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The Chairman’s Report for 2018/19

The main activities of the ASA in the session 2018/19 are as follows.

1. **Violation of Employment Ordinance by HKU**
   A staff who retired in June 2016 received an email from the Human Resource (HR), a day before his retirement, stating that HKU would forfeit all his annual leave that he did not take. As it was just a day before the retirement date, there was no way the staff could be able to take his annual leave. The staff immediately wrote to the Director of HR warning her that it would be criminal if HKU forfeited his annual leave. The email was also copied to the Executive Vice-President - Administration and Finance (EVP), Dr Steven J Cannon. As no reply was forthcoming from both of them, he sent them several reminders, but yet no reply was received. Finally, the staff filed a complaint to the Labour Department of Hong Kong Government. The reason the then Director of HR, Ms Jennie Wong, and the Head of Personnel, Ms Eva Fung, gave to the Labour Department was that the staff had already encashed his annual leave entitlement, and consequently no further encashment was awarded. It is unfortunate and unbelievable that the then Director of HR, Ms Jennie Wong, and Head of Personnel, Eva Fung, were so ignorant of the Hong Kong Employment Ordinance, under which the employer should settle the annual leave of the employee no later than 7 days after the termination of an employee's employment contract.

On 1 February 2018, HKU was issued TWO summons for the following violations (Appendices 1 & 2):

1. Violation of sections 41D (1) and 63 (4) (e) and (7) of the Employment Ordinance, Chapter 57 of the Laws of Hong Kong
2. Violation of sections 41D (2) and 63 (4) (e) and (7) of the Employment Ordinance, Chapter 57 of the Laws of Hong Kong.

After deferring the hearing twice, HKU eventually pleaded guilty on 17 July 2018 and was fined $10,000 (Appendices 3 & 4). HKU would not have committed this criminal offence, if the then Director of Human Resource, Ms Jennie Wong, the Head of Personnel, Ms Eva Fung, and the EVP, Dr. Steven J Cannon, had taken proper action upon receiving the request from the staff to reimburse his leave entitlement. Despite the reputation of HKU as a good employer has been badly damaged, it is not sure whether the then Director of HR, Ms Jennie Wong, the Head of Personnel, Ms Eva Fung, and the EVP, Dr. Steven J Cannon, have been required to be responsible for committing the offence.

The ASA wishes to remind members, even those who have retired, to contact the ASA, if they have been improperly treated by HKU in relation to their leave entitlements, and the ASA will help.

For your information, the followings are extracts of the case against HKU from https://www.elegislation.gov.hk/hk/cap57?xpid=ID_1438403463600_002

**41D. Payment of annual leave pay on cesser of employment**

(1) **Where**—

(a) an employee ceases to be employed; and
(b) annual leave is due to him,

the person by whom he was formerly employed shall, as soon as practicable and in any case not later than 7 days after such cesser, pay to him in respect of the annual leave compensation equal in amount to the annual leave pay he would have received had the leave so due been granted immediately after such cesser.
(2) Where—
   (a) an employee ceases to be employed;
   (b) the cesser occurs otherwise than on the expiration of a leave year of the employee;
   (c) his contract of employment terminates or is terminated otherwise than under section 9 for any reason whatsoever (including his resignation); and
   (d) the termination occurs at least 3 months after the appropriate day,

he shall, as soon as practicable and in any case not later than 7 days after the termination, be paid by the person by whom he was formerly employed, in addition to any sum due under subsection (1), a sum equal in amount to that which bears to the notional leave pay the same proportion as the number of days in the final employment period bears to 365.

63. Offences and penalty

(4) Any employer who without reasonable excuse fails—
   (e) to pay to an employee—
      (i) pay as regards leave which he is required to grant or allow under section 41AA or 41F(3); or
      (ii) a sum or compensation which he is required to pay under section 41D,
           (Replaced 53 of 1990 s. 5)
       shall be guilty of an offence. (Added 39 of 1973 s. 6. Amended 53 of 1977 s. 7)

(7) A person who is guilty of an offence under this section shall be liable on conviction to a fine at level 5. (Amended 24 of 1988 s. 2; 103 of 1995 s. 19)

Schedule 8
Level of Fines for Offences
(Format changes—E.R. 1 of 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Fine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Merging the General Pay Adjustment with PRD salary adjustments

The ASA had an informal meeting with the then HR Director, Ms Jennie Wong, on 23 March at 4:00 pm. After discussing various issues, the HR Director, Ms Jennie Wong, suddenly informed the ASA near the end of the informal meeting at about 5:30pm the merging of the General Pay Adjustment (i.e., the COLA) with the PRD salary adjustment. The ASA immediately and strongly opposed this suggestion, as staff had already changed from regular annual salary increments to that based on their PRD reviews. Indeed, the ASA has received numerous complaints about the PRD and the salary award based on it that they are unfair and non-transparent. The ASA has written to the University requesting them to revise the PRD salary award system, but has yet to receive any reply from them. Merging the COLA (which is mainly to compensate for factors such as inflation) with the non-transparent PRD salary award system is therefore totally unacceptable to all staff in the University.

Despite the ASA’s strong opposition to the suggestion in the informal meeting, the University sent a bulk email to all staff at 7pm on that day stating that the new performance based General Pay
Adjustment would begin on 1 July 2018 (Appendices 5 & 6). In response, the ASA and EU wrote several bulk emails to the acting VC with copies also sent to members and staff (Appendices 7, 8 and 9). This incident was reported in the media, and eventually, the EVP sent a bulk email on 20 April 2018 (Appendix 10), announcing that the 2018 pay adjustment would still be based on the existing mechanism.


3. Meeting with Vice-Chancellor

On 7 November, the ASA met with the VC and raised the following issues:

1. Performance Review and Development (PRD)

2. Extension of retirement age, and


Regarding Point 1, the ASA complained to the VC. Prof Xiang Zhang, that the processes of promotion, contract renewal and extension were unfair and non-transparent. We quoted a few cases. One of them was an unfair extension-beyond-retirement case. In this particular case, despite the Applicant had all high assessment scores in teaching, research and Service/Administration in his Performance Review and Development (PRD), yet the Head of Department, Prof Victor OK Li, did not submit his recommendation to the Faculty Human Resource Committee (FHRC), which was required in the application procedure. Consequent to this erroneous omission, the FHRC, chaired by the then Dean of Engineering, Prof Norman C Tien, who had conflict of interest with the Applicant, did not go back to Prof Victor OK Li for this information, but decided not to support the application without giving any reason.

After the not-to-support decision, the Applicant launched an appeal which was upheld by the Appeals Panel. Despite the applicant strong objection to the existing of conflicts of interest, the then VC, Prof Peter Mathieson, still referred the case back to the FHRC and Head of EEE Department, Prof Victor OK Li, who had conflict of interest with the Applicant. In his recommendation, Prof Victor Li commented that “the courses taught by the Applicant could be taken up by other teachers; that the Applicant had published a lot of journal papers, not many of which being published in top journals” and so he would not support the Applicant’s application. However, the truth was that the course, with a large class of enrollment of over 70 students that the Applicant had taught in the EEE Department, was cancelled after his retirement because no one in the Department was able to teach it. To make matters worse, the Applicant had seven PhD students who were most unfairly treated. As no one in the Department was in the same research areas, the Department had to ask someone in City University to supervise them. Consequently, their studies were unnecessarily disrupted and to be extended by at least a year. Prof Terry Au, the PVC (ASR) and Prof Norman Tien, the then Dean of Engineering, offered the students one extra year of studentship, which cost a total sum of about a million dollars of HKU money. The FHRC, chaired by Prof Norman Tien concurred with Prof Victor Li’s recommendation to reject the application again.

