



A.M.D.G.

Wah Yan College, Hong Kong

A Jesuit Secondary School

Exploration Exercise on Adopting DSS

Interim Consultation Report

Commissioned by the Jesuit Education Board

October 2017

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Backgrounds	3
A. Timeline of events	3
B. Collection, summary and reporting of stakeholders’ opinions and feedbacks	6
Chapter 2 – Rationale for turning DSS	8
A. Vision	8
B. Learner Diversity and EMI status	14
C. Resources	18
Chapter 3 – Regarding the key features of the proposed model of DSS for WYHK	20
A. School fee and fee remission	20
B. Admission	22
C. Learning & teaching and student development	23
D. Financial model	25
Chapter 4 – HR related matters and particular concerns of teachers	29
A. Job security	29
B. Contract teachers	32
C. Non-graduate track teachers	33
D. Workload	33
E. Parent relationships	34
F. Other employment conditions and benefits	34
G. Others – miscellaneous comments/queries	36
Chapter 5 – PUAWYPS - Quotas to be reserved for PUAWYPS graduates	38
Chapter 6 – Method for consulting stakeholders on the DSS proposal	42
Appendix One: Summary of Survey of Consultation Session Participants	44

Chapter 1 – Backgrounds

A. Timeline of events

The following lists some of the key events so far since the report of the Exploration Taskforce was submitted to the Jesuit Education Board in December, 2016.

2016		
Month	Day	Incident(s)
December	10 th	Jesuit Education Board (JEB) received the Report on the Exploration Exercise that started in September 2015. The report does not have recommendations on the preferred option or course of actions to follow.
2017		
January	19 th	Discussion Session for staff on report of the Exploration Exercise.
	25 th	JEB finalized its direction for the school to go further and wider on exploring the DSS option.
February	13 th	Special assembly on DSS for all staff and students.
	17 th	Dr. So sent a letter to Dr. Tan to clarify matters related to the Exploration Exercise. The letter subsequently circulated to PUAWPS stakeholders.
	22 nd	Meeting with PUAWYPS IMC members to clarify the contents and status of the Exploration.
	23 rd	The backgrounds of the Exploration Exercise were shared briefly at the WYHKPSA Spring Dinner.

	27 th	Meeting with core members of PUAWYPS major stakeholder groups (staff/ ex-co members of PUAWYPS-AA/ PTA).
March	10 th	Group discussion session on beta version of the proposal with WYHK teachers and staff.
	28 th	“Consultation Tab” launched on our school website.
April	13 th	WYHK DSS Consultation Paper uploaded onto school website.
	21 st	(1) WYHK Consultation Meeting for WYHK staff in the afternoon. (2) WYHK Consultation Session for WYHK parents in the evening ¹ . Forty-four attended.
	22 nd	WYHK Consultation Meeting with PUDA core members and PUAWYPS SSB managers.
	26 th	WYHK DSS Consultation Session for WYHK alumni ¹ . One hundred and twenty-five attended.
	27 th	WYHK DSS Consultation Meeting for PUAWYPS teachers.
	28 th	WYHK DSS Consultation Session for PUAWYPS alumni/ parents ¹ . One hundred and seventy-three attended.
	June	6 th -22 nd

¹ Survey of participants’ views was conducted. The results, which represent only the views of those who took part in the session, can be found in Appendix 1.

July	4 th	WYHK Consultation Session (Round 1 Follow-up Session) for WYHK parents/ alumni. Thirty-three attended.
	5 th	WYHK Consultation Session (Round 1 Follow-up Session) for PUAWYPS teachers/ parents/ alumni. Forty-eight attended.
	8 th	WYHK Consultation Session (Round 1 Follow-up Session) for WYHK parents/ alumni and PUAWYPS teachers/ parents/ alumni. Twenty-one attended.
	10 th	First meeting between representatives of JEB and Pun U District Association (PUDA) on the quota to be offered to PUAWYPS students if and when WYHK turns DSS.
	18 th	A message regarding wrapping up of Round 1 consultation posted on our school website.
August	5 th	Second meeting between PUDA and JEB representatives on the quota to be offered to PUAWYPS students if and when WYHK turns DSS.
	15 th	Round 1 consultation ends.

B. Collection, summary and reporting of stakeholders' opinions and feedbacks

Opinions, suggestions and feedbacks were collected via the following channels:

1. Written and verbal comments collected during consultation sessions;
2. Written comments received via emails addressed to the email address specifically for the DSS consultation as well as to the school's general email address;
3. Letters sent to the school, the Society of Jesus or the JEB.

All comments received are classified and grouped under the following categories:

1. Rationale for turning DSS
a. Vision
b. Learner Diversity and EMI Status
c. Resources
d. Other concerns
2. Key features of the proposed DSS model
a. School fee and fee remission
b. Admission policy
c. Learning & teaching and student development
d. Financial model
e. Other concerns and suggestions
3. Human resources matters
a. Job security
b. Contract teachers
c. Non-graduate track teachers
d. Workload
e. Parent relationships

f. Other employment and working conditions
4. PUAWYPS - quotas to be reserved if WYHK turns DSS
5. Method of consulting stakeholders on the DSS proposal
6. Others

The following chapters report on the salient comments and concerns received and the school's analysis and response. The JEB received an earlier version of this report. All JEB members were also given the chance to inspect all the comments and feedbacks received in their raw form.

Chapter 2 – Rationale for turning DSS

A. Vision

(1) Comment: DSS prevents the poor from enjoying Jesuit education

This concern relates to both financial ability and psychological barrier.

Response: A DSS-WYHK will be operated on the principle that “no student should be prevented from being admitted solely because his family cannot afford it”. Ten measures as explained in in Section 5.2 and fee remission schemes suggested in Section 5.3 of the Consultation Document (“CD”) were proposed to address concerns of different sorts. The school is confident that with these measures, we can attract more students who are able, yet less well-off, students to apply for places in a DSS-WYHK. On the other hand, by remaining in the aided system, the school is not able to provide as many admission opportunities to poor, yet able students. Please refer to Chapter 2, Section 2.1 of the CD.

In other words, the DSS model proposed eliminates both the institutional barriers and the financial barrier for less well-off students to be educated at WYHK.

(2) Comment: The system of DSS is unjust

One important reason behind this argument is that most schools in Hong Kong are aided schools which enjoy less flexibility and have less resources. DSS is seen as unfair to these schools.

Response: Benefits of students in enjoying unique and high quality Jesuit education should be the primary objective of our school, not the strife to make every school identical to achieve “fairness”. In fact, the objective of the government for introducing the DSS system is to encourage diversity and development of unique educational approaches as well as to provide choice for parents and students. It may also lead to a more vibrant education sector with the good practices derived benefitting Hong Kong as a whole. No school is discriminated against as the DSS is open for application by all aided schools. Different schools operating in different contexts should choose the model that suits them best in terms of their contexts and objectives. While DSS schools enjoy some advantages over aided schools in some aspects, aided schools also enjoy advantages over DSS schools in others, such as more financial security and standardization.

