

第六章

《解委會報告》結果部分



在第一到第五章，我將「解委會」報告內提出解僱我的理由逐一分析及回應。這一章我將《解委會報告》中有關結果及決定部分完整地重現於讀者眼前，並就這部分引發的其他問題，再作回應。

《解委會報告》內的結果部分共五頁。我會把原文放在右頁，左頁則是事件真相的剖析和我的回應。

我在文中提及的一些事件，都有電郵、備忘、信件或文件作佐證，請參閱相關章節的內容。

在整件事件中，我察覺到一些特別而且具有深遠意義的問題，值得我們深入思考，我會把這些問題放在下一章「討論議題」部分，希望和讀者一起探討。

1. 我到底犯了什麼規條？

2005年3月11日，校方應黃院長要求，成立「紀律調查委員會」。黃院長從我未被剝奪職銜前，即我在2004年8月至11月期間所處理的日常部門運作事件中，挑出了「七項事件」，主觀地冠上「inappropriate and unacceptable conduct」的惡名，而且在沒有指出哪一事件違反了哪項規條的情況下，便把文件呈交「紀律調查委員會」作調查。而上述七項事件，便成了往後三年多先後成立的「紀調會」和「解僱委員會」調查再調查、聆訊再聆訊的焦點。


在2007年3月「解委會」開始聆訊時，我曾就《解僱指引》5.2.1項（圖6.1）內列出的紀律違規項目，向主席黃律師提問，我在黃院長指控我的七項事件中，究竟違反什麼紀律規條，但一直沒有得到任何回應。


Evidences

5.2.1 In the case of alleged *misconduct*, the Committee of Enquiry should consider if the case can be substantiated. Misconduct may refer to a wide variety of situations where the appointee could be involved in dishonesty, breach of terms and conditions of service, breach of regulations and conditions governing fringe benefits, convicted criminal offence, conduct of an immoral, scandalous and disgraceful nature, continued unauthorized absence, wilful damage to University property, physical violence, wilful negligence of duties or refusal to perform any of his/her duties, wilful non-compliance with University regulations and/or any lawful/reasonable request from the University or from any authorized officers acted on behalf of the University, and actions which bring disrepute to the University or other staff members.

圖 6.1 《解僱指引》第 5.2 項：有關行為不檢的定義（紀律規條）(Policy Guidelines & Procedures Governing Removal from Appointment of Substantiated Academic & equivalent Administrative Staff on Term A of Service) (全文見附件一)

紀律調查委員會的成立，是因為僱員做了嚴重違反紀律的事，需要作出懲罰；假如查明未有違規，便應還僱員一個清白，這樣才算有公理、公義。校方和「解委會」未能指出我犯了什麼紀律規條，便先成立「紀律調查委員會」，再翻出僱員的陳年紀錄，以無限上綱上線的主觀指摘、缺乏理據和經不起邏輯辯證的指控，作為解僱我的理由，這樣未審先判，還算是申張公義嗎？

 **討論議題（一）**
七項事件與文革批鬥

 **討論議題（二）**
什麼是「行為不檢」？職業可有保障？



II. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

18. CTA noted that allegations made against Mrs. Lai as contained in the CoE Report at Annex1 and summarized below:

The University's Position:

The act of Mrs. Lai in handling the incidents related to Ms. N involved both misconduct and inefficiency on the part of Mrs. Lai.

N's grievance case was not isolated incident of its kind. Mrs Lai was unable to perform effectively and professionally as a leader in the TED as her problematic staff management approach had worked against developing a cohesive and collegial team.

Mrs. Lai's attitude and behaviour towards the CoE and other relevant staff during the investigation process constituted misconduct.



2. 解委會調查的三項事件

《解委會報告》第 5 頁第 II/18/a 項指出：

The act of Mrs. Lai in handling the incidents related to Ms. N....