Prof Ed X Wu (Ed Wu Xuekui) is from the same Department with the Applicant and had conflict of interest with the Applicant. He is a member of the Head Advisory Committee (HAC) of the Department and discussed the Applicant’s case in the Department level. However, he is also an FHRC member and so was in the FHRC meeting for the applicant’s case. He did not declare his conflict of interest with the Applicant and did not declare that he had participated in the discussion of the Applicant’s case in the Department to the FHRC which subsequently rejected the application. After the Appeals Panel upheld the Applicant’s appeal and the application was referred back to the
FHRC by Prof Peter Mathieson, a FHRC meeting was held to discuss the Applicant’s case. Even though Prof Ed X Wu was unable to attend that FHRC meeting, as an FHRC member, he discussed the Applicant’s case again by email, indicating that he supported the recommendation from the Head of EEE Department against the Applicant. This comment was clearly recorded in the FHRC report, showing his participating in the discussion of the Applicant’s case. Since Prof Wu is also a member of the University Selection and Promotion Committee (USPC), there was a possibility that the Applicant's case would be brought forward to the USPC for discussion. Prof Wu suggested removing his comments from the FHRC report. By doing this, if he discussed the Applicant’s case again in the USPC meeting, the FHRC report would not reveal that he had participated in the prior discussion of the Applicant's case in the FHRC meeting, so there would be no issue of his double jeopardy of the Applicant by him in discussing the application yet again as a USPC member in the USPC meeting. As a result, Prof Wu had discussed/involv ed in the Applicant’s case three times with a possibility of the 4th time in the USPC. All these are in record.

Prof Ed X Wu’s prediction was correct. Prof Peter Mathieson indeed referred the case to the USPC. For some unknown reasons, Prof Ed X Wu did not attend the USPC meeting for the Applicant’s case, but Prof Ron SY Hui. In the USPC meeting, the Chairman, Prof Paul KH Tam, informed members that “he was the subject of allegations by a group involving the Applicant for at least two issues which was reported by the media: (i) he was considered to have conflict of interest in handling the complaint against Professor Dan Yang for research misconduct, on the ground that he was a former collaborator with Professor Yang; (ii) he and Professor Terry Au, who were members of the Research Grants Council, had not thoroughly declared conflict of interest when they applied for research funding as Principal Investigator.” Having made this statement, both Prof Paul KH Tam and Prof Terry KF Au did not excuse themselves for conflict of interest. Prof Paul Tam still chaired and led the discussion in the meeting and Prof Terry Au remained in the meeting. Prof Ron SY Hui was in the same Department as the Applicant and was an USPC member in the meeting. The Applicant published many papers in number 1 ranking journal in his research areas. Even in the meeting on 7 November 2018, our VC, Prof Xiang Zhang, also agreed that the journal was a top-grade journal. However, in the USPC discussion, an USPC member commented that the journal only ranked number 3 and not number 1. Is rank number 3 a bad journal? He also deliberately used citations in google scholars, instead of the proper citation counts, to undermine the performance of the Applicant. When did the University start using citations in google scholars to assess the research performances of staff? When did the University make this known to staff? Finally, the USPC rejected the application.

This case clearly demonstrates how a scoring top grade professoriate was mal-treated by the University. Even the Applicant had a successful appeal, the then VC, Prof Peter Mathieson, referred the case back to the same people to reconsider the case and these people adopted the same rationale to reject the application, at the expenses of canceling a course with over 70 students, disrupting the study of seven PhD students and additional spending of about $1m for these PhD students.

In the meeting with VC, we had a constructive and open exchange. The VC promised he would look into the issue on extension beyond retirement.

Related news reports:


4. Interim DVC/Provostship

In November 2018, the media reported the controversy of the appointment of Professor KH Tam’s Interim Provostship. The selection of the DVC of the University had been halted for over two years. During this period, Prof Tam claimed himself as Provost and DVC instead of “Interim Provost and DVC”. The HKU Students’ Union (HKUSU) and ASA expressed the utmost concerns, as it was most improper to have someone to be an Interim Provost and DVC for over three years without starting the procedure to fill the post.

Related news report:


On 6 November 2018, the HKUSU and ASA made a Joint Statement on the Interim Provostship (Appendix 11).

On 29 January 2019, HKU suddenly announced that the Council has received from Professor Tam his notification of resignation from the position of Interim Provost & DVC, and the Council appointed Prof Richard Wong as another Interim Provost & DVC from April 1, 2019 until the arrival of the new Provost & DVC (Appendix 12).

The ASA has great worries of Richard Wong for the interim post:


5. Request to amend HKU Statutes

In April 2016, the HKU Council set up an independent Review Panel to study the governance of the University and its effectiveness. At the end of the study, the Review Panel recommended that the Chancellorship shall be honorary and the HKU Council shall be authorised for the appointment of the 7 members who are neither students nor employees of the University, including the Council Chairman. However, the Council gave an excuse that ‘amending legislation... is time-consuming ...’, and did not implement the recommendation. As a result, Arthur Li was still reappointed as the Council Chairman by the Chancellor, the Chief Executive of Hong Kong.

On 1 January 2019, the HKUSU, ASA and HKU Alumni Concern Group held a press conference on requesting the Chancellor, the Court and the Council to amend the University of Hong Kong Statutes (Appendix 13).

Following the press conference, the HKUSU, ASA and HKU Alumni Concern Group sent emails to invite all students, alumni, teachers and staff members of, and organisations within the University to petition the Chancellor, the Court and the Council (Appendix 14) for the followings:

1. That the Chancellorship restores its time-honoured status as a titular office;
2. That the procedure to appoint Council members not being students or employees of the University in Statue XVIII of the University of Hong Kong be reviewed and amended; that the appointment of the Council Chairman be vested in the Council as recommended by the Review Panel on University Governance; and that it be ensured all stakeholders can participate in the appointment process;
3. Against the Chancellor’s perverse reappointing Arthur Li as the Council Chairman.

On 21 January 2019, the HKUSU, HKUASA and HKU Alumni Concern Group handed the petition of over 3,000 signatures to the Registrar, Henry Wai, outside Knowles Building. Editors, Assignment Editors and Reporters were invited to witness the event (Appendix 15).
We are still waiting for the response from HKU.

Related news reports:


6. Grievances from members
In the past year, the ASA has received a number of complaints from staff on staffing matters. It is important that members should keep a full account of relevant information leading to their complaints so as to build a strong case to protect their interest.