The justice of any system at the SAR level is a very complex matter, and particularly so for the education system. So while each individual is entitled to his/her views based on the aspects of the system they are familiar with or hold dear, it is primarily the responsibility of the government to evaluate the overall merit of the system by aggregating the diversity of views in society and considering them based on the collective and long term good of Hong Kong. Of course, in extreme cases, a system can be seen to be so intrinsically unjust that individual members of society may choose to either boycott this system or even rise up to force a change to this system. The question for us is whether the DSS is something so unjust that warrants these drastic actions or whether we should stick to the primary purpose we have been set up for – to provide the best Jesuit education for primary school students in Hong Kong within the regulatory framework in Hong Kong.

(3) Comment: WY's reputation will suffer if we change our stance regarding DSS

The Society of Jesus ("SJ") did decide to refrain from considering DSS in 2008 and this has won the SJ and the two WYs praise among the public. Will a change in tack this time hurt our reputation?

Response: The school and the SJ are here not for our reputations, but rather to provide the best Jesuit education to young people, thereby contributing to a better world. Furthermore, the decision in 2008 was based on the information available, context of, and analysis done at the time. Times and contexts have changed. More information is available, and better ideas have been developed. By stubbornly adhering to the original position solely because of consideration of face, we shall not be setting a good example about learning and growth.

(4) Comment: PUAWYPS's move to Eastern District (HKE) will automatically enable more poor kids to be admitted to WYHK as HKE has more poor families

Response: About half of the P.1 places of PUAWYPS are allocated based on a point system that is independent of school Net. As for the half or less students to be admitted through Central Allocation from the school Net based on lot drawing, they will be admitted from POA School Net 14. Primary school Nets are smaller than secondary school Nets² and POA School Net 14 around North Point is arguably the wealthiest primary school Net within the Eastern District. If WYHK would like to widen its net and open up more quotas to poorer districts within the Eastern District

² The secondary school Net of the Eastern District on Hong Kong Island (HKE) is broken down into three primary school Nets. POA School Net 14 is right next to the Wan Chai School Net. It must however be noted that when deriving Net Banding for admission to secondary schools (and to WYHK, being in a feeder relationship with PUAWYPS, in particular), the relevant school Net is the secondary school Net, not the primary school Net, which takes into account academic standards of all students in HKE.

(e.g. Chai Wan) as well as outside the Eastern District (e.g. Kwun Tong, Wong Tai Sin, Shum Shui Po, the New Territories, etc.), it needs the flexibility of the DSS.

(5) Comment: The school should focus on competence, not students' Socio-economic Status (SES), as admission criteria

Response: Caring for the poor and the marginalized is part of our school vision and that of the SJ. The proposed model of DSS is to (a) open up more F.1 places to all districts, most of which are poorer than Wan Chai and even HKE and (b) actively promote the school to and encourage applications from the poorer districts. However, admission is still based on competence as set out in the admission criteria³ and this system applies to both rich and poor. The rich will not be discriminated against. This way, the poor will not feel inferior too because they were not given special favour when being considered for admission.

(6) Comment: Whether WYHK students are relatively richer than the Hong Kong average is doubtful

Response: Please refer to data and exact wordings in Section 2.1 of the CD.

(7) Comment: Adopting DSS in order to admit more poor kids is a price not worth paying

³ Admittedly, some admission criteria favor the well to do, such as ECA achievements which may depend on family resources for training. The way to tackle this is to limit the quota for admission that takes into account such factors.

Response: There are admittedly shortcomings with the DSS system, just as there are shortcomings with the aided system. Whether the benefits of DSS outweigh its costs, as compared to the aided system, calls for our careful discernment based on our context and how we design our policies to minimize the shortcomings.

(8) Comment: How can the school continue to uphold its Jesuit vision towards education after it has successfully turned DSS?

Response: The SJ continues to be the School Sponsoring Body (SSB) of the school after it turns DSS. Vision is the primary concern of the SJ when deciding on whether to turn WYHK DSS. There is no reason to doubt that the SJ will abandon its vision and values after WYHK turns DSS.

(9) Comment: Why can't the Jesuit vision towards education continue to be upheld even if it becomes a CMI school?

Response: Proficiency in English has been emphasized at WYHK since Day One. Cultivating students' appreciation of both eastern and western cultures and widening their horizons to see beyond Hong Kong are key elements of our tradition. Developing competent, compassionate, committed leaders with conscience so that they can have a positive and profound impact in society is what we have always been doing throughout the years. If we want to continue our identity, our tradition, and our historical role in Hong Kong, then keeping our EMI status is essential.

(10)Comment: Charging a fee under DSS means “commoditization of education”

Response: There can be long debates on the actual meaning and the “evil” of “commoditization of education”. The practical issue here may be: parents may regard themselves as “consumers” of educational service (just like, say, paying for dining service), leading to a) their sons being passive recipients of education (rather than active learners who see learning as their own responsibility) and b) parents and sons making unreasonable demands on the school and teachers.

There are indeed stories of some expensive international schools and DSS schools in which principals bend to unreasonable demands of parents, leading to undue pressure on teachers and staff. This is definitely what WYHK wants to avoid.

The fact that WYHK is charging a significantly lower fee than schools of similar standing will take away the pressure to bend to unreasonable parent pressure. The school should also articulate clearly to prospective and current parents its views about parent-school relationship that is conducive to a healthy development of their sons. At WYHK, we believe that if students want to learn well, their own efforts are key. An overly comfortable environment is actually unhealthy for growth. If unreasonable demands of parents and students are routinely being met, we will be ill preparing these students for life and they will suffer miserably when they face the challenges of the workplace as well as personal relationships when they grow up. So basically, parents are not consumers, but collaborators. We need to work together to provide a caring yet challenging learning environment for their sons.

This is not to say the school should ignore reasonable requests. It is only right, and we shall set a good example to students as humble learners ourselves if we listen to our stakeholders and address areas that need improvement. However, the school is fully prepared to lose any student with unreasonable parents who do not agree with our educational philosophy.

(11) Comment: “Education for all” (有無教類), as understood by the Jesuits, relates to ability, not socio-economic status (SES). WYHK should admit students with a wide spectrum of abilities rather than a wide spectrum of SES.

Response: Part of the vision of the school is to serve “the poor and the neglected” so we do care about the SES of our student mix. As for ability, while the school has never shied away from educating the academically weaker students, it has never adopted a policy of admitting an academically weaker student over one who is stronger when everything else is the same. It is a matter of fairness when many students are competing for limited school places at Wah Yan. We believe that no matter how strong a student is, there are always valuable lessons to be learnt, from character formation to development of more advanced intellectual skills. Efforts of schools which focus on admitting particularly weak students are laudable but this is not the traditional role of Wah Yan.