N 導師在浸大持續教育學院的職位是高級導師 (Senior Instructor)，而非如《解委會報告》所說，是高級講師 (Senior lecturer) (《解委會報告》第一頁，第 3 段、第 5 行)。事實上，N 導師在 2004 年底離職時，在浸大前後只服務了十八個月。在她任職期間，其中八個月我都在休假，由署理總監 Y 博士擔任其直屬上司，黃院長為加署上司。因此，我作為 N 導師的直屬上司，亦只有短短十個月。

「解委會」作出解僱我的決定，主要針對我在病癒復工後的三個月期間，有關 N 導師的三件事，「解委會」亦就此三件事指我「行為不檢」及「工作效率低」，需要解僱。這三件事就是：

- 未有與 N 導師會面；
- 沒有撰寫她的工作表現評估報告，不與她會面；
- 沒有提交學員投訴她的報告。

在還未釐清事實真相前，大家可能會問：

- 如果個案中被解僱的員工真的違反了紀律規條，是 insubordination (不服從上司指令及蓄意拒絕執行職務)，那為什麼處理的事件只集中在一個下屬即 N 導師身上？
- 作為部門主管十年，這位員工帶領的下屬約百多人，而在以往的評估報告中，其專業發展及管理風格都得到歷任上司稱許，為什麼會在病癒復工後，為了當時一位將要離職的下屬，要針對她而令自己遭到解僱？
- 如果個案中被解僱的員工真的在三年多前違規辦事，為什麼不立刻遭到解僱？
- 究竟未有與 N 導師會面、沒有撰寫她的工作表現評估報告、沒有與她會面，以及沒有提交學員投訴她的報告，對校方或其帶領的教師教育部造成什麼嚴重後果或損失，值得校方耗費巨額公帑，來作出調查和解僱？

作為該名被指控的員工，我當然期望校方能藉著調查和聆訊釐清事實真相，還我清白。但結果上述問題始終無法得到解答，反而予人未審先判的感覺。

More importantly, Mrs. Lai, hitherto, had been given ample opportunities for mitigation. However, unfortunately, she had neither shown any sign of remorse, nor attempted to mitigate any previous conduct. On the contrary, Mrs. Lai demanded a public apology from the University,

19. On the basis of presentation/ evidences provided by Mrs. Lai and the University during the hearing. CTA had the following views on the case under review:

A Mrs. Lai's handling of incidents relating to N

Members found that despite repeated and reasonable requests of Dean Wong, her supervisor, Mrs. Lai had not made any positive and sincere attempted to meet with N with a view to understanding any complaints / grievances that N might have against her, and to resolving the matter in a collegial and informal way.

Evidences of correspondence/ emails submitted by both parties, including the e-mail from Mrs. Lai to N attached to the CoE Report, reflected that Mrs. Lai had adopted a defensive and confrontational attitude towards Dean Wong, her supervisor and N, her subordinate. When Dean Wong, in an email of 29 October 2004, made further attempt to encourage Mrs. Lai to meet with N by saying that he would otherwise consider issuing a warning a letter to her, Mrs. Lai responded by requesting Dean Wong to allow her the opportunity to read through and understand the coming warning letter before firming up an appointment with N. Members opined that such contentious and uncooperative attitude exhibited by Mrs. Lai was not conducive to resolving complaints / grievances, and highly improper for a senior administrator.

Concerning the allegation of Mrs. Lai's failure to submit N's assessment report and conduct a mid-contract assessment review with N, Members noted that upon Dean Wong's request in late August 2004 and repeated reminders in September 2004, but it was not on the usual assessment report/appraisal report format adopted by SCE. Mrs. Lai had not acceded to Dean Wong's request to conduct an assessment interview with. As the Head of the Teacher Education Division (TED), Mrs. Lai should be responsible for ensuring that performance assessment on staff of the Division was conducted in a proper manner. Mrs. Lai had failed to conduct a proper performance assessment on N in accordance with the established practice/ procedures of SCE. Mrs. Lai had not provided any opportunity for N to know the assessment on her performance by her supervisor. When Dean Wong subsequently informed her that N would like to have access.