SW Cheung
1 April 2019

違反香港法例第57章僱傭條例第41D(1)及63(4)(e)及63(7)條

該項告發是於2018年1月31日由香港勞工處的陳國強提出

因此，本傳票現規定你須於2018年3月5日上午9時30分到東區裁判法院第2法庭

在屆時主審的裁判官席前，就該項告發作出答辯，並依法接受進一步處置。

代表你者須備有獲你正式委派代表你公司的證明，縱使你有意認罪，仍須親自到庭。

本傳票乃根據《裁判官條例》(第227章)，由裁判官或由根據該條例第8(1)條獲授權的裁判法院人員發出的。

日期：2018年2月1日
致被告

香港特別行政區
東區 裁判法院
西灣河太安街29號 東區法院大樓

致：

香港大學
香港薄扶林道香港大學鈷鈦堂10樓


違反香港法例第57章僱傭條例第41D(2)及63(4)(e)及63(7)條

該項告發是於2018年1月31日由香港勞工處的陳國強所提出

因此，本傳票現規定你須於2018年3月5日上午9時30分到東區 裁判法院第2法庭

在屆時主審的裁判官席前，就該項告發作出答辯，並依法接受進一步處置。

代表你者須備有獲你正式委派代表你公司的證明，縱使你有意認罪，仍須親自到庭。

本傳票乃根據《裁判官條例》(第227章)，由裁判官或由根據該條例第8(1)條獲授權的裁判法院人員發出的。

日期：2018年2月1日
### Appendix 3

**HONG KONG SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGION EASTERN MAGISTRATES’ COURTS CERTIFICATE OF TRIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>案件編號</th>
<th>被告人姓名</th>
<th>告發人/申請人</th>
<th>控罪</th>
<th>裁判官</th>
<th>判令</th>
<th>判令日期</th>
<th>備註</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESS004836/2018</td>
<td>香港大學 THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG</td>
<td>香港勞工處 Labour Department</td>
<td>沒有付給年假薪酬 Failing to pay annual leave pay</td>
<td>香淑嫺 Veronica HEUNG Shuk-han</td>
<td>罰款 Fines / Penalties</td>
<td>16/07/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

香港法例第 57 章僱傭條例第 41D(2) 及 63(4)(e) 及 63(7)條 Sections 41D(2) and 63(4)(e) and 63(7) Employment Ordinance, Cap.57

港幣 $5,000.00 HKD $5,000.00

日期：二零一九年三月十五日
Date：15 March 2019

For First Clerk, Eastern Magistrates’ Courts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Name of Defendant</th>
<th>Name of Informant/Complainant</th>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Magistrate</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Date of Order</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESS004835/2018</td>
<td>THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG</td>
<td>Labour Department</td>
<td>沒有付給年假薪酬</td>
<td>Veronica HEUNG Shuk-han</td>
<td>罰款</td>
<td>16/07/2018</td>
<td>Fines / Penalties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Failing to pay annual leave pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>港幣 $5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>香港法例第 57 章僱傭條例第 41D(1)及 63(4)(e)及 63(7)條</td>
<td></td>
<td>HKD $5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sections 41D(1) and 63(4)(e) and 63(7) Employment Ordinance, Cap.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

日期：二零一九年三月十五日  
Date: 15 March 2019  

Danny Tee  
For First Clerk, Eastern Magistrates' Courts
Message from Human Resource Section of the Registry

Dear Colleagues,

In an attempt to explore a more fit-for-purpose pay system that can help to
• enhance academic and professional excellence
• recognise outstanding performance more effectively
• capitalise on the recent changes to the PRD and PRSD guidelines to move towards a performance-based pay system,

a proposed framework has been developed as set out in the attached document. The following main features are involved-

(a) General Pay Adjustment - Injecting some performance element in the allocation of General Pay Adjustment, and introducing pro-rated adjustments for service of less than a year;

(b) Merit Adjustment - A higher maximum merit award, and allowing one-off merit award to those remunerated at the maximum pay range;

(c) Effective Date - A common effective date for the General Pay Adjustment and Merit Adjustment, thus allowing more flexibility in the allocation of funding.

We would be happy to explain to you details of these proposals at the following sessions and to hear your views on the proposals. Please click the relevant link below for enrolment:

Session 1 (For Academic and Non-Academic Staff)
Date and time: April 6, 2018 (Fri) at 12:45 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Venue: Rayson Huang Theatre
Medium of delivery: English
Session 2 (For Academic Staff)
Date and time: April 10, 2018 (Tue) at 1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Venue: Rayson Huang Theatre
Medium of delivery: English/Cantonese

Session 3 (For Academic and Non-Academic Staff)
Date and time: April 11, 2018 (Wed) at 12:45 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Venue: Lecture Theatre 2, G/F, William M.W. Mong Block, Faculty of Medicine Building
Medium of delivery: English/Cantonese

Session 4 (For Non-Academic Staff)
Date and time: April 12, 2018 (Thu) at 5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
Venue: Room KK101, 1/F, K.K. Leung Building
Medium of delivery: Cantonese

Session 5 (For Non-Academic Staff)
Date and time: April 13, 2018 (Fri) at 12:45 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Venue: Rayson Huang Theatre
Medium of delivery: English/Cantonese

Enquiries on the above may be directed to Ms. Eva Fung (tel: 2859 2244, email: evafung@hku.hk) or Ms. Jennie Wong (tel: 2859 1930, email: jywong@hku.hk).

Human Resource Section
Registry

Note from HKU Bulk Email Delivery System
This is a General Notice delivered by the Bulk Email Delivery System.

**To Unsubscribe**
If you do not wish to receive General Notice from a department, please click here to unsubscribe.
(You will be prompted to login HKU Portal if you have not done so.)
Purpose

This paper puts forth a proposed framework for a more fit-for-purpose pay system that:

- Highlights the importance of continuous professional development to enhance academic and professional excellence;
- Recognises outstanding performance more effectively;
- Capitalises on the recently improved PRD and PRSD guidelines – based on clearly defined criteria and measured against objectives for all staff, and with Faculty-specific and shared key performance indices for each academic rank in teaching, research, knowledge exchange, and service – to move towards a more performance-based pay system for the University.

Background

2. Currently HKU staff may, depending on the terms and conditions of their contracts, be eligible for the following annual adjustments:

(a) General Pay Adjustment – This is payable with effect from April 1 each year and applied at a flat rate to staff in the same rank regardless of performance.

(b) Merit Adjustment – This is payable according to performance with effect from July 1 each year.

Framework for a More Performance-Based Pay System

3. The proposed more performance-based pay system will have these three important features:

(a) No systematic change in available resources – The total amount of resources for annual pay increases for the University will be determined by the same principles adopted currently.

(b) Average distribution – The majority (about 80%) of staff eligible for General Pay Adjustment should have salary increase around the average approved for the University for the year.

(c) Staff on maximum pay – Meritorious staff who are at the top of their rank’s pay range should be able to receive one-off Merit reward (i.e., not accumulative in basic salary).
4. To achieve the above, the following changes are proposed:

(a) **General Pay Adjustment** –

   (i) **Performance** – Instead of applying a flat rate to staff in the same rank regardless of performance, the General Pay Adjustment will be allocated according to *individual performance*. Those with performance meeting expectations or at times exceeding expectations will receive an increase close to the approved average increase for the entire University. Those with performance consistently exceeding expectations will get an above-average increase; those not meeting expectations consistently may not get any increase;

   (ii) **Duration of service** – The General Pay Adjustment will be pro-rated for those with less than a year’s service (e.g. 50% of General Pay Adjustment for six months’ service), and will only be payable if the staff member has served for at least two months. Such pro-rating is in line with common practice in Hong Kong and will release resources for recognising good performance of staff who have served the full year;

(b) **Merit Adjustment** –

   (i) **Larger differential** – The pay-for-performance element may be enhanced by increasing the maximum merit award;

   (ii) **Staff at maximum salary-point** – High performing staff at the maximum salary-point of their rank may receive a One-off Merit reward (i.e., that will not be accumulative in the basic salary);

(c) **Common effective date** – Both the General Pay Adjustment and Merit Adjustment will be paid in **July** each year, i.e. only one pay review each year.