B. Learner Diversity and EMI status

(1) Comment: The issue can be solved by improving standards at PUAWYPS

Response: The issue of excessive learner diversity can be alleviated somewhat with improvements at PUAWYPS but to say that it can be resolved entirely is too optimistic. Efforts at PUAWYPS do matter but it cannot work miracles to significantly narrow the natural spread of innate abilities of students admitted at P.1. Entrance tests or interviews do not apply to admission of students at P.1 in general. Even if PUAWYPS turns DSS and admission interviews are allowed, their desirability, not to mention accuracy, for applicants at the young age of 5 to 6 is debatable.

As for banding of PUAWYPS students (which has important bearings on the EMI status of WYHK), it depends solely on the Pre-S1 test performance of their seniors, not themselves. These Pre-S1 tests do not necessarily reflect students' learning of subject matters that the primary school or the secondary school find important.

There is also the question of whether PUAWYPS should place excessive emphasis on academic studies and training for Pre-S1 tests of their students in the expense of the non-academic aspects of their students' development solely to help keep WYHK as an aided EMI school and a quota of about two thirds of PUAWYPS graduates to be admitted to WYHK. A healthier alternative might be to turn WYHK DSS so that a more flexible, yet still significant number can continue to be admitted from PUAWYPS and WYHK can still be relieved from the risk of losing its EMI status and the problem of excessive learner diversity.

(2) Comment: The issue can be solved by improving standards at WYHK

Response: While WYHK should always be open about ways to further improve its standards, this has nothing to do with its EMI status because this status depends solely on banding of its F.1 admittees and not the performance of its students at the public exam taken at graduation at F.6.

(3) Comment: The issue can be solved by reducing intake from PUAWYPS while WYHK continues to stay aided

Response: This option is not available. The aided system allows for only limited options if the two schools are to maintain a close link: either a) the Feeder relationship through which WYHK is to provide a quota equivalent to 85% of its Central Allocation places (79 under current class size at WYHK) or b) the Through-

train relationship in which all PUAWYPS students are to be admitted. The option of admitting slightly less than 79 does not exist if WYHK stays as an aided school.

(4) Comment: The issue can be solved by delinking with PUAWYPS

Response: While some stakeholders are advocating this option, it implies ending the relationship between the two schools entirely. This is not the option that we plan to pursue at the moment. We are requested by SJ to focus on the DSS option first.

(5) Comment: It is OK for WYHK to lose the EMI status

Response: Please refer to Response to Comment A (i) of this Chapter. Also, this does not seem to be the opinion of the overwhelming majority of stakeholders.

(6) Comment: We can admit the poor through Discretionary Places ("DP") (43 places), there is no need to delink with PUAWYPS or turn DSS

Response: There are only 43 DP places which are open to applicants from all districts, rich or poor, in Hong Kong. For the sake of fairness and avoidance of labelling the less well-off students as weaker, all applicants are subject to the same criteria and SES is not a standard consideration in the selection process. In fact, using SES as an admission criterion is not really practicable given the short admission period and the need to verify and compare family income. Thus, there is no way to guarantee that everyone admitted through DP is poor.

DSS can allow the school to open up all places, except those reserved for PUAWYPS, to students from all districts. It is likely that more competent, yet poor applicants will be attracted with more places available. And if it is fairer to have the same set of admission criteria for applicants from all districts, why should we limit this arrangement to just the 43 places?

(7) Comment: Banding is just a label and labeling students is not Jesuit

Response: WYHK treats every student it admits as precious individuals, regardless of their ability. We should not and will not judge how valuable a student is based on his banding. However, this is not to say that we should ignore the context – students’ background abilities in this case as indicated by their banding – because doing so is to ignore facts which are relevant to finding the most suitable teaching method and learning environment for the student. This is actually not in line with the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm and not in the best interest of the students.

Another real consequence for the whole Wah Yan community if we turn a blind eye to the banding of our student intake is that we will be putting our EMI status at risk. Ignoring such key data is a grossly irresponsible act as the EMI status is regarded as of paramount importance to most stakeholders, including PUAWYPS parents most of whom may not choose WYHK if it loses this status. Both WYHK and PUAWYPS will be hurt in the real sense.

(8) Comment: Why are some EMI schools with feedback arrangements not having the challenges we have?

Response: Examples quoted can all be explained by one or more of the following:

- (i) The number of classes per level in the feeder primary school is either larger or smaller than that in the secondary school. Either way, the pressure on EMI status will be lowered.
- (ii) The primary school is located in one of the three rich and academically strong nets: Wan Chai, Kowloon City or Central & Western.
- (iii) The linked school is a girls’ school. It is well known that banding of girls is higher than that of boys.

(9) Comment: WYHK wants to admit more able students. It also wants to admit more less well-off students. The two aims are contradictory as there is a positive relationship between family SES and students' achievements.

Response: The trade-off between SES and achievement may be prominent if we limit the pool from which we admit our students. However, if we allow applications from a much bigger pool – the whole of Hong Kong, then it is much more likely for us to find and admit students who are able and less-well-off.

In fact, our desire to admit more less-well-off students to WYHK is exactly an attempt to alleviate their unfavorable life prospect (as stated in the sad relationship between SES and achievement that perpetuates poverty over generations) by providing quality Jesuit education as well as access to the social capital of the Wah Yan Community developed over our long history.

C. Resources

(1) Comment: WYOFF has been in operation for many years already. Why is it that you suddenly find it necessary to open up new sources of finance in 2017?

Response: WYOFF has raised over \$100M since its inception. However, subsidy for Small Class Teaching and other programmes of the two Wah Yans now require slightly over \$10M per year and the net balance of funds at WYOFF is only around \$30M as at the end of 2016. We are grateful to WYOFF and all donors who have given so much and we encourage all in the Wah Yan community to support its upcoming fund raising drive. However, given the current financial situation, WYOFF has already resolved to cut significantly its funding to the school from 2018/19

onwards. This will possibly lead to a cut in the number of teaching posts, hurting students' learning, if we do not open up other sources of finance.

Funding based solely on donations is also unstable. Moreover, it is unreasonable that some of the students supported by WYOFF funding actually come from well-off families which can afford to pay for the extra service. It is only because we are an aided school that they do not need to pay their share of the cost because we are not allowed to charge them a school fee.

(2) Comment: Has the school considered cutting its spending?

Response: The school has always been prudent in its spending. However, as stated in Chapter 2 Section 2.3 of the Consultation Document, there are a number of areas in which we need funding beyond the level provided by the government given our context and the vision and principles of the Jesuit approach for quality education.

Chapter 3 – Regarding the key features of the proposed model of DSS for WYHK

A. School fee and fee remission

Salient comments received:

- (1) *“The fee is on the low side”*: A higher fee level can give the school more flexibility to provide fee remission to the needy. The school needs additional resources to recruit and retain competent staff. Many teachers and some alumni hold this view.
- (2) *“The fee is too high. The school fee of \$20,000 is 6.7% of median income (\$300,000 per year)”*. [N.B. Actually, based on the proposed fee remission models, such families will be entitled to half-fee remission, so the actual school fee is 3.3% of the family income.]