3. N 導師對我不合常理的指控

《解委會報告》第 5 頁第 II /18/ A /(b) 指出：

N's grievance case was not isolated incidents of its kind.

N 導師這位被學生投訴、違規辦事的導師，非但沒有就其錯失表示歉意和糾正錯誤，還反過來投訴其上司（有關 N 導師對我的投訴，請參閱第二章）。而在整個調查過程中，對於 N 導師到底申訴（grievance）什麼，黃院長和《解委會報告》以至所有文件，都沒有清楚交代。

事實是，N 導師投訴我的事件，與我被指違反紀律規條根本扯不上關係。而《解委會報告》中，對於 N 導師的申訴也沒有提出實質內容，只隱晦和含糊地帶過。假如 N 導師的申訴的確能夠指出我違反紀律規條，為什麼黃院長和校方無法提供確切的理據？校方未能用 N 導師投訴我的事情作指控我的基礎，反而誣衊我，用三項不符事實、也無關要旨的事件（即指我未有與 N 導師會面、沒有撰寫她的工作表現評估報告、不與她會面，以及沒有提交學員投訴她的報告）當作指控我的理據，這事件是否顯得極之不合常理？

報告指 N 導師對我的投訴不是我被投訴的單一事件。這是事實，因為 N 導師正是模倣另一位用口頭向黃院長「打小報告」、藉詞投訴我「趕走她」而要求取得約滿酬金的 A 導師（有關個案請參閱第二章第 2 節：向未完成合約員工發放約滿酬金合理嗎？）。

在 2004 年 8 月，即我病癒復職後約一個月，N 導師自動提出辭職。8 月 31 日，黃院長突然告訴我，N 導師向他投訴，指我「趕走她」，並要求黃院長按比例向她發放她沒有資格領取的約滿酬金。而在 N 導師呈交投訴我的信件中，所提及的事件都是她個人塞責的例子，根本無法指出我對她做了任何違規的事情。

而整件事，最令人費解的是，最後被解僱的，竟然是在浸大服務了十年、依校規辦事、剛病癒復職的上司！



討論議題(三)

是申訴還是蜚短流長？



討論議題(四)

這樣處理投訴合理嗎？



to her assessment report, Mrs. Lai responded by suggesting that N should apply to the Personnel Office for a copy of the report under the Personnel Data (Privacy) Ordinance. As Head of TED and the supervisor of N, this was not responsible attitude and was not necessary had she conducted an assessment interview with N.

Concerning Mrs. Lai's investigation of the student's complaint against N, Members found that she had not conducted a fair investigation into the complaint by balancing views of the complainant and the party being complained. Mrs. Lai had failed to provide a complete report thereon after having been allowed sufficient time, and having been reminded repeatedly. As Head of TED, Mrs. Lai had an important role in ensuring that complaints made by students were investigated properly and impartially and conclusion and observation on the matter be provided clear to her supervisor.

On the basis of the above, Members took the view that Mrs. Lai's refusal to comply with the reasonable instructions of Dean Wong in handling the incidents related to N involved insubordination and refusal to perform her duties, and this amounted to misconduct. Mrs. Lai had not given any valid reason to Dean Wong for not following his reasonable requests or instructions: to meet with N, to conduct a proper and fair investigation on the complaint lodged by a student. From Mrs. Lai's presentation, she failed to provide any valid reasons to provide any valid reasons to explain why she had not done what she was reasonably asked to do.

Members took the view that the way taken by Mrs. Lai in handling N's case, in failing to perform her duties after given adequate time and opportunity, reflected inefficiency in performance on her part, including:

- (i) Mrs. Lai failed to respond promptly and without prejudice to the grievances raised by her subordinate and attempt to meet with the staff concerned to understand the cause of the grievance and explore the possibility of informal resolution first.
- (ii) Mrs. Lai failed to write the assessment report on N promptly and responded to Dean Wong's request.
- (iii) Mrs. Lai failed to conduct a mid-contract assessment interview with N as required.
- (iv) Mrs. Lai failed to act on the student's complaint and to provide a complete investigation report on the case within a reasonable time.