**Time frame for implementation**

5. The above framework, if approved, may be implemented with effect from **July 1, 2018**. Two possible approaches:

   (a) **A phased approach**: 25% of the General Pay Adjustment being merit-based in 2018, 50% in 2019, and 100% in 2020 and beyond; or

   (b) **A full-implementation approach** with 100% of the General Pay Adjustment being merit-based starting 2018.

6. **From July 1, 2018**, pro-rating of General Pay Adjustment may begin according to duration of service, with minimum service of 2 months (General Pay Adjustment from April to June for 2018 to be included in the pay adjustment budget).
7. From July 1, 2018, those remunerated at maximum salary-point of their rank may, depending on performance and availability of funding, be eligible for one-off Merit reward.

March 2018
Subject: Proposed New Pay System
From: asahku <asahku@hku.hk>
Date: 4/4/2018 12:12 PM
To: undisclosed-recipients:;

Professor Paul Tam
Acting Vice-Chancellor
The University of Hong Kong
4 April 2018

Dear Professor Tam,

I wish to refer to the circular entitled “Performance-Based Pay System – Cost-of-Living Adjustment (Cola)” being sent to staff by bulk email on 23 March 2018 by the Director of Human Resources, in which a proposal to replace the Cola by a “Performance-Based Pay System” was presented.

We objected to similar proposal by the University a little more than 10 years ago and we were glad that the University had taken our views on-board and withdrew the proposal. It is a rather surprise that the University suddenly raises this issue again, citing the proposal is “more fit-for-purpose” as the only reason. Unfortunately, the opposite is true, as the proposal fails to compensate for the rise in the cost of living, while only Cola can.

Perhaps, we would like to take this opportunity to re-iterate the reasons for our objection.

(1) The sole purpose of the additional extra funding allocated by the Government is to compensate for the rise in the cost of living of government employees and publicly funded entities’ employees. It is deemed illegal if the University decides to use this additional extra funding for whatever artificial and discretionary other purposes, such as the so-call performance-based pay system, which has already been fully funded in the block grant to the University, it is clearly a misappropriation of Government funding by the University. If there is any penalty arising from such a misdeed, such as reducing or even removing this extra funding by the Government in the future, not only the University will suffer, but staff who took no part in this decision will suffer unnecessarily.

(2) The proposal will have a detrimental effect on the retirement entitlement of the great majority of staff. With the removal of cola, the maximum pay for all salary scales will effectively be frozen, and may only be changed at the mercy of the University’s high ranking administrators in power. Those staff whose retirement entitlement is based on the final year salary will take a direct hit if no mercy blessed. For example, assuming an annual inflation of 3%, the retirement entitlement under the proposal will be compounded to a 34% less for a staff retiring 10 years after reaching the maximum pay. Those in the SPF will similarly suffer, as their one-off payments from the converted Cola will not be counted in their basic salary after reaching the maximum pay. Given that the maximum pay is frozen, their contribution to the SPF will be much less than that under Cola. With reduced contributions, the retirement entitlement will naturally be significantly less.

(3) Some staff who may not suffer but can even benefit from this change are those who do not have a maximum pay and be blessed by the high ranking administrators, such as the Senior Management: the next Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Pro-Vice-Chancellors, Executive Vice-President, Deans, and Chair Professors. It is clear, though may not be intentional, that the funding for Cola by the Government will be channeled from the great majority of staff to these privilege few, who are already earning a salary way above others and the power and authority to bless the others!
This kind of proposal, perhaps, is not new. The Vice-Chancellors of universities in Hong Kong supported strongly to delink our salary from the civil service, and now they are obvious beneficiaries enjoying a salary 2 or 3 times of their salary before delinking adopted, while lower ranking staff receive lower salary increments and are struggling to keep up with inflation!

(4) The Proposal is deliberately vague with most important details missing. It looks like a generous offer in saying that “the majority (about 80%) of staff eligible for General Pay Adjustment have salary increase around the average approved by the University for the year”. However, what the majority of staff are going to receive regarding General Pay Adjustment is around the average approved by the University, but not the figures used by the Government in calculating the extra funding for Cola. This saying is irrelevant for the purpose of Cola entitlement. Unfortunately, for obvious reasons, the average approved by the University is most likely to be lower than the figures used by the Government, implying nearly many staff will be getting smaller portion of cola than what they are entitled for. It is a zero-sum game. Needless to say, the Cola funding not being paid to the majority of staff will end up popping up the General Pay Adjustment and the retirement benefits of the privilege few mentioned in (3).

(5) More importantly, there is no mention of how the maximum pay will be adjusted arising from Cola payments. As such, the University will be given a free hand to freeze unilaterally the maximum salary of all staff, except that of the privilege few mentioned in (3).

(6) The Cola payment will start in 1 July instead of 1 April, implying all staff will lose 3 months of cola payments, and those staff retiring a day earlier on 30 June and whose retirement benefit is based on their final salary will take an immediate cut in their retirement entitlement.

(7) Contrary to expectations of the reliability, the relevancy, the suitability and the fitness of the staff performance mechanisms in the University, we have received numerous complaints over the years regarding the performance assessments based on the Performance Review and Development (PRD) for academic staff and the Performance Review and Staff Development (PRSD) for Non-Academic Staff. For instances, it has been heard a ridiculous case that a reviewer in the Electrical and Electronic Engineering (EEE) Department was allowed to claim and criticize an applicant’s (reviewee’s) papers published in a ranked No. 1 International Journal for not being published in top journals. Despite the obvious and apparent conflict of interest, this was even concurred and supported as final by the Dean, Head, FHRC also USPC and as well as your good self as the Deputy VC and Chair of USPC. A reviewer in EEE Department criticized an applicant’s papers with top 1% citation as in the top journal list for not having enough citations in Google Scholars, which is never an acceptable referencing standard in any world class universities. Grants are the input to the research process and known to be not directly proportional to the outputs of research valued by UGC. UGC funding weighs heavily on research outputs. It has been that a reviewer criticized an applicant for not having GRF grant but in fact the applicant did not need research grant to publish many papers in top journals. In another case, a reviewer criticized an applicant in the Science Faculty who had GRF Grants. It has also been heard that a reviewer in the EEE Department criticized an applicant for not having enough invited talks at international conferences, but in fact, he had many invited talks. Despite the obvious and apparent conflict of interest, all these are again concurred and supported as final assessments by the University administrators, namely, the Dean, Head, FHRC also USPC and as well as your good self as the Deputy VC and the Chairman of USPC.

