

Carsten Holz
Professor, Social Science Division
Hong Kong University of Science & Technology
carstenholz@gmail.com

Dr. Marvin K.T. Cheung
Chairman
HKUST Council
c/o Court, Council and Senate Secretariat
Room 6371-6, Main Academic Building
The Hong Kong University of Science & Technology
Clear Water Bay
Kowloon

Grievance against Professor Tony Chan, President of HKUST

Dear Dr. Cheung,

in accordance with the HKUST grievance procedures, Article 36,

“In the event that the President is himself/herself the source of a grievance, the grievance may be lodged direct with the Chairman of the Council”

I herewith lodge a grievance against the HKUST President with you.

The grievance is against the President’s abuse of authority in his handling of a grievance of mine.

The earlier grievance of mine is against the apartheid system and the double standards imposed on economics PhD faculty in the Social Science Division who are prohibited from teaching courses in their field (a pattern from which no other discipline in the Social Science Division is affected) and then, furthermore, being evaluated as economists in promotion reviews (double-standards).

The President, in his decision of 7 February 2014, writes that my grievance falls under section 3 of the Staff Grievance Procedures, which state that “Matters about which an appeal properly lies under separate University procedures ... shall not be resolved with these procedures.” He asks me to address questions to Dr David Mole, Associate Provost (Teaching and Learning). The President failed to specify the “separate University procedures” under which my matter properly lies.

On 14 February 2014, I wrote to Dr David Mole, requesting access to the (non-published) “separate University procedures,” and I also sent a response to the President. Not hearing back from Dr David Mole, I wrote to Dr David Mole again on 27 February, only to be told that he will allow the President an opportunity to determine the next step. As of this moment, almost three months later, I have not heard any further from Dr David Mole and I have not

been given access to these “separate University procedures.” I am led to conclude that the “separate University procedures,” which the President cites as justification for the dismissal of my grievance, do not exist. I.e., the President resorted to a lie in dismissing my grievance.

The President wrote to me again on 13 March 2014, stating that “the issues at stake are of academic nature and do not fall under any grievance procedure.”

The Staff Grievance Procedures at no point specify circumstances that do **not** fall under this procedure (and make no mentioning of matters of academic nature). The “Definition and Scope” of the Staff Grievance Procedures is given in articles 2 and 3:

2. For the purpose of these procedures, “grievance” is defined to be an expression of feeling of injustice and unfairness by staff members about the treatment received from the management or other University staff members *which* [emphasis in original] adversely affect their general welfare at the workplace and/or their terms and conditions of employment at the University.”

This perfectly describes my original grievance. It appears to me that the President in his second letter, of 13 March 2014, simply resorts to another lie. I regard lies by the HKUST President which have a direct impact on my welfare to be a gross injustice and unfairness.

3. Matters about which an appeal properly lies under separate University procedures, or which are not employment-related, or which should be referred to an appropriate public body such as the police or the Independent Commission Against Corruption, shall not be resolved within these procedures.

As mentioned earlier, the President as well as the Associate Provost failed to identify the separate University Procedures.

Attached please find the relevant documentation.

Sincerely,