4. 未見投訴信便要先見投訴人

《解委會報告》II /19/ A /(a) 項指控我沒有正面和真誠地約見 N 導師，從 N 導師的角度去了解她的投訴。但當時我根本還未見過投訴信，了解投訴內容，又如何會見投訴人以解決她的問題？

■ 與事實不符的指控

- 黃院長的要求不合理，任何人被投訴人都有權知道投訴人投訴什麼。我在沒有看過投訴信副本的情況下，被黃院長要求與投訴人會面。而更甚的是，黃院長在我未了解投訴內容，未有澄清及回應的情況下，便在 2004 年 10 月 26 日通知我，說 N 導師對我的投訴成立。
- 《解委會報告》內 II /19/ A /(a)指我 not made any positive and sincere attempt，究竟「解委會」怎樣判斷，憑什麼證明我 not positive and sincere？
- 正如本報告第 II /19/ A /(a) 中所言，黃院長當日並沒有「指令」我與 N 導師見面，而是 made further attempt to encourage，即只是「鼓勵」。
- 2004 年 10 月 29 日，當時我還未收到 N 導師的投訴信副本，我已向 N 導師發出電郵，邀請她會面。但直到 2004 年 12 月底 N 導師離職時，她仍然沒有回應（有關我未能與 N 導師會面的指控詳情，請參閱第一章）。

■ 指控合理嗎？

我的哪些行為是 insubordination、是 refusal to perform duties？我做了哪件事是「行為不檢」、「工作效率低」呢？

5. 我發出的電郵犯了什麼紀律規條？

《解委會報告》內第 II /19/ A /(b)項指我發出的一些電郵犯了紀律規條，究竟報告指的是哪些電郵？那些電郵又犯了什麼紀律規條？（有關詳情請參閱第四章：我發的電郵與我的管理風格）

B. Mrs. Lai's management approach

(a) In addition to what was stated in paragraph 19 A (b) above, Members observed from evidences presented that Mrs. Lai, had at the materials times, reacted strongly and defensively to situations or comments / suggestions regarded by her as not in her favour. She tended to adopt a confrontational and even hostile attitude as reflected in numerous submitted correspondences and emails between her and her supervisor/ subordinates / co-worker, her handling of incidents relating to N, and her impulsive reaction to two mild comments in an otherwise very positive appraisal report by her supervisor.

(b) Mrs. Lai's problematic management style hindered open communication and development of a cohesive and collegial relationship between her and others in the workplace. Members noted that she had acted high-handedly in asserting her authority while on sick leave. Based on evidences presented, including some cases involved departed staff members, Members had reasons to believe that N's incident was not an isolated incident. Mrs. Lai's problematic management style was intimidating and threatening for those working with her reflecting serious failure on her part as Head of a Division.

C. Mrs. Lai's attitude and behaviour towards CoE and other relevant staff during the CoE investigation process

Members took the view that the open letter in Chinese entitled 致浸會大學各同事同學及教育界同工的公開信 of 27/12/06 issued by Mrs. Lai (a copy of which was attached to the CoE Report) during the investigation process of CoE was not proper and appropriate, and reflected her disrespected for the University's internal procedures. The act was not fair to those staff members mentioned in the letter who had no appropriate channel to make clarifications to the recipients of the letter. Members took the view that the publicity Mrs. Lai had created during the whole series of events was not appropriate and had caused damage to the image and reputation of the University. Members took the view that Mrs. Lai's attitude and behaviour towards CoE and other relevant staff during the CoE investigation process constituted misconduct on her part.

