

Dear Members of the Commission,

My name is MA Miu-wah, Katherine. I have the pleasure of submitting a supplementary statement pertaining to the Commission's inquiry on the allegations relating to The Hong Kong Institute of Education. **This is my third statement.**

Responding to the three questions by Mr Keith Ho of Wilkinson & Grist dated April 17, 2007:

1. (Para 3.2 of my first statement dated March 19m, 2007 refers). I did not keep a note of the meeting with Professor Bernard Luk in his office in June 2004
2. (Para 84-92 of my second witness statement refers) I did not keep any notes in relations to the conversations I had with Professor Paul Morris relating to the incidents set out in para 84 to 92.
3. (The First Allegation set out in the terms of reference of the Commission refers) I recalled being briefed about the telephone conversation in which SEM proposed that Professor Paul Morris should initiate merger related discussions with other institution(s), or else he would allow the then PSEM to have a free hand in cutting the number of students of the Institute. I have not kept any note on this. And the memory of this piece of information is not very complete by now. I recalled that this was brought up by Professor Paul Morris in around March or April. It was brought up by Professor Morris more or less around the time when he told me another piece of information, i.e. EMB was very unhappy about the outcome of the First Principals' Conference and had started to undermine the Institute's leading role and share of teacher training in early childhood education. (Para 90 of my second statement dated April 16, 2007 refers).

Supplementary information regarding the Council Retreat on 24 June 2004

4. I would like to provide supplementary information regarding the Council Retreat on 24 June 2004 with reference to para 18 in my second statement dated April 16, 2007.

5. Below are further details of the Retreat and the context in which the merger idea was raised by the Council Chairman Dr Thomas Leung, but discussed and rejected by the participants of the Retreat.
6. On 4 March 2004, before the Retreat, the President Professor Paul Morris has written an email to Council Chairman Dr Thomas Leung, while copying other Council officers and a number of staff including myself on "Collaboration etc" (Exhibit KMa – 15)
7. In the email, Professor Morris gave a brief on the Niland Report which he had just received. He noted that: "What is noteworthy is that deep collaboration is clearly distinguished from mergers insofar as the former does not affect the autonomy of the institutions involved. We have begun to think of possible ways to collaborate". In other words, before the Retreat, there was a discrete effort for the President to advise the Chairman the difference of the various terminologies employed in the Niland report.
8. As set out in para 16 of my second statement dated April 16, 2007, shortly before the Retreat, the President briefed me a few senior staff that the Chairman has drawn up an agenda that focussed on merger as the way forward for the HKIEd. The President managed to stop him from doing so and revise the agenda to become more open-ended which broadly addressed the long term development of the Institute. (Exhibit KMa – 16)
9. (Exhibit KMa – 17) At the beginning of the Retreat, the Chairman introduced the Niland Report and the five models outlined in the report. He went on to talk about the Singapore model, the history of mergers in Hong Kong, and that Hong Kong was not a typical model as compared to the government around the world which did steer the development of tertiary institutions.
10. He noted the function of UGC being a buffer between Government and universities. He added that organisations similar to UGC around the world were fading out. He remarked that he didn't mean to doubt UGC's position but the Hong Kong Government had 'no strategic plan' and Hong

Kong was not applying a centrally directive model.

11. He went on outlining a number of factors that are the usual motives behind integration. Among the audience, outgoing Council member Mrs Angela Cheung asked why the Council Chairman was 'swinging from no merger to considering merger'. She was referring to Council's stance of not favouring a merger with other institutions.
12. Dr Leung replied by first referring to SEM as talking about the diminishing education market and that HKIEd was not super-competitive.
13. He then directly addressed Mrs Angela Cheung's question: "why I change my mind?" He said: in the previous year (2003), there was a pressing need for salary delinking plans and other issues. He said he didn't want to increase burden of staff. He went on to say: "Later, I changed my mind" because he thought the Institute's Academic Development Proposal (ADP) was not on the right track. He said if we just addressed staff issues without addressing the strategic position of the Institute, then the Institute was 'fighting a losing battle'. He also said that HKIEd will be 'dying by a thousand cuts' and he urged the participants to 'reinvent the business model'.
14. As set out in the agenda, the President Professor Paul Morris and Deputy Chairman presented two Powerpoints on the ADP 2005-08 and the report of the Task Force on the Future Development of the HKEd respectively. The rest of the day was devoted to group discussions which focussed on the long term development of the Institute in an open-ended fashion. It was subsequently followed by another Retreat on 5 June 2004 where participants discussed and unanimously agreed that they were against a full merger.

The Statement is prepared by Katherine Ma Miu-wah on the 18<sup>th</sup> of April, 2007.



---

Katherine Ma Miu-wah