These numerous irregular performance assessment cases are only tips of the icebergs. Since the criteria for performance assessment have never been made clear to staff, and the conversion of performance into salary increments is totally non-transparent, the current performance based HR policy encourages shoe-shinning and even collusion, which is certainly harming the performance and reputation of the University, as reflected in the downward trend in our world ranking. For this reason alone, any change to the Cola which is serving extremely well in compensating us from cost-of-living rise, especially by the performance based HR policy, is totally unacceptable.

(8) The proposal is no more than to give the Senior Management more direct control of the salary of the
majority of staff. Consequently, it leads to even more shoe-shinning, and provides the Senior Management a tool to suppress unwelcome voices or research, which can lead to infringement of academic freedom.

For these reasons and cases, the proposal is totally unacceptable. We urge the University to be responsible in the use of Government funding, and that funding should only be used for the purpose it is earmarked for. The recent order by the Government to dismantle unauthorized structure in Knowles Building is a good example that the kind of poor management of the powerful Administrators of University and that the Government can and will take action against any illegitimate and illegal violation by the University.

We hope the University can follow what have been done in the previous occasion to take our views on-board and withdraw the proposal, and cancel the consultation meetings, which are deemed unnecessary.

We look forward to hearing your reply urgently.

Yours sincerely,

SW Cheung
ASA Chairman

cc. All staff

/In pursuant to the Unsolicited Electronic Messages Ordinance, if you wish to unsubscribe from ASA, please reply this email with subject: Unsubscribe/
Subject: Proposed Performance-Based Pay System
From: asahku <asahku@hku.hk>
Date: 4/11/2018 9:18 AM
To: undisclosed-recipients:;

Dear Members and Colleagues,

We refer to the recent circular 384/318 on Performance-Based Pay System issued by Human Resource Section of Registry. The Executive Committees of Academic Staff Association (ASA) and University of HK Employees Union (HKUEU) have studied the proposed framework and oppose this proposal as it is detrimental to all staff members. Please try your best to attend the briefing sessions and let the administration hear your voices and objections. We have highlighted below the disadvantages of the proposed framework for your reference.

“3 (a) No systematic change in available resources – The total amount of resources for annual pay increases for the University will be determined by the same principles adopted currently.”

There will not be any additional resources for the new framework. The University is redistributing the funding allocated by the Government for annual pay adjustment.

“3 (b) Average distribution – The majority (about 80%) of staff eligible for General Pay Adjustment should have salary increase around the average approved for the University for the year.”

You will not receive the same percentage rises as Civil Servant’s annual pay adjustment, as the average approved by the University will definitely lower than that of the Civil Service.

“3 (c) Staff on maximum pay – Meritorious staff who are at the top of their rank’s pay range should be able to receive one-off Merit reward (i.e., not accumulative in basic salary).”

This is already a key feature in the 2006 Human Resources Reform. However, the University did not honor its commitment since 2008. Further, the amount for one-off Merit Reward is top sliced from the amount from Government for annual pay adjustment.

“4 (a) (i) …. Those with performance meeting expectations or at times exceeding expectations will receive an increase close to the approved average increase for the entire University. Those with performance consistently exceeding expectations will get an above-average increase; those not meeting expectations consistently may not get any increase;”

Most staff members will get an increase at an average determined by the University. The average percentage must be lower than that of the percentage for Civil Servant as no additional resources is provided (3a refers). This implies majority of staff’s salary will never catch up with rise in cost of living.

“4 (a) (ii) Duration of service – The General Pay Adjustment will be pro-rated for those with less than a year’s service (e.g. 50% of General Pay Adjustment for six months’ service), and will only be payable if the staff member has served for at least two months....”

This policy will not attract new comers to join the University.

“4 (b) (i) Larger differential – The pay-for-performance element may be enhanced by increasing the maximum merit award;”
This puts more weighting in the annual performance review of which the criteria for performance assessment have never been made clear to staff, and will lead to even more shoe shining culture.

“(4) (c) Common effective date – Both the General Pay Adjustment and Merit Adjustment will be paid in July each year, i.e. only one pay review each year.”

This will have a detrimental effect on staff retirement entitlement as you will not receive full pay rise as before and the contribution from the University will be proportionally less. The impact is more severe for staff serving on Terms of Service III and STBS member as their benefits are based on their salary as at June 30.

ASA and HKUEU are strongly opposing the proposal as the University administration made a guarantee to the 3 staff associations/union that Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA and now with the term Pay Adjustment) would be provided to staff member without any cut during the 2006 Human Resources Reform. Pay Adjustment (COLA) is provided for tackling inflation and the automatic annual increment has been turned to reward steps based on annual performance. Taking part of the Pay Adjustment will downgrade the level of living especially for junior staff.

Regrettably, there is no consultation from staff before circulating the proposal to staff. We urge the University to be responsible in the use of Government funding, and that funding should only be used for the purpose it is earmarked for, as the Government can and will take action against any illegitimate violation.

We hope the University can follow what have been done in the previous occasion to take our views on-board and withdraw the proposal, and cancel the consultation sessions, which are now unnecessary.

Regards,

Executive Committees
ASA & HKUEU
April 27, 2018

Professor Paul Tam  
Acting Vice-Chancellor

Dr. Steven Cannon  
Executive Vice-President

Dear Professor Tam and Dr. Steven Cannon,

We are glad that the University has taken staff’s and our concerns for not initializing the proposed Performance-Based Pay System in 2018.

We would like to reiterate that the extra funding provided by the Government for General Pay Adjustment is mainly to cope with changes in the cost of living. Other factors include: the Government's fiscal position, the state of the economy, the Staff Sides' pay claims and staff morale. There is nothing linked to performance for the General Pay Adjustment and it is clearly a misappropriation of Government funding by the University if it is not solely used for such purpose.

The University has already moved to a performance-based salary adjustment system by replacing the automatic annual salary increment with performance-linked Reward Steps. The outcome of the annual performance review (the PRD or PRSD) is used as an indicator for salary increase for those who have not reached the top point of their salary scales. Since implemented in 2007, there have been a lot of comments criticizing the performance review systems. The University should refine the performance review systems so that staff are truly and fairly assessed. As details of the criteria for performance assessment have never been made clear to staff, and the conversion of performance into salary increments is totally non-transparent, the proposed performance-based HR policy encourages shoe-shinning and favoritism, which is certainly harming the performance and reputation of the University, judging by the downward trend in our world rankings. Therefore, linking performance with General Pay Adjustment is totally unacceptable.

The current performance systems have a built-in mechanism for rewarding consistently performing staff, the One-off, Performance-based Variable Pay. Additional funding was allocated to reward staff who had reached their top salary point and, with outstanding performance for two consecutive years. However, this mechanism was stopped after 2008 due to unknown reasons. In this regard, we would welcome the University to continue this practice as this is the best approach to reward performing staff without scarifying other colleagues’ benefits, and in particular the junior staff.