D. Possibility for Improvement

Throughout the hearing process, Members noted from Mrs. Lai's presentation that she had not shown any sign of remorse for her conduct and did not admit any wrong on her part. Instead, she had tried to put forward defense and excuses to justify her insubordination and inefficiency in handling the complaint case and grievance



■ 超越「解委會」的調查範圍的指控

黃院長所呈交的文件，有些可以追溯至 1996 年我的前上司向同事發的電郵、我的私人電郵及載有同事私隱資料的聘書等。這些文件大部分是我在 2006 年底「**新**第二紀調會」才第一次見到的，有些沒有撰寫人簽名，有些更沒有撰寫日期。直到「解委會」成立，黃院長才翻箱倒櫃把這些文件找出來，還惡意批評。

■ 未能提出有違校規佐證的指控

黃院長在呈交這些文件時，由始至終都沒有指出哪一份文件是作為哪一件事件的佐證，以及哪一份文件犯了哪一項規條。《解委會報告》對我的指摘，根本無法成立。只呈交了文件，沒有指出哪份文件有違校規，或怎樣違反校規。

■ 與事實不符的指控

這些年來，我向同事發放過無數電郵，從來沒有收到黃院長或受件者任何負面回應和批評，可見我向同事發放的電郵根本沒有違反紀律規條。

■ 指控合理嗎？

這解僱理由成立嗎？我的哪些行為是 insubordination？我做了哪件事是「行為不檢」、「工作效率低」呢？

6. 我沒有呈交 N 導師的工作表現評估報告？

《解委會報告》第 II /19/ A /(c) 項指我沒有呈交 N 導師的工作表現評估報告及與 N 導師會面，是不負責任的表現。究竟我有沒有呈交這份報告？究竟我哪裏不負責任？

■ 與事實不符的指控

- 我已呈交 N 導師的工作表現評估報告：黃院長在 2004 年 11 月 12 日與我會面時，已接受我呈交的報告，
- 黃院長沒有重複催促 (repeated reminders)：我在黃院長限期七個工作天後，才呈交早應由黃院長在九個月完成的 N 導師的工作表現評估報告，是



issues by shifting the responsibilities to , and putting the blame on other persons, her subordinates, supervisor, and CoE. Her conduct had demonstrated that she persistently refuse to face up to weaknesses in her interpersonal and management skills and to rectify the problems that had arisen. This was a basic flaw for any one in a senior management position. Members had grave concern about Mrs. Lai's effectiveness and professionalism in resuming a senior managerial position within the University.

Conclusion

Members had taken note on the one had the allegation against Mrs. Lai as contained in the CoE Report and supported by evidences / submissions presented by the University; and on the other hand Mrs. Lai's defence to the allegations, and tended to agree with the University findings.

In accordance with Paragraph 2.4 of Appendix F of the Terms of Service A that 'in reaching decisions, the Committee shall be guided by the balance of probabilities'; the CTA had deliberated thoroughly on the evidences for and against the allegations; and came to the unanimous view that there were substantial grounds to show that Mrs. Lai's acts and her willful non-compliance with reasonable requests from her supervisor amounted to misconduct and inefficiency on her part.

On the above grounds and in the interest of the University, CTA Members unanimously **CONCLUDED** that the appointment of Mrs. Tammy Lai should be terminated in accordance with Clauses 16.3 of Terms of Service A.

-END-



因為我要等待黃院長回覆我向他請示的問題，即我是否需要把 N 導師對學生投訴的回應一併呈交，而黃院長又一直沒有回應。按常理，遲了七個工作天呈交報告，應該不可能引發任何專業災難或校方損失（詳情請參閱第一章）。黃院長作為 N 導師的加署上司，沒有在九個月前完成 N 導師的工作表現評估報告，又是否嚴重失職？

- 我已邀請 N 導師會面：我呈交 N 導師的工作表現評估報告時，黃院長沒有指摘我遲交報告，而我亦依指示邀請 N 導師會面。但 N 導師一直沒有回應，直到 2004 年 12 月底，N 導師離職，仍一直沒有回應。

■ 顛倒是非的指控

報告第 II /19/ A /(c) 項指出：

When Dean Wong subsequently informed her that N would like to have access to her assessment report, Mrs. Lau responded by suggesting that N should apply to the Personnel Office for a copy of the report under the Personnel Data (Privacy) Ordinance. ... Mrs. Lai ... not responsible attitude ...