Response: Regarding fee level of around \$20,000, there are concerns on both sides. Some think it is too low to provide for stability, flexibility for the school, job security for the staff and sufficient funding for fee remission for the needy. Others stick to the view that once it is fee charging, then the higher the fee, the less chance for the poor to be admitted. Actually, the relatively low fee level is there not because of concern about affordability for the poor (who will be entitled to fee remission – in fact a higher fee can provide more resources for fee remissions) but the concern about formation of an impression that the school is solely for the rich and powerful – this will deter the poor from applying in the first place.

The JEB has resolved that the school should work on the basis of a \$20,000 annual school fee, at “2016/17 dollars”, but we could charge a higher fee (say \$22,000 to \$23,000) for senior forms given there are more subject choices and the average class sizes are smaller. In other words, the fee can be adjusted for inflation in future. Besides, if there is a genuine need, say if the school is running a deficit, then fee revision can be considered.

Salient comments received:

(3) There are other hurdles that fee remission cannot address. The less-well-off students enjoying fee remission will feel psychologically inferior.

Response: Regarding psychological barrier of poor students receiving fee remission, one needs to

- a) Ascertain the degree to which poor students hold this view to the extent that they would abandon a place at Wah Yan; and
- b) Consider which value/culture we want to uphold/promote – (i) pride of the individual who does not need others’ help, or (ii) love of a community in which there are mutual assistance (as everyone has their moments of weakness – no one is a “superman”), gratitude and the expectation that those who have been helped by others should “pay it forward” so that the sense of community can be extended across generations.

Salient comments received:

(4) With 25% income devoted to fee remission, will there be sufficient resources for the school? Will full-fee-paying students suffer, with resources skewed towards the poor?

Response: As for the concern that full-fee-paying students or their parents find it unfair that resources devoted to supporting poor students actually come them,

- a) It must be clarified that most resources supporting poor students come from the government – government direct subsidy fee is over \$50,000 per year and rich students are in fact getting this subsidy from the government too;
- b) It is a matter of whether these parents understand and appreciate the value of instilling in their sons the sense of “community” rather than the sense of “individualism”, that we should actually be grateful (and not proud or frustrated) that we can afford the full fee and to be able to help others in need, and that from time to time, we would also have our moments of weakness during which we also need help from others.

Salient comments received:

(5) Those students currently studying at PUAWYPS have the expectation that WYHK

does not charge a school fee. Can the school consider not charging this group of PUAWYPS students?

(6) If a family has more than one kid studying at a DSS-WYHK, then the burden will become excessive.

Response: As for waiving the school fee for current PUAWYPS students when they are admitted to WYHK, this is not the policy of the government since a DSS WYHK is using more resources to provide better education to students. The fee remission scheme should be able to take care of those families who cannot afford the fee so that only the families which can afford the fee will need to pay. For special cases of hardship that the proposed fee remission scheme cannot cater for, the school is willing to consider them on a case by case basis.

As for families with more than one son concurrently studying at WYHK, thus increasing their financial burden, we are prepared to provide significant discounts for second son onwards.

B. Admission

This section deals with comments regarding admission of non-PUAWYPS primary graduates. Those relating to PUAWYPS graduates will be address in Chapter 5.

Salient comments received:

- (1) Given your intention to admit more less-well-off students, will poorer students be given special treatments (e.g. bonus marks) in admission? Will this be unfair to more competent, yet richer students?*
- (2) On the other hand, since you need to make the DSS school financially viable, will you favour the richer students who can pay the full fee? How will the school choose between a competent applicant and a poor applicant?*
- (3) Poorer families have less resource to develop their children's non-academic potentials such as music and sports. How can the admission criteria avoid implicit discrimination against them if ECA achievements will be taken into account?*

Response: While it is our desire to admit more less-well-off students, we do not intend to give them special advantage in the admission criteria, such as bonus marks. We intend to do it through more intensive promotion to schools in poorer districts and reducing their psychological barrier towards WYHK through summer courses in our campus. When it comes to the selection process, students' SES is not a factor for consideration, unless everything else is the same, which is rare. So it is fair to all applicants.

Likewise, the school will not favour a rich applicant over a poor one for the sake of collecting more fees. Our financial model is prudent in the sense that we have already reserved sufficient funds for fee remissions. In fact, stakeholders seem to be more concerned about difficulties of recruiting more less-well-off students. In the unlikely event that there are more poor kids than we have projected, we are confident that the Wah Yan community will rise to the occasion and make donations specifically aimed at helping needy Wahyanites.

Regarding the concern that ECA achievement as a criterion might favour families with the means, our view is that while we shall not ignore entirely consideration of ECA achievement as this reflects our recognition of the importance of whole person development that is much more than academic achievement and classroom learning, we propose to address the dilemma in this way:

- a) A quota will be set for places that consider EAC achievements / potentials, leaving the rest of the places to sole consideration of academic achievements and potentials.
- b) Even for those places which consider ECA achievements, academic achievements and potentials will still make up significant percentages in the total score.

C. Learning & teaching and student development

Salient comments received:

- (1) *How can more resources enhance teaching quality and better realization of Jesuit education?*

(2) How can students' academic standards be improved under DSS?

(3) Can the school employ more NETs with more resources?

(4) What are the uniqueness of your curriculum and your approach to education under DSS?

(5) Will delay in considering IB/GCSE affect university admission rate?

(6) How can more resources enable students to reflect more on the ECA they have participated in? And how can WYHK maintain its tradition of a rich ECA experience that enables a balance development of the whole person while enhancing their academic standards?

Response: The general approach to learning & teaching and student development has already been addressed in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Document. More details will be provided in the revised DSS proposal. Basically, the two broad and related approaches are a) provide students with better attention with smaller classes, more teachers and student support staff; b) provide teachers with more “space” by reducing the tasks and lessons to a more reasonable level, more administrative assistance for non-teaching duties, more formation opportunities through local and overseas training, seminars, visits, exchanges and other experiential development programmes. Additional NET teacher(s) to enhance the English learning environment will also be considered.

As for uniqueness of a DSS-WYHK education, it is ultimately based on uniqueness of the Jesuit education that countless Wahyanites have benefitted from and still feel grateful for. While it is understandable that some stakeholders would like more specific descriptions of strategies, it is worth noting that the DSS exploration has the more fundamental purpose of creating sustained conditions favourable to developing, adapting and renewing educational strategies over the very long run. Educational strategies suitable today may be out of date five, ten or twenty years later. However, our concern is whether we have the flexibility and resources to make timely and needed adjustments when times change, as inevitably they will. The key question is thus whether adoption of DSS would place us in a better position over the long term to endure and thrive despite changes in circumstances by altering the underlying institutional constraints the school is subject to. While we have been sketchier

so far in the details of what educational strategies to adopt once WYHK turns DSS, we have made very clear in the Consultation Document the core principles of Jesuit education out of which implementation strategies applicable to students across different generations can be developed. This essence of Jesuit education is what we have full confidence in and it is also this belief that has driven us to work so hard to find ways to ensure its sustainability over the very long term at WYHK.