We have attended 5 consultation sessions, but only heard voices objecting the proposal. It would be most appreciated if the EVP and VP (ASR) can disclose where they have obtained the views supporting the proposal and how many these views are. As from the consultation sessions, it is clear that there is little support for the proposal. We wish the University can take staff’s and ours views not to re-initiate this kind of proposal in any form in the future.
Yours sincerely,

Executive Committees
Academic Staff Association
HKU Employees Union

cc. All staff

譚廣亨教授
署理校長

康諾恩博士
行政及財務副校長

譚教授和康諾恩博士:

我們樂意看到大學接受員工和我們的意見，不會在2018年度實施建議的薪酬調整機制。

我們重申聲明，政府提供給一般薪酬調整的額外撥款，主要是為了應付生活費用的上升。其他因素還包括政府的財政狀況，社會經濟情況，員工的祈望和士氣，也是在整體考慮之列。這與員工的表現，並沒有任何關係，如這些撥款不是僅僅用於這目的，顯然是大學錯用政府資源。

大學已經推行與表現掛鈎的薪酬調整，每年的自動增薪點已改為與表掛鈎的獎勵薪階。年度表現評核(PRD & PRSD)的結果，將被用為未達到頂薪點員工的加薪指標。自2007年實施以來，這兩評核制度突顯出不少弱點，大學應改進這兩評核制度，以便員工得到真實和公正的評估。鑑於這兩制度的標準細節，從來沒有向員工說清楚，加上如何將評核結果轉化為獎勵薪階，也不透明，令現行人力資源政策下的週年評核，易導致奉承及偏私，這無疑損害了大學的表現和聲譽，港大在世界排名的下降趨勢，足以証明這點。故此，將表現與一般薪酬調整掛鈙是完全不可接受的。

目前的週年評核制度，已置有機制來獎勵持續表現優良的員工，這些員工可獲得一次性的獎薪。一次性的獎薪是從額外資源支付，用於獎勵已達到頂薪點，而持續兩年表現優良的員工。但基於不明原因，該機制在2008年後停止實施。在這方面，我們歡迎大學繼續以額外資源發放一次性的獎薪，因為這是獎勵優良員工而不損害其他員工，特別是基層員工利益的最佳方法。

我們參加了5次諮詢會議，但只聽到反對該建議的聲音。我們希望行政及財務副校長和副校長（學術人力資源）能夠透露他們獲得多少支持該建議及其觀點。從諮詢會議中可以看出，反對該建議的支持很少，我們希望大學能夠接納員工和我們的意見，不要以任何形式重新啟動這類建議。

此致

執行委員會
香港大學教師及職員會
香港大學職工會

2008年4月27日

副本抄送:全體職員
From: EVP (Administration & Finance) and VP (Academic Staffing & Resources)  
<hrshku@hku.hk>  
Date: 20 April 2018 at 17:00  
Subject: IMPORTANT: Performance-Based Pay System – Follow-up to Consultation Sessions  
To:  
Cc: mail.service@intranet.hku.hk

Important message from EVP (Administration & Finance) and VP (Academic Staffing & Resources)

Dear Colleagues,

We are writing to thank all those who attended the recent consultation sessions and those who shared their views through various means.

A large number of colleagues expressed concern at the implications of the proposal to cut the link between an annual adjustment to basic salary and the cost of living. We have listened to those concerns and will review our proposal accordingly. At the same time, we heard many voices in support of the University’s wish to ensure that all our staff who perform at or above the standard required of them are recognized and appropriately rewarded. Again, we will look to build this feature into our revised proposals, in alignment with our aspirations to sustain a performance culture.

To allow us time to take forward the review considering colleagues’ feedback, we have agreed that the 2018 adjustment will be based on the existing mechanism with no change to the effective date.

We will present a revised framework in the weeks ahead.

Once again can we take this opportunity to thank you for your constructive and helpful input.
建議按工作表現釐定每年薪酬調整幅度的諮詢跟進

各位同事：

感謝同事出席最近關於薪酬調整機制的多場諮詢會及透過不同方式表達你們的意見。

很多同事關注到在原本建議下，每年基本薪酬調整未能與生活指數掛鈎。我們聽到同事的聲音，並將會相對檢討有關建議。與此同時，我們也聽到很多聲音支持大學對表現達至或超越職位工作要求的同事，予以肯定及適當的獎酬。我們在檢討建議時，也會確立有關元素，以配合大學推動持續績效文化的目標。

由於需時考慮同事的意見及作出檢討，校方同意2018年的薪酬調整將按沿用機制進行。

我們將在數星期内向同事提出新的修訂議案。

在此，我們再次感謝各位同事向校方提出各項有益及有建設性的意見。

康諾恩博士
行政及財務副校長

區潔芳教授
副校長 (學術人力資源)
“Gather ye rosebuds while ye may” –

The Joint Statement by The Hong Kong University Students’ Union and Academic Staff Association of The University of Hong Kong in the Interim Provostship

Currently, the media reported the controversy towards the status of Professor K.H. Tam’s Interim Provostship. The selection of the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor of the University has been halted for over two years. During this period, Tam claims himself as “Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor” instead of “Interim Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor”. The Hong Kong University Students’ Union (“HKUSU”) and Academic Staff Association of The University of Hong Kong (“HKUASA”) are expressing our utmost concerns.

It’s unusual that Professor Tam has been the Interim Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor for over three years. For recent instance, Professor Terry Au, the Vice-President, and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Academic Staffing and Resources), has taken her interim role for four months only. It is reported that Professor Peter William Mathieson, the then Chairman of the Selection Committee of Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor, has expressed that the selection process should be resumed by the new President and Vice-Chancellor. However, the Council of the University has not discussed this matter since August of 2016. On the past few days, media reported that the recruitment of this post was removed by Human Resource Section from their website. The university spokesperson replied that, if there is no suitable candidate in the process of searching and selecting, the program will be suspended and then restarted. Yet, a concrete timetable has not been provided by the authority till now.

The title of Professor Tam is “Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor” in different official documents, including but not limited to the email he had issued and his website biography. But according to another emails, the title of Professor Tam was “Acting President and Vice-Chancellor” from February to July, when Tam was taking the acting role. It’s a fair practice. Both of the interim provostship and the acting presidency are transitional, but obviously, there is a different way of handling his title. HKUSU and HKUASA is hereby asking for an explanation from Professor Tam.

In accordance with the Statute of the University of Hong Kong, an international selection of the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor of the University have to be conducted. It is a full-time post as well. Recently, the student's representatives of the Selection Committee have left the University, and no meetings have been convened since Professor Mathieson left his role. Thus, it’s doubted that whether the Committee could continue to be functioned. HKUSU and HKUASA hereby urge the University to dissolve the current Selection Committee and resume the selection process immediately by re-establish a new committee after the new appointment of the Council members in January.
花開堪折直須折 —

香港大學學生會與香港大學教師及職員會就暫任首席副校長程序聯合聲明

近日媒體報道香港大學「暫任首席副校長」譚廣亨教授身份的爭議，包括「首席副校長」物色程序停頓逾兩年，以及譚在暫任此職期間多次自稱「首席副校長」(Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor)而非「暫任首席副校長」(Interim Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor)。香港大學學生會與香港大學教師及職員會（下稱學生會與教師及職員會）對此表示強烈關注。

譚廣亨教授自2015年「暫任首席副校長」至今已長達三年半，並不尋常，如最近曾暫任學術人力資源副校長的區潔芳教授之任期亦不過四個月。而據悉，時任物色委員會主席的前校長馬斐森曾表示應由新校長重新啟動物色程序，但校委會自2016年8月後亦未曾討論過相關事宜。而近日傳媒報導校方竟於今年七月移除了載於人力資源部(Human Resource Section)網站的招聘廣告。校方發言人日前表示在尋覓和遴選的過程中如果未有合適候選人，程序會暫停待適時再啓動，惟校方至今並沒有提供重新啟動物色程序的明確時間表。