報告指，N 導師要求閱讀她的工作表現評估報告，而我卻叫她向「人事部」索取，是不負責任的行為。

根據學院的規則，所有僱員的個人資料，包括工作表現評估報告（內含僱員自評、上司評語及加署上司的評語），都必須由「人事部」收藏。那麼，我又怎會知道文件收藏在哪裏？我請 N 導師向「人事部」查閱，正是依法辦事，又何來違反校規？我對黃院長的回應是合情合理的，又何來不負責任？

■ 無聊可笑的指控

黃院長為了加罪於我，連我撰寫工作表現評估報告的用紙也拿來當罪證，指我不依規則辦事。《解委會報告》第 II /19/ A /(c) 項指：

the report was not on the usual assessment report/ appraisal report format adopted by SCE...

在 N 導師的工作表現評估報告中，我按慣例使用學院的表格，但由於空間不足，我才另加四頁紙作為附件。我實在犯不著也沒有必要因為 N 導師的報告而違規。再者，沒有在工作表現評估報告內填寫內容，難道就是行為不檢、不負責任？工作效率低？

■ 到底誰失職？

N 導師的工作表現評估報告是早應在九個月前（即我病假期間），由加署上司黃院長及當時的署理總監完成的。在我呈交了 N 導師的工作表現評估報告後，黃院長有沒有以加署上司的身分跟進？由始至終，到底失職的是誰？

■ 指控合理嗎？

我的哪些行為是 *insubordination*、是 *refusal to perform duties*？我做了哪件事是「行為不檢」、「工作效率低」呢？

7. 我調查 T 學員對 N 導師的投訴不公平？

《解委會報告》第 II /19/ A / (D) 項指我未有為學生投訴 N 導師的事件作公平的調查，究竟我對誰不公平、怎樣不公平？

■ 與事實不符的指控

· 報告第 II /19/ A / (D) 項指出：

there on after having allowed sufficient time and having reminded repeatedly.

我在 7 月 9 日收到投訴 N 導師的信，立刻在翌日撰寫報告存檔。8 月 6 日，黃院長突然一反 SCE 的正常運作（按 SCE 的常規，部門主管可自行處理投訴事宜），要我就 T 學員投訴 N 導師事件作電話調查，我亦在翌日進行，並撰寫報告存檔。9 月 1 日，黃院長又突然一反 SCE 的正常運作，要求我向他呈交報告，而我亦在翌日呈交。因此，就 T 學員投訴 N 導師的個案，我共撰寫了四份報告（見附件二）

- 2004 年 7 月 10 日我與 T 學員會面的報告（共三頁）
- 2004 年 8 月 7 日電話調查的報告（共六頁）
- 2004 年 9 月 2 日綜合並分析了客觀資料的報告（共九頁）
- 2004 年 9 月 21 日有關投訴信可能已外洩的備忘錄（共四頁）

整件事完全不是黃院長所言「*having allowed ... sufficient time and having reminded repeatedly*」，希望解僱委員會成員、我們德高望重的教育家不要誣衊我。



- 報告第 II /19/ A /(D) 項指出：

and conclusion and observation on the matter be provided clear to her supervisor.

我在 9 月 2 日向院長呈交的報告，分析的資料包括：

- 學員的投訴
- 與投訴者會面的紀錄
- L 學員來函的內容
- 電話訪問調查

報告採用了 triangulation 的方法，作多方求證。當時黃院長已接受了報告，唯一的評語是「輸打贏要」。雖然我不明白指的是什麼，但我亦已邀請 N 導師作書面回應。她沒有回應，我可怎麼辦？最後，報告也沒有建議懲罰 N 導師，只提出部門及各方要改善和跟進的事項。