D. Financial model

Salient comments received:

- (1) Is a school fee of \$20,000 sufficient to run a DSS school?*
- (2) Do we have sufficient resources to recruit more good teachers? Will our teachers' pay be less than those in the aided sector?*

Response: \$20,000 is surely a modest amount but the financial model as presented in the Consultation Document in Chapter 8 shows that we shall have substantially more resources than if we stay in the aided sector, e.g. a gross school fee income of over \$17M or net increase in resources of over \$10M under Scenarios 1 (\$20,000 per year) and 2 (\$18,000 per year) in Table 3 of the original CD and these are arrived at based on rather prudent assumptions.

The additional resources mean that we can hire additional teachers while keeping all the benefits and salary levels of existing teachers unchanged. If we can retain features of the aided schools that are key to provision of job security which may not be provided by other DSS schools, then we will be rather competitive in recruiting and retaining good teachers.

Salient comments received:

- (3) There is a financial gap between current government subsidy under the aided model and that under DSS. Please elaborate on how this can be / has been addressed.*

Response: While the whole DSS system is not introduced by the government to save funding expenditure, for the sake of prudence, we have factored in the possible shortfall in government funding due to the different formula in calculating the funding amount between the two modes (DSS vs. Aided). Details have already been provided in the CD. Please refer to Assumption 3 and footnote 30 of the Consultation Document.

Salient comments received:

(4) Donation has been assumed in the financial model. Does it mean that the school needs to continue relying on donations even after turning DSS?

Response: The financial model in the CD has certainly assumed an annual donation of \$1M but this is what we can realistically assume based on our track record during years without explicit fundraising drive and assessment of alumni's strong desire to help poor Wahyanites. (WYOFF is currently donating over \$4M a year to us.) Even if we take this \$1M away, we can still have net additional resources of about \$10M if we charge \$20,000 (scenario 1 of the original CD).

Salient comments received:

(5) Are there spending areas which are covered under the aided mode but not the DSS mode? For example: dangerous slopes, major maintenance work, electricity bill (e.g. the school hall), emergency repairs, teacher relief grant to cater for teachers who need to take long periods of sick leave, etc.

Response: As for whether there are expenditures that are covered by the government under the aided mode but not under DSS, the answer is "no" because as mentioned, the government is not trying to cut spending through DSS. Of course, due to the different formulas to calculate the actual funding amount, there can be discrepancies (which can mean that a DSS schools receives more or less government funding than is aided counterpart). As mentioned in an earlier paragraph, this discrepancy has been factored in our financial model. Specifically, for the examples quoted, some are covered on an actual

cost basis and some on an All-HK-average cost basis included in the per student subsidy amount. For electricity bill, the school has to bear the risk of the actual amount regardless of whether it is a DSS school or an aided school. Things like maintenance of trees (and we have a lot), they are not covered even under the aided mode, and only if we are a DSS school that we can charge a school fee to cover it. For example, the cost to trim or remove dangerous trees (our legal obligation) since August this year amounts to \$37,000 and it has to be paid for by our private funding even though we are an aided school.

Salient comments received:

(6) If WYHK runs into financial difficulty under DSS, will we need to lay off staff, impose a salary cut, favour admission of wealthier students or increase the class size to make ends meet?

Response: The hypothetical case of the staff being required to cut their salaries or even being laid off if we do not have sufficient enrolment of students has been raised by some people and this has certainly caused alarm among some staff. However, those who conjecture such an extreme scenario have missed a number of important facts and factors.

As mentioned in the response to comment A(1) in this chapter, the JEB will be open to fee revisions if there are genuine needs, such as when the school runs into structural deficit, to cover the shortfall. *Cura personalis* for the staff being one of the parameters set by JEB, it is unthinkable that the school will resort to pay cuts and layoffs to deal with deficits.

It is also worth noting that during the transitional period of the first five years of switching to DSS, the government will ensure that we will not receive less government subsidy as compared to the case if we are aided. That is, it will make up any shortfall in government funding during this period.

In fact, the school should be able to accumulate reserves over the years and these (together with other private funds of the school) will provide comfortable buffer for the school even if the extremely unlikely “worst case scenario” happens.

To consider this extreme “worst case scenario” further, let us ask ourselves these questions:

a) What is the risk of this happening vs. the other risks and challenges we have explored including students’ SES, learner diversity/EMI status and need for extra resources in various aspects of the school? What does the actual experience of other DSS schools, including many which are less reputable than WYHK, tell us about the likelihood of this “worst case scenario” happening to WYHK?

b) If WYHK can become this unpopular even with additional resources, how can we assume that WYHK can do better if we remain aided? And will jobs be secure under this “worst case scenario”, even if we are an aided school?

Salient comments received:

(7) There is a rumour that a certain DSS school with similar background to WYHK is charging over \$30,000 and it still runs into a deficit. Can WYHK make ends meet?

Response: For the rumour quoted, we need to look at the facts. While this school might well have had deficit “budgets”, the claim that it has run into deficits in reality is not supported by evidence. Based on the financial reports for all the years available from its website, it has been running a surplus. In the latest report for the year 2014-15, it is shown that it has accumulated a total surplus of 2 months’ expenditure. Its annual overall expenditure (based on schools of a similar size) is estimated to be around \$60M to \$70M⁴ so a surplus of 2 month expenditure is about \$10M to \$12M.

⁴ Based on its financial summary of 2014-15, the DSS received from the government is 77% of its total income. Average government subsidy per student is about \$60,000. As it has 5 standard classes per level, and assuming attritions in senior forms, the approximate student population is 1,000. With these numbers, we can estimate that the total income for 2014-15 was $(\$60,000 \times 1,000) / 0.77 = \$78,000,000$. With a surplus of one month expenditure, we can estimate that total annual expenditure to be $\$78,000,000 \times 12/13 = \$72,000,000$. Thus the monthly expenditure is estimated to be \$6,000,000.

Chapter 4 – HR related matters and particular concerns of teachers

This chapter deals with concerns regarding job security, career prospects, parent pressure and workload of teachers and staff⁵.