譚廣亨於各官方文件，包括電郵、網站個人簡介，均以「首席副校長」自稱。然而，譚廣亨於2018年2月至7月出任「署理校長」期間，發出的電郵則有冠上「署理」一字(Acting President)，於本年2月主持港大傳媒春茗時，譚亦是自稱「署理校長」而非「校長」，做法合理。暫任首席副校長及署理校長均屬過渡性質，然而譚廣亨在處理二者職銜時手法卻明顯有別。學生會與教師及職員會要求譚廣亨就此事解釋。

根據大學規程，首席副校長需經由國際物色及遴選程序篩選及屬於全職，而譚廣亨卻暫任「首席副校長」長達三年半。現時，負責首席副校長物色委員會的學生代表已離開港大，而據悉委員會自前主席馬斐森離去後並無召開會議，故此現存委員會之功能成疑。學生會與教師及職員會敦促校方於來年一月初校委改選後馬上重啟物色程序，解散舊有委員會並成立新委員會，花開堪折直須折。

香港大學學生會
香港大學教師及職員會
二零一八年十一月六日
Message from The President and Vice-Chancellor

Dear Colleagues and Students,

The Council of the University at its meeting earlier today received from Professor Paul Tam his notification of resignation from the position of Interim Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Provost & DVC). Professor Tam would return to teaching, research and clinical work in the Department of Surgery and steer the development of the Dr Li Dak-Sum Research Center as its Director with effect from April 1, 2019.

Since the search for the next Provost & DVC will take time, on my recommendation and after consultation with the Senate, the Council approved that Professor Richard Wong, Philip Wong Kennedy Wong Professor in Political Economy, and Professor: Chair of Economics, be appointed as Interim Provost & Deputy VC from April 1, 2019 until the arrival of the new Provost & DVC.

I would like to thank Professor Paul Tam for his contribution to the University over the past years, during which he worked tirelessly to uphold and elevate the academic profile of the University. I look forward to his equally important contributions to our academic endeavors when he returns to his academic position.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank Professor Richard Wong for graciously agreeing to take up the position while the University launches a new search. Professor Wong was the University’s DVC during 2004 to 2010. I am sure the University will benefit from his deep knowledge of HKU and rich management experience during the interim period.

Best regards,
Professor Xiang Zhang
President and Vice-Chancellor

Note from HKU Bulk Email Delivery System
This is a General Notice delivered by the Bulk Email Delivery System.

**To Unsubscribe**
If you do not wish to receive General Notice from a department, please click here to unsubscribe.
(You will be prompted to login HKU Portal if you have not done so.)
採訪通知

致: 各採訪主任、編輯及記者

改弦易轍 迫在眉睫

要求校監、校董會及校委會修改《香港大學規程》之記者招待會

香港大學學生會將聯同香港大學教師及職員會與香港大學校友關注組舉行記者招待會，發表聯合聲明，要求校監、校董會及校委會修改《香港大學規程》。現誠邀貴傳媒派代表出席，詳情如下:

日期：2019年1月1日
地點：香港大學綜合大樓地下平台
時間：上午11時至中午12時
語言：廣東話

傳媒查詢：supresid@hku.hk/+852 95496427（香港大學學生會會長黃程鋒同學）
Press Invitation

(Attn: All Editors, Assignment Editors and Reporters)

Change Now Or Never

Request to the Chancellor, the Court and the Council:  To amend the
“Statutes in University of Hong Kong”

The Hong Kong University Students’ Union jointly organises a press conference with Academic Staff Association of The University of Hong Kong and HKU Alumni Concern Group. A Joint Appeal to the Chancellor, the Court and the Council for amendments to the Statutes of the University of Hong Kong Statutes will be issued. You are cordially invited to send representatives to attend the press conference.

Details are as follows:

Date: 1 January 2019
Venue: Union Foyer, Composite Building, The University of Hong Kong
Time: 11:00 - 12:00
Language: Cantonese

Media enquiries: supresid@hku.hk / +852 95496427 (Mr Davin Wong, President of HKUSU)
Subject: 【Change Now or Never: Joint Appeal to the Chancellor, the Court and the Council for Amendments to the Statutes of the University of Hong Kong】
From: asahku <asahku@hku.hk>
Date: 1/2/2019 9:46 AM
To: undisclosed-recipients:

(The Chinese version of this email comes right after the English version)

【Change Now or Never: Joint Appeal to the Chancellor, the Court and the Council for Amendments to the Statutes of the University of Hong Kong】

Link of cosignatory:
https://goo.gl/forms/DaUvM34dGrUD8pM83

It has been most horrendous that former Chancellor Leung Chun-ying perversely appointed Arthur Li as the Chairman of the University of Hong Kong Council against the public’s will; that the current Chancellor Carrie Lam now continues her wrongdoing and reappoints Arthur Li is not only a grave misdeed but also an utter dismay for all members in HKU.

Only with a reformed system can the institutional autonomy of the University be upheld.
The excessive power of Chancellor is undoubtedly a great threat to our institutional autonomy, particularly the authority to appoint 7 members in the HKU Council, who are not students or employees of HKU. From former Governors of Hong Kong to the Chief Executives after the handover of sovereignty, it has been reiterated that the Chancellor of HKU has always been just a ceremonial role. Both British-Hong Kong government and Hong Kong SAR government mentioned several times that the Chancellor in all tertiary institutions is just a titular head with only ceremonial duties. Currently, amidst the 24 Council members, the Chancellor has the power to appoint 7 members who are not students or employees of HKU, including the Council Chairman. Former Chancellor Leung Chun-ying willfully abused such power which in result led to a more severe situation of cronyism. Indeed, of many top universities around the world, such as the University of Cambridge, the University of Oxford, and the University College London, there are also external members in the composition of their highest governance structures. Yet, such selection and appointment of external members are all decided by the University. The practice of granting the sole power to Chancellor to appoint external members as Council members is hardly convincing, as it has never been adopted by any other international institutions. Worse still, there is no authorisation from HKU members. We solemnly remonstrate against the unreasonable decision made by Carrie Lam, the current Chancellor.

The Working Party looked into the recommendations in a report submitted to the Council by a Review Panel on University Governance in 2016 recommended that the Chancellorship shall be honorary and the HKU Council shall be authorised for the appointment of the 7 members who are neither students nor employees of the University, including the Council Chairman. However, the Working Party was excused that ‘amending legislation... is time-consuming and uncertain in result’, thus an incompetent Advisory Committee on Council Chairmanship was introduced. Yet, the reappointment of Arthur Li revealed the lack of transparency of both the Committee and the appointment process of the Council Chairman as a whole. In fact, delegating the authority of appointing external members of HKU Council does not require any legislative amendment while the Working Party misinterpreted it. The amendment of the Statutes of the University of Hong Kong could be raised to the Chancellor through HKU Court once the HKU Council proposed.

As the threat is hanging over us, we should stand up for refining the University of Hong Kong Ordinance and its statutes. In addition, it is pressing to safeguard the institutional autonomy, so that the University could be brought towards the genuine co-governance by students and staff.