縱觀我調查 T 學員投訴 N 導師事件的整個過程，都是在黃院長監察下進行的，沒有對任何人不公平，更不能說我有失職。

■ 到底誰失職？

上述有關 T 學員投訴 N 導師的報告，詳列了調查結果及結論，我也曾向黃院長請示跟進的事宜，他一直沒有回應。到底失職的是誰？

■ 指控合理嗎？

- 《解委會報告》第 II /19/ A /e 及 f) 指我不服從上司指令，拒絕履行職責，是行為不檢與工作效率低，到底我何時不服從上司指令？何時拒絕履行職責？我又如何行為不檢？
- 我的哪些行為是 insubordination、是 refusal to perform duties？我做了哪件事是「行為不檢」、「工作效率低」呢？



討論議題(五)

學術自由得到維護嗎？



討論議題(六)

誰不服從上司指令？

8. 有關態度的指控

「解委會」除了以 N 導師的投訴為基礎指控我外，還把一些與調查範圍無關的主觀批評，作為我「行為不檢」的證據。然而，此舉更令校方的指控顯得軟弱無力。

《解委會報告》指我在調查期間，對「紀調會」和其他相關職員的態度不恰當，而且沒有表現任何悔意（見《報告》第 5 頁第 II /18/ (c)、(d) 項及第 8 頁第 II /19/(D) 項），到底我做錯了什麼而需要有悔意？「解委會」對我這樣有關態度的指控，究竟是根據什麼呢？難道是另一「莫須有」的例子？

這些指控都是主觀的批評，校方也從未給我機會跟進和回應。而最重要的是，這些有關我的態度的主觀批評，根本不能構成違反嚴重紀律規條的指控。

「解委會」以超出其調查範圍的主觀批評為依據，指控我「行為不檢」，這樣撰寫出來的報告，又如何令人信服？

《報告》第 8 頁第 II /19/(D) 項指出：

she had tried to put forward defense and excuses to justify her insubordination and inefficient.

黃院長處理有關我的投訴個案的方式及其後對的懲罰，根本就是不公平、不合理的。而他為了指控我「行為不檢」，多次作出前後不一致的陳述，而且謊話連篇，我作為「當事人」，努力作出澄清及回應是理所當然的，這不是我作為被投訴人應有的權利嗎？（有關我沒有表現任何悔意的指控詳情，請參閱第五章）

9. 有關我的管理風格的批評

《解委會報告》批評我的管理風格惡劣，不能帶領團隊有效運作，並以我過去發出過的一些電郵為證據（報告 II /19/ (B) /(a) 及(b) 項）。到底我的管理風格有什麼不善之處？為什麼校方多年來一直沒有提出過？

在「解委會」聆訊之前的十年，黃院長從沒有就我管理下屬的方法或表現表示不滿。但現在校方卻片面地根據 N 導師的投訴，在不經邏輯驗證的情況下，主觀地批評我的管理風格惡劣，不能帶領團隊有效運作（請參閱第四章：我發的電郵與我的管理風格）。這樣的指控又合理嗎？



10. 小結：服務十載，無愧無悔

我在浸大工作十年，一朝大病回來復工，便遭逢長達三年多的精神虐待。還望校方的調查委員會能彰顯公義，還我清白。但事與願違，最後得到解僱報告，結果竟是：

Mrs. Lai's acts and her willful non-compliance with reasonable requests from her supervisor amounted to misconduct and inefficiency on her part.

On the above grounds and in the interest of the University, CTA Members unanimously CONCLUDED that the appointment of Mrs. Tammy Lai should be terminated in accordance with Clauses 16.3 of Terms of Service A.

在 2005 年 9 月至 2006 年 3 月期間，我已被大學懲罰——在 2006 年被解除職務。但黃院長在「解委會」聆訊中，繼續把一些他已接受及肯定的事件翻出來作調查，並對我嚴厲質詢。最後，「解委會」接受黃院長的虛假陳述，指我違反紀律規條，行為不檢，需要解僱。聆訊及調查結果，以至解僱的理由是否合理，大家從《解委會報告》就可以看到，也大概會明白，我為什麼會有像文革時代被批鬥般的強烈感覺了。