>Once taken out the Insurance, guaranteed of annual renewal for lifetime regardless of health. (Basic Hospital &amp; Surgical Plan)</td>
<td>HK$3,000.00 (10% discount)</td>
<td>HK$2,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Ward Bed Plan for the aged 40 - 44</td>
<td>HK$3,111.00 (10% discount)</td>
<td>HK$2,799.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Ward Bed Plan for the aged 45 - 49</td>
<td>HK$4,960.00 (10% discount)</td>
<td>HK$4,464.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Ward Bed Plan for the aged 50 - 54</td>
<td>HK$5,357.00 (10% discount)</td>
<td>HK$4,821.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Ward Bed Plan for the aged 55 - 59</td>
<td>HK$5,853.00 (10% discount)</td>
<td>HK$5,267.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Ward Bed Plan for the aged 60 - 64</td>
<td>HK$10,882.00 (10% discount)</td>
<td>HK$9,793.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) PRUchoice Motor - motor insurance for private vehicles</td>
<td>a) Third Party Cover</td>
<td>On Quotation (35% discount)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Comprehensive Cover</td>
<td>On Quotation (40% discount)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All the covers and premiums above are for illustration purposes only and are subject to terms and conditions, Prudential General Insurance Hong Kong Limited reserves the rights to make final underwriting decisions.

For product details, please refer to product brochures and policy terms and conditions.

Enquiry Hotline
Mr. Andy Leung  Tel: 3726 7629 or 9279 6653  Fax: 3117 6911  Email: andy.cf.leung@pruhk.com
Office Address
23A/F, Tower 1, The Gateway, 25 Canton Road, Harbour City, Kowloon.
The University of HK Staff Insurance Promotion Scheme

Terms and Conditions:

1. PRUchoice Travel, Fire Insurance, PRUchoice Home, PRUchoice Maid, PRUchoice Personal Accident, PRUchoice Medical, PRUchoice Motor – The University of HK Staff Insurance Promotion Scheme (“this Promotion”) covers the period from now until 31 December 2015, both dates inclusive (“Promotion Period”).

2. This Promotion is only applicable to The University of HK staff who successfully apply through Mr Andy Leung (email to andy.cf.leung@pruhk.com or fax to 31176911) for PRUchoice Travel, Fire Insurance, PRUchoice Home, PRUchoice Maid, PRUchoice Personal Accident, PRUchoice Medical, PRUchoice Motor underwritten by Prudential General Insurance Hong Kong Limited (“Prudential”) during the Promotion Period can enjoy the special discount. The policy(ies) must have been issued within the Promotion Period.

3. PRUchoice Travel, Fire Insurance, PRUchoice Home, PRUchoice Maid, PRUchoice Personal Accident, PRUchoice Medical, PRUchoice Motor are underwritten by Prudential and are subject to all their respective policy terms and conditions. For product information, please refer to the term and conditions set out in the product brochure(s) and specimen policy(ies) issued by Prudential.

4. All applications are subject to Prudential underwriting, Prudential reserves the right to accept or decline any policy application.

5. Prudential reserves the right to change or terminate any terms and conditions of this promotion and special discounts without issuing further notices. In the event of any disputes, Prudential shall have the absolute discretion to make the final decision.

6. The product details at this flyer and other relevant information listed above are for reference only. It does not constitute any contract or any part thereof between Prudential and any persons or entities. For the terms and conditions of any insurance product, please refer to policy documents.

7. Prudential General Insurance Hong Kong Limited is a member of Prudential plc group.

This flyer is intended to be distributed in Hong Kong only and shall not be construed as an offer to sell or a solicitation to buy or a provision of any insurance product outside Hong Kong. Prudential General Insurance Hong Kong Limited does not offer or sell any insurance product in any jurisdictions outside Hong Kong in which such offering or sale of the insurance product is illegal under the laws of such jurisdictions.
In order to conform to the University’s policy on supporting a green campus, printed materials should be reduced and the use of internet and e-service as a publication media should be encouraged.

An electronic version of our newsletter will be sent to those who opted for this and posted on our website: http://www.asahku.hku.hk.

Should you support to receive an electronic version of our newsletter, please complete the following and return to us.

**************************************************************************

Name (in full): Professor/Dr/Mr/Mrs/Ms/Miss*: ____________________________________________

Staff Number: _______________ Membership No.: __________________

Department: __________________________ Faculty: __________________________

Email Address: __________________________ Contact No.: ______________________

☐ I wish to receive an electronic version of the ASA Newsletter via email in lieu of the printed copy.

________________________________  _______________________
Signature                                                                 Date

*Delete as appropriate

Please return the completed form to:

The Secretary
Academic Staff Association of The University of Hong Kong
Internal Mail Box No. 1
Room 104, Pao Siu Loong Building
The University of Hong Kong