A. Job security

Salient comments received:

(I) *General remarks*

- (1) *If employment conditions remain the same under DSS, it will be fine but the contract needs to state this clearly*
- (2) *A clear procedure should be spelt out for layoff decisions and this should be formed in consultation with teachers.*
- (3) *Panel heads should have a say in layoff decisions. Panel heads should have a role in annual appraisals so they have better knowledge of the performance of their members*
- (4) *If the school cannot enrol sufficient fee-paying students, the school might have to lay off staff or cut salaries. **[Please refer to Chapter 3, Section D Financial Model comment (6)]***

(II) *Formation of appeals committee to deal with appeals against layoff*

- (1) *Some staff appreciates formation of such a committee but some regarded it as only a start. Suggestions on its composition and size:*

On composition:

- i. Parents and alumni with no professional background cannot serve the committee well*
- ii. Independent persons are more suitable*
- iii. An independent professional like a judge or solicitor*

⁵ At the Staff Meeting without the Principal held on 9 June, 2017, a vote on the issue regarding DSS was taken. This was not organized by the school and the results have been reported to the JEB.

- iv. Must include an independent party agreed by both parties*
- v. Should consist of 2 elected teachers*
- vi. 30% to be teaching staff elected as teacher representatives*
- vii. Teachers should not be members because of privacy and conflict of interests*
- viii. Can the staff appealing against a layoff decision have the right to reject membership?*

On number of members:

- i. odd number members*
- ii. Number in the committee should not exceed 10*
- iii. should consist of 5-6 people (supervisor, a VP, 2 staff reps elected from the staff meeting and the relevant panel head*

Response: Suggestions on enhancing transparency of appraisals and the role of Panel heads in the appraisal process, clear spelling out procedures for layoff like those in the Code of Aid are all reasonable and worth pursuing.

Having in place an Appeals Committee to deal with staff grievances regarding layoff decisions is welcome by the staff but some still do not think this is sufficient to compensate for the diminished role of the EDB in monitoring schools. This is debatable. The so-called monitoring role of the EDB relates basically to whether the school has followed proper procedures. In fact, numerous teachers have been laid off by aided schools, with no objection from the EDB. And if a DSS school lays off teachers without sufficient justification, it is also doubtful that the EDB will not intervene. On the other hand, the possibility of having a say in membership of the Appeals Committee or even having a teacher representative as member is something rare, if not non-existent, among aided and DSS schools alike. However, we are ready to take this idea on board.

There are diverse views on composition of the Committee. One possibility is to let teachers vote on a choice of compositions endorsed by the JEB and that among the choices, there must be some which consist of teacher representatives.

Two examples of such choices are:

3-member example:

- Supervisor
- An academic in the Faculty of Education of local University OR An alumnus who is either a lawyer or a judge
- A teacher representative (a teacher from among the pool of elected teacher representatives⁶ at the time not objected to by either parties⁷)

5-member example:

- Supervisor
- An academic in the Faculty of Education of local University
- A member of the JEB OR a Jesuit Father
- An alumnus who is either a lawyer or a judge
- Teacher representative (a teacher from among the pool of elected teacher representatives at the time not objected to by either parties) OR the Legco member elected from the education constituency OR a person nominated by the PTU

⁶ Currently, there are a total of 7 positions in the school which are filled by elected teachers: Staff Meeting Chair and Secretary, IMC Teacher-manager and Alternate Teacher-manager, and 3 teacher representatives in the School Advisory Committee.

⁷ To avoid not having a teacher member, we can allow each party to have an objection list of at most two persons. This way, the maximum of potential teacher members rejected is 4, leaving at least 3 to choose from.

B. Contract teachers

Salient comments received:

- (1) *Non-permanent teachers (contract teachers?) will feel insecure and will look for positions in aided schools.*
- (2) *Having two types of teachers in parallel – contract and permanent - will cause division among the teachers. This is inevitable yet undesirable.*
- (3) *6 years for contract teachers to turn permanent is too long. It is feared that their contracts will be terminated in the fifth year. Some DSS schools layoff staff who have higher salaries.*
 - i. *“3 years is preferred”*
 - ii. *“1+2 is preferred”*
 - iii. *“4 years preferred”*
 - iv. *“2+2 is preferred”*
- (4) *Will there be excessive financial burden if contract teachers gradually join the permanent ranks after a few years?*
- (5) *Transparency of transferring from contract to establishment (permanent) positions should be enhanced.*
- (6) *The appraisal system should be improved and be made fair and transparent*

Response: It is suggested that a 1+2 model is to be adopted for contract teachers who, upon satisfactory completion of the 3-year period, will be put on a “queue” for permanent posts. The number of permanent posts will be identical or slightly more than regular posts available in the staff establishment of an aided school of the same size⁸. Contract teachers will then need to wait for vacancies. Once there are vacancies, those already in the queue will automatically take up the permanent posts in turn. This method balances the sense of insecurity among contract teachers who desire to be confirmed of their suitability early and financial prudence for the school. The issue of having “two types of teachers” can be solved

⁸ Most if not all DSS schools have their permanent establishments shrink as over the years because retired permanent teachers will be replaced by contract teachers only. The model we are proposing is that the size of the permanent establishment will not shrink because permanent posts will be filled by turning eligible contract teacher into permanent teachers.

because all contract teachers who prove themselves to be suitable within 3 years will one day become permanent teachers.

C. Non-graduate track teachers

Salient comments received:

- (1) All teachers should follow graduate track if they have a degree.*
- (2) Can the school afford the increase in expenditure if all non-graduate track teachers are turned into GMs?*
- (3) If all non-graduate track teachers join the graduate track, then their job nature and workload should be similar to grad track teachers. School should talk to CMs to know if they really like to be regraded to GM and accept the change in workload or job nature.*

Response: Balancing the views expressed, it is proposed that:

- (a) Degree-holder non-graduate teachers who are already performing duties of GMs will automatically be offered the GM rank.
- (b) Degree-holder non-graduate track teachers who are not performing duties of GMs can opt to either (i) stay in the Non-graduate track with no change in workload and job nature (e.g. teaching senior forms) but with the salary ceiling increased by 2 points to recognize the degree qualification; or (ii) migrate to the Graduate track if they are willing to change their workload and job nature to those of a GM's.

D. Workload

Salient comments received:

- (1) Additional workload may come from admission work, dealing with parents, and student support, counselling and discipline*
- (2) Teachers may need to shoulder more promotion and marketing work*

- (3) *There may be more demand on boosting ECA performance*
- (4) *Teachers should not exceed the current workload and class size should not exceed 36.*
- (5) *Split classes should not be abolished, otherwise language teacher workloads will actually increase under DSS*
- (6) *Non-teaching staff can be hired to reduce non-teaching workload of teachers*
- (7) *Non-teaching staff cannot fully replace teachers as they may lack the human touch*

Response: One purpose of getting more resources through DSS is to adjust the workload of teachers to a more reasonable level so that they find it easier to rediscover the joy and meaning of their educational work. It is believed that less teaching periods per week, better student-teacher ratio, more administrative support, etc. will lead to lower workload for teachers on average.

Regarding specific arrangements for individual panels, they will be invited to make suggestions on whether the current mechanism for split classes should be changed and how the increased resources for their Panels are to be deployed to alleviate heavy workload of their members. One thing is certain – there will be more teaching members in these Panels with additional resources from DSS.