We cordially invite all students, alumni, teachers and staff members of, and organisations within the University to join this petition to the Chancellor, the Court and the Council:

That the Chancellorship restores its time-honoured status as a titular office;
That the procedure to appoint Council members not being students or employees of the University in Statue XVIII of the University of Hong Kong be reviewed and amended; that the appointment of the Council Chairman be vested in the Council as recommended by the Review Panel on University Governance; and that it be ensured all stakeholders can participate in the appointment process;
Against the Chancellor’s perverse reappointing Arthur Li as the Council Chairman.

Initiators:
The Hong Kong University Students’ Union
Academic Staff Association of The University of Hong Kong
HKU Alumni Concern Group

Co-signatories:
Hong Kong University Employees Union
Architectural Society, HKUSU
Architectural Conservation Association, AS, HKUSU
Arts Association, HKUSU
French Society, AA, HKUSU
German Association, AA, HKUSU
Korean Society, AA, HKUSU
Society of Comparative Literature, AA, HKUSU
Business and Economics Association, HKUSU
Dental Society, HKUSU
Education Society, HKUSU
Engineering Society, HKUSU
Law Association, HKUSU
Medical Society, HKUSU
Science Society, HKUSU
Social Sciences Society, HKUSU
Geographical, Geological and Archaeological Society, SSS, HKUSU
Hornell Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
Lady Ho Tung Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
Lee Chi Hung Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
Lee Hysan Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
Lee Shau Kee Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
Morrison Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
R. C. Lee Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
Ricci Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
Simon K. Y. Lee Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
St. John’s College Students’ Association, HKUSU
Starr Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
Suen Chi Sun Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
Swire Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
University Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU
Wei Lun Hall Students’ Association, HKUSU

1st January 2019
改弦易轍 迫在眉睫
— 要求校監、校董會及校委會修改《香港大學規程》之聯合聲明

联署網址 Link of cosignatory:
https://goo.gl/forms/DaUvM34dGrUD8pM83

前任校監梁振英倒行逆施，忤逆民意，委任李國章為香港大學校務委員會主席，令人髮指。現任校監林鄭月娥因襲其制，不思改進，延續李國章的委任，乃嚴重失誤，港大人極度痛心。

欲恪守院校自主，莫若改變制度。

校監權力過大，為院校自主之極大威脅，當中以任命校委會校外委員尤甚。從昔日港督及主權移交後的特首，兼任港大校監時均明確表明為禮儀角色，無論港英政府和特區政府，均曾多次表明大學校監僅是名義首長或只具有禮儀性質。現時二十四名校務委員中，校監可自行任命七個連同主席在內的校外人士。前任校監梁振英恣意擴權，任人唯親，越演越烈。放眼世界諸頂級學府如劍橋大學、牛津大學、倫敦大學學院等，其最高管治架構之組成亦有校外委員，惟人選及任命皆由校內制定。校監一人獨行專斷任命校外人士之制，外無國際學府沿用，內無港大師生授權，實難服眾。我們嚴正抗議校監林鄭氏之無理決定。

二零一六年，檢討大學管治專責小組向校委會工作小組提交報告，建議校監應屬榮譽性質，並要求任命連同主席在內之校外委員之權力下放予校委會。惟其後校委會成立的六人工作小組卻以「修改法例程序費時」為由，推出四人顧問委員會與校監溝通人選作幌子，從今次再度任命李國章為主席的決定，過程處處不開誠布公，明顯反映出顧問委員會仍屬閉門做車。再者工作小組析律貳端，誤引條文，實有失職，事實上，下放校監權力並將任命校委會成員及其主席之權力交予校委會，毋須修改法例，只需在校委會動議下，通過校董會向校監提出修改《香港大學規程》之建議。
我們面對迫在眉睫的威脅，更應奮起當先，戮力完善《香港大學條例》及其規程，改弦易轍，堅守院校自主，使香港大學邁向真正師生共治。

現邀請各位香港大學學生、校內組織、校友、教師及職員參與聯署，向校監、校董會及校委會鄭重表達下列訴求：

（一）校監應恢復百多年傳統的榮譽性質角色。
（二）檢討及修改《香港大學規程》第十八條「校務委員會」中校外委員任命程序，並按照檢討大學管治專責小組的建議，將校委會主席任命交予校委會，並在過程確保各持份者參與
（三）對校監倒行逆施再度委任李國章擔任校委會主席表示嚴正抗議

發起人：
香港大學學生會
香港大學教師及職員會
香港大學校友關注組

聯署組織：
香港大學職工會
香港大學學生會建築學會
香港大學學生會建築學會建築文物保護學會
香港大學學生會文學院學生會
香港大學學生會文學院學生會法文學會
香港大學學生會文學院學生會德文學會
香港大學學生會文學院學生會韓文學會
香港大學學生會文學院學生會比較文學學會
香港大學學生會經濟及工商管理學會
香港大學學生會牙醫學會
香港大學學生會教育學會
香港大學學生會工程學會
香港大學學生會法律學會
香港大學學生會醫學會
香港大學學生會理學會
香港大學學生會社會科學學會
香港大學學生會社會科學學會地理地質及考古學會
香港大學學生會康寧堂學生會
香港大學學生會何東夫人紀念堂宿生會
香港大學學生會李志雄紀念堂學生會
香港大學學生會利希慎堂學生會
香港大學學生會李兆基堂宿生會
香港大學學生會馬禮遜堂宿生會
香港大學學生會理學堂宿生會
香港大學學生會利銘澤堂宿生會
香港大學學生會利瑪竇宿舍宿生會
香港大學學生會李國賢堂學生會
香港大學學生會聖約翰學院學生會
香港大學學生會施德堂學生會
香港大學學生會孫志新堂宿生會
香港大學學生會太古堂宿生會
香港大學學生會太古堂宿生會
香港大學學生會偉倫堂學生會

二零一九年一月一日
採訪通知

致：各採訪主任、編輯及記者

改弦易轡 迫在眉睫

向港大校方遞交要求校監、校董會及校委會修改《香港大學規程》之聯署

香港大學學生會將聯同香港大學教職員及職員會與香港大學校友關注組明日遞交《改弦易轡 迫在眉睫—要求校監、校董會及校委會修改香港大學規程之聯合聲明》及其聯署簽名予港大校方，要求校監、校董會及校委會修改《香港大學規程》。現誠邀 貴傳媒派代表出席，詳情如下：

日期：2019年1月21日（星期一）

地點：香港大學鈕魯詩樓地下平台

時間：中午十二時至中午十二時半

傳媒查詢：supresid@hku.hk / +852 95496427 （香港大學學生會會長 黃程銓同學）
Press Invitation

(Attn: All Editors, Assignment Editors and Reporters)

**Change Now Or Never:**

**Handing In Petition for Amendments to the Statutes of the University of Hong Kong**

The Hong Kong University Students’ Union, with the Academic Staff Association of The University of Hong Kong and HKU Alumni Concern Group, is handing in the petition “Change Now or Never: Joint Appeal to the Chancellor, the Court and the Council for Amendments to the Statutes of the University of Hong Kong” to the University tomorrow. You are cordially invited to send representatives to attend. Details are as follows:

Date: 21 January 2019 (Monday)

Venue: Ground Floor, Knowles Building, The University of Hong Kong

Time: 1200 - 1230

Media enquiries: supresid@hku.hk / +852 95496427 (Mr Davin Wong, President of HKUSU)