

## 「院校自主公投」

記者招待會新聞稿（2016年4月6日）

由八大資助院校的教職員工會和關注組發起的「院校自主公投」投票結果已於3月24日公布。是次為首次跨院校就共同關注的議題合力推動的公投運動，共有4,520教職員參與，佔合資格投票人數16.5%。若參照過去個別院校的教職員選舉、問卷調查等的參與人數，是次公投的投票率相當令人滿意，贊成兩項議題的人數均超過90%，顯示各大專院校教職員對兩項議題，即（1）取消特首任命校董會/校委會成員的權力；以及（2）增加校董會/校委會中民選代表的比例，意見相當一致。

無獨有偶，剛出爐的《香港教資會資助高等教育院校的管治》報告（《報告》）第四部分清楚指出，香港一反許多國家的大學校董會自行委任成員的做法，由行政長官以各大學校監的身分委任大量校外人士進入校董會，卻沒有系統地考慮各大學的需要，會對管治造成嚴重後果。為維持市民對大學管治的信心，管治組織必須廣泛涵蓋相關持分者的代表。這些意見都與是次公投結果相符。

《報告》的焦點在香港高等教育院校管治。內文多次提及良好管治對大學教育發展的重要，以及對大學的國際聲譽的影響，亦清楚指出特首任意委任校董會成員乃管治問題的癥結所在，可惜《報告》就此卻完全沒有提出改善建議，只圍繞校董的培訓與發展、校董會的受信責任，與大學的策略規劃著墨，但求治標，不敢治本。在討論文件中雖有校董的「招募、就任培訓和專業發展」一項，並表示「最佳做法」是校董會根據本身的需要自行招募新成員，確保可以維持大學的院校自主，有助高等教育與政治勢力保持健全距離，然而，在相關的建議，卻隻字不提如何糾正或改善校董會成員招募出現的問題，只建議院校「應自行制定對不同專長要求的準則」，至於準則有何作用，誰負責按準則招募校董等，完全沒有說明。

我們對《報告》就高等教育院校管治的建議缺乏遠見、缺乏勇氣、缺乏承擔深感失望。大學同仁深知良好的管治與院校自主密切相關，二者皆有賴健全的校董會組成，就此，同仁在「院校自主公投」中已經清楚表達意見。為此，我們有以下跟進行動：

- 一、把結果提交各院校校董會/校委會，促請其正視同事的意見，全面啟動修訂大學條例的相關討論
- 二、把結果提交政府/行政長官以及教資會，促請政府及教資會正視大學員工對院校自主的要求，請政府啟動修例程序
- 三、把結果送交各立法會議員，促請其支持，提出修改大學條例議案；並簽署約章，畀香港市民知悉其立場，作下屆立法會選舉投票的參考

四、在九月立法會選舉中，要求各參選人支持院校自主的大學條例修訂，並公開讓選民知悉，作投票參考

香港大學教師及職員會

香港大學職工會

香港中文大學員工總會

香港理工大學教職員協會

香港浸會大學教職員工會

香港城市大學教職員協會

香港教育學院教學人員協會

香港教育學院職員協會

香港科技大學院校管治關注組

## Referendum on Institutional Autonomy

Press Release (6 April 2016)

The results of the Referendum on Institutional Autonomy organised by staff unions and concern groups of 8 universities was released on 24 March. This is the first large-scale cross-institutional referendum on common concerns of university governance in tertiary educational sector of Hong Kong. The 4,520 votes casted represent 16.5% of eligible voters. The voting rate is very encouraging when compared to the participations of staff council member elections or staff surveys of individual institutions. The fact that over 90% of the 4,520 voters is in favour of the two motions reflects the over-whelming and near-unanimous support among the staff working in different universities to the two motions, i.e. (1) “To abolish the powers of the Chief Executive in appointing members to the Council” and (2) “To increase the ratio of elected members of academic/teaching and administrative/supporting staff, postgraduate and undergraduate students in the Council”.

Not coincidentally, the newly released UGC report on “Governance in UGC-funded Higher Education Institutions in Hong Kong” (hereinafter as the Report) points out clearly in part 4 that, contrasted with most other countries whereby councils themselves are responsible for appointing their own members, creating a nominations committee to undertake this task, “The Chief Executive, in his role as Chancellor of the universities, appoints a significant proportion of council members... without a systematic consideration of the needs of the university to fill the requisite range of skills and expertise which they feel the council needs to discharge its responsibilities,” and thus leads to important potential consequences for governances. In order to maintain public confidence in the governance of universities, the report continues, “it is important that their governing bodies are broadly reflective of the stakeholders which have a legitimate interest in their affairs”. All these echo the opinions expressed in the

referendum.

The focus of the Report is university governance. In numerous places the Report mentions the importance of good governance to the long-term sustainability and development of the universities, and its impact to international competitiveness. It also states clearly that the crux of the problem of university governance in Hong Kong is the arbitrary appointment of council members by the Chief Executive. Nevertheless, nothing has been said on this in the recommendations. Instead, it focuses on the induction and professional development, and the fiduciary accountability of the council members, and lays the responsibility to the university by asking for strategic plans. All these can only scratch the surface without fixing the underlying problems. Although it mentions the “best practice” of recruiting council members is that the governing body being responsible for its own recruitment according to the skills which it sees appropriate to the affairs of the university, nothing has been put further on recruitment in the related recommendation except the suggestion of a skills template for each institution to draw up and keep under review.

We are very disappointed to the lack of vision, courage, and commitment of the Report on the governance in higher education institutions in Hong Kong. Colleagues working in the 8 universities have had first-hand knowledge and experience of the importance of a healthy and balanced council to university autonomy. They have expressed their views clearly and loudly in the Referendum on Institutional Autonomy. Therefore, to follow up, we are to:

1. send the results to the Councils of individual institutions and request them to initiate a full review and discussion on the amendments to related University Ordinance;
2. send the results to the Government/Chief Executive and UGC, and request the Government to initiate amendments to related University Ordinance;
3. send the results to Legislative Council members and request them to move a private bill to amend related University Ordinance, and urge them to sign a pledge to vow support for the cause publicly; and
4. ask all candidates of the 2016 Hong Kong Legislative Council election to support for the cause

Academic Staff Association of The University of Hong Kong

University of Hong Kong Employees Union

The Chinese University of Hong Kong Employees General Union

Polytechnic University Staff Association

City University Staff Association

Hong Kong Baptist University Faculty and Staff Union

Academic Staff Association of the Hong Kong Institute of Education

Staff Association of The Hong Kong Institute of Education

HKUST University Governance Concern Group