E. Parent relationships

- (1) Comment: *Would parents who need to pay school fee may be more demanding?*

Response: Please refer to discussions in Chapter 2, Section A Comment (10).

F. Other employment conditions and benefits

- (1) Comment: *Will MPF contributions by the employer be the same as PF if the staff*

does not have a PF account after the school turns DSS?

Response: Yes.

(2) Comment: Would teachers be offered 1-2 extra points?

Response: It may be offered to contract staff with outstanding performance but not yet in the permanent establishment. Some DSS schools charging higher school fees do provide extra points to all their teachers but these teachers do not enjoy permanent contracts in the same way as what we are proposing.

(3) Comment: Would there be bonus?

Response: This is controversial. The initial impression is that it does not seem to fit the culture that we treasure. So, without investigating the matter further, we do not tend to include this in our proposal.

(4) Comment: Would the staff be entitled to medical scheme

Response: Yes, this will be provided to the staff, spouse and eligible dependents.

(5) Comment: Retirement age should be extended with another mode of contract offered to the staff after turning 60

Response: There are indeed good teachers whose service we treasure and would like to retain beyond their retirement age. However, it must be introduced in a way that will not affect the promotion prospect of junior staff members. One way is to offer eligible retiring teachers a short term (renewable) contract with a lower salary (e.g. mid-point of GM pay for those performing GM duties) and the permanent post (and if applicable, the promotional post) vacated should be offered to younger teaching members of the school.

G. Others – miscellaneous comments/queries

(1) Comment: *What will be the ratio of GM:SGM:PGM?*

Response: For those within the permanent establishment, it will be the same or more favourable than the current permanent establishment.

(2) Comment: *Will annual increment currently applicable to permanent staff continue under DSS?*

Response: Yes.

(3) Comment: *Will disciplinary action result in suspension of point increment for permanent staff?*

Response: The school will follow strictly provisions in the Code of Aid that applies to aided schools. It is understood that under the Code of Aid, such an occurrence is extremely rare if not non-existent.

(4) Comment: *Will the school cut SGM posts to reduce costs?*

Response: No. The number of senior permanent posts will be the same as or more than the current provisions in the regular establishment.

(5) Comment: *How will part-time teachers be affected by adoption of DSS?*

Response: There may be more job opportunities given smaller classes and lower teaching load for full-time staff.

(6) *Comment: Job prospects of non-teaching staff not being sufficiently addressed*

Response: For certain posts, higher maximum points and additional annual leave will be provided to long serving staff with proven track record.

(7) *Comment: Will promotion criteria follow current policies?*

Response: Switching to DSS will not be a reason to change the promotion criteria.

(8) *Comment: There should be a reasonable, clear and transparent appraisal system. Those not fulfilling the requirements, reaching the required standards, should be subject to clear follow-up actions, with sufficient time for staff to make improvements.*

Response: This is something that all schools should have in place no matter whether they are DSS schools or aided schools.

Chapter 5 – PUAWYPS - Quotas to be reserved for PUAWYPS graduates

Salient comments received:

- (1) PUAWYPS students have positive influence on students from other primary schools. Thus, WYHK should not rely solely on academic achievements when admitting PUAWYPS students.*
- (2) The quota for PUAWYPS was 79 when there were around 160 graduates in 2013 or before. That translates to around 50% of their graduates. The current problem results from a cut in class size in the primary school while the quota of 79 is unchanged. The quota should be maintained based on a similar percentage, i.e. 50% of PUAWYPS graduates. This translates to a quota of 60 even if it consists of some Band 2 students.*
- (3) To maintain standards of intake, the quota for PUAWYPS should be between 39 to 45.*
- (4) The quota for PUAWYPS should stay at 79 or even higher after turning DSS to maintain the close relationship between the two schools.*
- (5) Both WYHK and PUAWYPS should turn DSS and that a through-train arrangement with all PUAWYPS students being admitted.*
- (6) If WYHK turns DSS, the risk of losing the EMI status will be eliminated. Should WYHK then admit more students from PUAWYPS?*

Response: We do recognize the value to students of both schools in having a significant number of PUAWYPS graduates continuing their studies at WYHK. The question is the actual quota that can optimally balance this desire, with fairness for other applicants who need to score higher to get admitted. The issue has exacerbated after 2013 because in 2013 or before, 79 represents just about 50% of PUAWYPS's graduates but since 2014, the same number represents 66% of PUAWYPS's graduates. Another point is that a rigid quota, whether it be a fixed number or a fixed percentage does not recognize changes in students' standards, for example increasing the quota when standards improve.

The following model is proposed after taking consideration the different factors in the above discussion, with further modifications to accommodate concerns expressed by PUDA representatives in their meetings with JEB representatives during the summer of 2017:

- (i) WYHK will admit directly all students ranked 55th or higher (with no replacement for lower ranks if some choose not to take up the offer).
- (ii) For those ranked 56th to 80th, they will be offered the chance for interviews along with applicants from other primary schools. However, these PUAWYPS graduates will be given bonus marks to recognize their background of Jesuit education.
- (iii) To facilitate PUAWYPS to settle in its new school district, WYHK will provide an extra three years upon the initial six transitional years enjoyment of the current status quo arrangement, i.e., enrolling the first ranking 79 P.6 students of PUAWYPS.

This arrangement provides:

- A sense of security for PUAWYPS and its prospective parents that there is a sizable guaranteed quota for PUAWYPS graduates (current parents and even prospective parents in the coming three years will not be affected at all, given the extended transitional period proposed in response to PUDA's concerns);
- Other primary schools will have a reasonable chance for being admitted as well;
- When PUAWYPS students become even better than before, then more from the group ranked 56th to 80th will be admitted, thus the hard work of PUAWYPS teachers will be recognized.
- Non-academic achievements and qualities will be considered for those ranked 56th to 80th. This steers the admission criteria away from a pure consideration of academic achievements under the current feeder system (which may have caused some parents to request their sons not to participate in ECA and focus on their studies in P.5 and P.6 to the detriment of these students' healthy development). The emphasis on whole person development under Jesuit education can be reaffirmed.

- This new system is fairer as admission is based on students' own merit, not the pre-S1 assessment done in previous years by their seniors. In the old system, if there are more eligible students than places (probably the Band 2 students), then a random number will determine who can get into WYHK or not so someone who ranks lower may get in while another who ranks higher may not. The current system eliminates this unfair randomness.
- With the top 55 plus a likely few (e.g. 5 or more) from those ranked 56th to 80th admitted to WYHK, the total admitted will likely be 60 or even more. With a graduating cohort of 120 in recent years, the percentage of PUAWYPS students admitted will likely be **50%** or higher. This is no worse, and could even be better than the situation in 2013 or earlier for PUAWYPS when the graduating cohorts were around 160 competing for a quota of 79 (**49.4%**).
- With a very outstanding graduating cohort, the number admitted can even be as high as 80.

