

Committee on Student Affairs

Minutes of the 46th Meeting of the Committee on Student Affairs held on 21 January 2011 at 2 pm at Room 5015

- Present : Prof Karl Tsim (Chairman), Prof Tai-Kai Ng,
Prof Roger Cheng, Prof King Chow, Prof Kristiaan Helsen,
Mr Johnny Ho, Mr Sun Hung, Mr Jack Ho, Miss Irene Chau,
Dr. Grace Au (Member and Secretary)
- On Sabbatical Leave : Prof Charles Chan
- Absent with apologies: Prof Kar-Yan Tam, Prof Chi-Ming Chan
- In Attendance : Mrs Pandora Yuen (SAO)

Action

Welcome

1. The Chairman extended a warm welcome to Mr Jack Ho who was attending the meeting for the first time.

Confirmation of Minutes

2. Minutes of the 43rd, 44th and 45th meeting of the Committee on Student Affairs were confirmed.

Communication Meeting with Student Societies on the Chanting Issue

3. It was reported that a communication meeting with student societies on the chanting issue and the survey results was held on 18 Jan 2011. Some 50 students were present at the meeting. Notes of the meeting were tabled for members' information.

SU Proposal

4. Mr Sun Hung gave a power point presentation on a revised proposal on chanting. SU proposed 6 chanting areas, each for a maximum number of students as follows:
 - Area 1 (60 students)
 - Area 2 -5 (100 students each)
 - Area 6 (50 students)

Mr Sun Hung then gave details on the monitoring arrangements and penalty system.

(Prof Tai-Kai Ng joined the meeting at this point.)

Action

5. Prof Kristiaan Helsen pointed out that the proposal was worse than the previous ones. He found the proposal not acceptable because it was not respecting the survey results. He urged the student representatives to lead a change for the common good of the campus community.
6. Prof King Chow expressed that the Committee was asking students to revise the proposal for improvement, with the aim of striking a balance among different interests, otherwise the Committee could have taken the majority view and agreed to ban chanting.

(Prof Roger Cheng joined the meeting at this point.)

7. Prof King Chow suggested to cut Area 6, move Area 1 towards Area 2 and 3 to free up more circulation space. He said that most Committee members were not totally against chanting, but the noise and blockage was a problem. He said most members were ready to give an opportunity to students to prove self-monitoring. If there was no improvement this year, then it would be difficult for Committee members to support any chanting proposal in future.
8. Dr Grace Au asked why the maximum was set at such high level of 100 students. She was concerned about whether SU executives could be able to monitor the situation given such a large number of students in the chanting areas.
9. Prof Roger Cheng asked the students to consider not having the full cabinet to chant at the same time. He suggested to reduce the limit to say 60 per area for easier control.

(Prof Kristiaan Helsen left the meeting at this point.)

Motion to support the SU Proposal

10. Miss Irene Chau moved a motion to support the SU Proposal subject to:
 - Area 1 being elongated to align with Area 2 and 3;
 - Area 6 being taken away; and
 - A limit of some 40 students per every 25 sq meter of the chanting area, exact number to be worked out by SAO and SU.
11. The motion was seconded by Mr Johnny Ho. The motion was open to discussion.
12. Mr Jack Ho pointed out that the Congregation was held in the Atrium even though the blockage caused was worse than chanting. He expressed that the University should have faith in its students to exercise self-discipline and self monitoring.

Action

13. Prof Karl Tsim said that the University had considered holding the Congregation in other venues but eventually respected the wish of the graduates who wanted to have the Congregation on campus and in the Atrium. He said Congregation and chanting were two separate matters and should not be compared with each other just for argument sake. He advised the students that the Committee trusted our students and therefore was ready to let chanting continue this year.
14. After discussion, the Motion was put to the vote. All the 9 members present voted for the motion. The motion was carried.

(There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm)