

香港浸會大學教職員工會

Hong Kong Baptist University Faculty and Staff Union

團結 • Solidarity 自主 • Autonomy 公義 • Justice

工會通訊 (二零五)

公道何在？(但這又與我何干?)

工會回覆李副校長來函及會議紀錄重點之公開信

五月二十七日，本會主席接到李副校長的英文信件，其中的附件列出了其本人與本會代表及傳理學院趙院長等於五月二十二日召開之會議重點 (A Summary of Main Points discussed)。該附件只列出管方的解說，實屬一面之詞，完全忽略本會代表在會中的主要論點及質疑，我們對此深感遺憾。

既然李副校長已將該函用 Postman 公開，本會為使同事全面了解會議的內容要點，現列出本會代表在當天會議上提出的討論要點，並用表列方式，逐點回應李副校所紀錄的會議重點(見附表)。

今次的爭議，源於傳理學院院長於今年一月提出非教學員工評核方法的草擬方案，包括容許系內系外所有教學人員或學生，即使與非教學員工毫無或甚少工作關係，亦可對他們的工作表現予以評核，而評核結果會影響受評核員工的薪酬。同時，該方案仍在諮詢之際、仍未定案之前，傳理學院院長便宣佈立即施行。目前有九位待續約的同事，將按此方案被加以評估，並決定薪酬。

因此，一月以來，工會理事會即嘗試盡力調解爭議，並於五月二十二日派代表與李副校長、傳理學院趙院長及人事部主任陳博士開會，以釋除員工的疑慮。然而，李副校長的覆函，連會議上本會代表說出的，傳理學院員工的疑慮和具體的建議，都沒有公開讓同事知道，更不要說主持公道了。

(事件現時或只限於傳理學院的九位非教學同事，但若評估的手法得校方通過，則可能會用之於其他院系的教學與非教學同事。)

我們懇請各位同事評理，在閱讀我們的逐點回應時，評判一下究竟管方有否妥善回答下列困擾員工的四項疑難：

1. 有關傳理學院新評核方法仍在草擬階段，最後方案仍未定稿之前，趙院長卻正式通知傳理學院全體員工，可對有意續約的非教學同事加以評核。即一邊諮詢，一邊執行，究竟是什麼道理？
2. 教學人員或學生即使與非教學員工毫無或甚少工作關係，亦可對他們作表現予以評核，其後果可影響員工的薪酬。這樣做是否公道？

3. 人事部通訊二十八清楚表明，評核若加入員工主管以外之資料，僅屬選項。擬議中之評核方法，是否只是選項，可供選擇，還是強制一律執行？人事部的通訊是否說了算數？
4. 即使評核方案已經定稿，應否立即實施，用來評估快將合約期屆滿的員工？新加入的評估方法，反映管方對員工的新期望，應否限於用以評估未來新合約期內員工的表現；而現時合約期內的表現，只須沿用原有的辦法？

最後，我們對李副校長及人事部在與會時及會後的的做法不同，實感到費解。與會時的最後結論，是新評核法有不明確的地方需要跟進，但會後卻繼續容許趙院長一邊諮詢，一邊執行，這種有違大學人事管理常規的做法，實令人憤怒！我們將繼續向大學高層提出嚴正抗議及尋求解決之方。

香港浸會大學教職員工會理事會
二零零九年六月一日

副本抄送：校董會主席王英偉先生

附件：工會對來函之表列回應

附件：工會對來函之表列回應

Mr. Andy Lee's Letter to HKBU Union	工會回應
(a) The non-teaching staff performance review system as proposed by the Dean of the School of Communication is not a new system. The Dean is only providing implementation details of how to solicit "additional feedback" from staff and students to assist in the performance review process.	我們最關切的不是表現評估制度是新是舊，而是傳理學院評核員工所引入的新方法，並按此決定薪酬的制度，竟然容許系內系外所有教學人員及院內院外學生評估申請續約的非教學員工，即使他們與該員工並無任何工作關係、交往或認識。
(b) It is clearly written on P. 11 of the Manual on Performance-based Reward System for Non-teaching Staff (the Manual) that "to increase transparency of the review process and to balance input from more than one reviewer, additional input from more sources can be used as 'optional' assessment tool in the process of performance review." See Annex 1.	既然評估方法只是可供選擇，就不該強制執行。其實在二零零六年一月推行「新薪酬及福利架構」之前，人事部主任在《人事部通訊二十八》向同事解釋，「加入其他評估者的意見」作評估工具一事，「教職員事務委員會」已有決定，即僅列為「可供選擇」，因而否定大部分同事要求對部門主管進行「全方位的評核」。為何傳理學院趙心樹院長建議的做法，可以繞過「教職員事務委員會」的決定？為何「加入其他評估者的意見」作評估工具，只可以向下，不可以向上？況且在員工不清不楚的情況下強行新評估方法，何來做到增加評核過程的透明度？
(c) The Manual has been distributed to all non-teaching staff since conversion to the New Pay and Reward Structure on 1 January 2006 and has since been used.	該守則的規定與上述《人事部通訊二十八》內容不符。後者只把「加入其他評估者的意見」視為「可供選擇」，而前者則賦予上司權力，在「與下屬經過詳細討論後作出最後決定」。但不少加入新制的同事是看過《人事部通訊二十八》才加入新制，而該守則是同事加入新制後才出版。人事部在同事加入新制後再在守則中混進“魔鬼的細節”，是否有違道義？
(d) There is no need to ask for staff's written consent to the implementation details of the Performance-based Reward System for Non-teaching Staff.	如上述，這項規定，人事部在同事加入新制前從未知會大家。
(e) The above points have been clarified in a letter sent by the Personnel Office in February in reply	參閱我們對(c)、(d)兩點的回應。另外於五月二十二日會議時，李副校長亦認為新評核

<p>to a letter from the Chairman of the Union on 23 January 2009.</p>	<p>方法有問題，並答應會再作跟進；可惜不到幾天，人事部竟然發出電郵，要求傳理學院同事為面對續約的同事作網上評估。究竟李副校長的承諾在那？既然要跟進，為何又馬上實行？</p>
<p>(f) The Dean emphasized the importance of soliciting additional feedback from staff and students in order to arrive at a fairer and more objective evaluation of the staff concerned.</p>	<p>容許與被評估者不相識、並無工作關係、從未合作的同事或學生參與評估，就是更公平、更客觀的評估辦法？系主任及系內同事對員工的工作表現及效率了解得最直接、最清楚，那趙院長是否不信任他們所給的評估？</p>
<p>(g) In an email message sent to all staff and students of the School of Communication before the start of every survey for additional input, the Dean emphasized the importance of providing the additional input in a responsible and considerate manner with the objective of helping the staff grow and develop. See Annex 2.</p>	<p>問題不在於院長如何語重深長、發人深省，而在於這種評估制度能否有效制止不符資格者（與被評估者沒有工作關係或任何關係）加入評估者行列，以免對被評估者不公平。</p>
<p>(h) The additional input so solicited would be used as reference material to the School's Moderating Review Panel, in addition to the information and comments contained in the Performance Planning and Review Forms completed by the staff and the staff's supervisor.</p>	<p>問題不在於是否參考資料而已，而是這些資料若混入不符資格者的意見，又有何價值？況且由本年一月到現在，員工仍不知道各項評估的比重是多少，員工的擔憂絕對不是多餘的。再者，根據趙院長發送給員工的電郵中說明，質化(qualitative)及量化(quantitative)的回應會作為評核小組主要商討的材料。那究竟資料會用作參考，還是作為主要材料？這點又再次令我們對趙院長的誠信起了質疑。</p>
<p>(i) It is acknowledged that staff might feel stressed due to this solicitation of additional input from staff and students whom the staff concerned might or might not have interactions with. The Dean explained that the purpose of sending out the survey to all staff and students was to provide an opportunity for input and he trusted that all staff and students of the School of Communication would be able to respond in a responsible manner.</p>	<p>既然看到問題所在，趙心樹院長何不從制度設計埋手，杜絕濫用情況？</p>

<p>(j) In case the survey results do reflect extreme and negative comments, it was suggested that the Panel could meet with the staff concerned to provide a chance for him/her to respond to the survey results before the Panel arrives at any conclusion.</p>	<p>其實關鍵不在於意見調查的結果是好是壞，而在於混入不符資格者的意見。更何況評估者對不認識的員工只須作出猜測性及籠統的判斷（包括非常同意、同意、中立、不同意、非常不同意）或評分，卻毋須作具體陳述，令被評估者欲辯無從。</p>
<p>(k) The Dean emphasized that in the initial round of the exercise, staff are allowed to give their own “preferred weighting” to the different groups of respondents of the survey. For example, he said that staff could assign 10% to peers and 10% to students, leaving 80% to supervisor’s comments. Alternatively, staff could assign 0% weighting to all other groups of respondents in this initial round of the exercise, in such a way that the “additional input” from other respondents will not be counted and the evaluation will rely 100% on the supervisors’ comments.</p>	<p>問題不單單是評分比重，更在於從一開始便不該在沒有預告、沒有共識的情況下實施這套新評估辦法。不同的評估辦法，代表管方對員工有不同的期望，亦影響員工的表現。就算員工同意可讓每位教學人員、每名學生評估他們，也該在新合約開始後才生效，讓員工日後的表現有所依循，而不是現行合約屆滿前才獲告知評估方法有變，令員工無所適從。因此，用原有方法評估現行合約，符合員工的合理期望。其次，趙院長表示可讓受評估者自行選擇每類評估者所佔整體分數的比重，以減他們的憂慮。但製造憂慮再減低憂慮，倒不如停止製造憂慮，先行擱置這項充滿主觀成份的評估方法。</p>
<p>(l) The Dean remarked that he would sit down with the staff concerned and his/her supervisor after this initial round, discuss and then agree with him/her the appropriate weighting for the next review exercise. In this way, staff could have enough time to adjust his/her performance and behaviour for the next review exercise.</p>	<p>趙院長既然明白員工須有足夠時間才能按評估計分辦法去調整自己的表現，不正好是承認現時立即施行該評估計劃是多麼不合理？更根本的問題是，不同類別評分者各佔多少比例如何訂出？準則如何？</p>
<p>(m) To ensure data integrity and confidentiality, the Personnel Office has agreed to assist in the online survey to summarize and aggregate the results for the School of Communication. Although the identity of the respondents would not be disclosed in the summary report to protect confidentiality, it was suggested that the respondents should be reminded to act responsibly especially because their identity is traceable in case the Panel needs to seek further information/clarification from any of the respondents.</p>	<p>人事部可否負責審查評核者與被評核者有何工作關係？評核小組（Review Panel）如何辨識哪些參與評估者的評分是不負責任的？問題不在於人事部能否保密，能否居中聯絡評估者與評核小組，而在於有何辦法識別哪些是負責任的評估人，又哪些不是？</p>

<p>(n) The Dean emphasized that he would continue to communicate with staff on the proposed implementation details of Performance-based Reward System for Non-teaching Staff in the School of Communication and seek to improve the review process on a continuous basis.</p>	<p>「不斷改進評核過程」固然是好事，但絕對不容變質為「一邊諮詢、一邊實行」，即還未定案，便草草施行。為免混亂，請趙院長按部就班，先行真正諮詢員工意見，然後定案，才再實行。</p>
---	--