It is unfortunate that some see the quota adjustment as a win-lose arrangement when in fact it is win-win. The DSS proposition of WYHK can provide key benefits to PUAWYPS on at least two counts: a) Some challenges that WYHK seeks to address are results of the inflexibility of the current feeder arrangement under the aided mode (which has nothing to do with teaching quality of PUAWYPS or that of WYHK). DSS is a way to tackle this while still maintaining a close link between the two schools, thus addressing concerns of some stakeholders who are advocating the delinking option. b) The provisions under DSS will strengthen WYHK's quality of education and open up new possibilities for the school's development in the long run. With a significant number of graduates who will continue to be admitted to WYHK after it turns DSS under the proposed arrangements above, the enhanced long-term prospect of WYHK will have lasting positive impact on PUAWYPS as well.

(7) Comment: If my son is studying at P.3, will his chance for being admitted to WYHK be reduced?

Response: His chance will not be affected as there will be nine years of transition based on the proposed arrangements set forth in the last section.

(8) Comment: When WYHK turns DSS, current PUAWYPS students' younger brothers already born should continue to enjoy an advantage of being admitted to WYHK.

Response: With the extended transitional period as proposed, young boys not yet admitted to PUAWYPS but who will be admitted within three years after WYHK turns DSS will continue to enjoy the current quota. After this extended transitional period, the proposed admission system will apply. PUAWYPS students will continue to enjoy significant advantage over students from other primary schools as explained earlier.

Chapter 6 – Method for consulting stakeholders on the DSS proposal

Salient views received:

- (1) For survey of alumni views, the method of voting should be adopted as it is objective and direct. A simple and definitive question “Do you agree Wah Yan College, Hong Kong joining the DSS as proposed?” should be adopted. Such a straightforward question provides a clear and conclusive reflection of the overall stance of the alumni.*
- (2) Some alumni expressed the desire that the WYHKPSA take up the task of surveying alumni’s views.*
- (3) There are already channels alumni to express their views. They should not be entitled to vote on whether the school should adopt DSS, thus unduly interfering with school matters. The SJ should have absolute say on this matter.*

Response: After careful deliberation, the view of the JEB is as follows:

i) Rigorous survey of stakeholders’ views

The Society of Jesus, being the School Sponsoring Body (SSB), is charged with the continued legal and moral responsibility of sponsoring and guiding the direction of the school and should try as far as possible to understand the diverse concerns and views of different stakeholders. Taking into consideration these inputs, the SSB will consider the matter conscientiously and thoroughly to make decisions that will lead the school forward towards the vision and mission of the school and the SSB in the best way possible. This calls for a rigorous survey and serious considerations of different stakeholders’ views both during and towards the end of the consultation period. The SSB is of the opinion that a rigorous survey of stakeholders’ views should not be confused with a “vote” by stakeholders as the latter is neither part of the governance structure of the school nor a requirement of the EDB. We should also be wary of encouraging a dualistic mindset for a complex issue that would require qualitative understanding.

ii) Survey questions

The purpose of the survey is to help the SSB make informed decisions so its design must be fit-for-purpose and be acceptable to the SSB. The opinion of stakeholders on whether they support the school to switch to the specific form of DSS as outlined in the proposal is an important question that the SSB is interested in. As there may be various factors regarding the design of DSS that would affect stakeholders' views on the matter, the survey could consist of questions on such factors too. Since different stakeholders may be concerned about different issues, it is possible that different survey forms will be used for different stakeholder groups. In terms of length, an excessively long survey is undesirable. Well worded and unbiased questions that are not ambiguous are also important. In this regard, inputs and advice from academics with expertise and experience in social surveys will be sought.

iii) Survey process

As the SSB is serious about hearing the genuine views of stakeholders, the survey process will be rigorously administered. A designated day or period will be picked for the purpose. Notice of two weeks or more will be given to stakeholders, and relevant bodies such as the Past Students Association (PSA) and the Overseas Chapters might be invited to help alert alumni of this survey and monitor the survey process.

iv) Survey result summary

The SSB will appoint an independent party, such as an auditor with no business dealings with the school, to summarize the results of the survey.

Appendix One: Summary of Survey of Consultation Session Participants
(Round One, First Series)

The following are results of the survey of views of only those stakeholders who attended the first series of Round One Consultation Sessions. It is by no means comprehensive and should only serve as a reference.

- (a) WYHK should admit more students from less well-off families.
港華應該取錄更多來自低收入家庭的學生

	Strongly agree/ Agree 非常同意 / 同意	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree 非常不同意 / 不同意	Neutral/ No comment 中立 / 無意見
WYHK Parents 港華家長	26.5%	14.7%	58.8%
WYHK Alumni 港華校友	42.1%	5.2%	52.6%
PUAWYPS Parents and Alumni 華小家長及校友	22%	13.5%	64.4%

- (b) WYHK should improve the intake quality of students.
港華應該改善收生質素

	Strongly agree/ Agree 非常同意 / 同意	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree 非常不同意 / 不同意	Neutral/ No comment 中立 / 無意見
WYHK Parents 港華家長	77.2%	0%	22.9%
WYHK Alumni 港華校友	72%	6.6%	21.4%
PUAWYPS Parents and Alumni 華小家長及校友	39.6%	23.2%	37.1%

(c) WYHK should try to avoid losing the EMI status.

港華應該盡可能避免英文中學(英中)“落車”的危機

	Strongly agree/ Agree 非常同意 / 同意	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree 非常不同意 / 不同意	Neutral/ No comment 中立 / 無意見
WYHK Parents 港華家長	100%	0%	0%
WYHK Alumni 港華校友	84%	5.3%	10.7%
PUAWYPS Parents and Alumni 華小家長及校友	65.2%	12.7%	22%

(d) Besides donations, WYHK should seek other sources of funds to enhance the quality of learning and teaching.

除單靠捐款外，港華應該藉其他途徑增加資源以改善教學質素

	Strongly agree/ Agree 非常同意 / 同意	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree 非常不同意 / 不同意	Neutral/ No comment 中立 / 無意見
WYHK Parents 港華家長	91.4%	0%	8.6%
WYHK Alumni 港華校友	71%	9.5%	13.6%
PUAWYPS Parents and Alumni 華小家長及校友	53.8%	12.6%	33.7%

(e) Adopting the DSS is the most effective way to address the challenges and opportunities that the school is facing.

對於港華面對將會遇到的挑戰和機遇，採用直資學校的靈活性是最有效的應對方法。

	Strongly agree/ Agree 非常同意 / 同意	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree 非常不同意 / 不同意	Neutral/ No comment 中立 / 無意見
WYHK Parents 港華家長	51.4%	8.6%	40%
WYHK Alumni 港華校友	48%	22.7%	29.3%
PUAWYPS Parents and Alumni 華小家長及校友	33.3%	30.8%	35.8%