



Carsten Holz &lt;carstenholz@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Summary of our meeting - revised version**

3 messages

**Tony F Chan** <tonyfchan@ust.hk>

Tue, Jun 10, 2014 at 8:13 AM

To: Carsten Holz &lt;carstenholz@gmail.com&gt;

Cc: Wei SHYY &lt;weishyy@ust.hk&gt;, Ernest CHAN &lt;ernestchan@ust.hk&gt;

Dear Carsten,

Thank you for your feedback. Where appropriate, we have incorporated your comments into the revised summary attached. However, I need to insist on 2 particular points:

- 1) The course offering issue is both a structural problem and an academic matter.
- 2) The individual academic unit or you as the complainant should initiate the appeal case up with Senate starting with CUS. We do make it clear that SOSC or you can appeal to the Senate as the final authority if the issue at stake is unresolved at the CUS level. If we reach that point, I may indeed have to set up an ad hoc committee to look into this.

If agreeable, I will send it to Council Chair and ask EVPP to follow up.

Tony

----- Original message -----

From: Carsten Holz &lt;carstenholz@gmail.com&gt;

Date: 2014/06/06 08:50 (GMT+08:00)

To: Tony F Chan &lt;tonyfchan@ust.hk&gt;

Subject: Re: Summary of our meeting

Dear Professor Chan,

thank you for the summary. I am not in complete agreement with some of the items in the summary and have added my views to the summary (attached).

One afterthought in response to you likening the SOSC-ECON conflict to a potential conflict between Engineering and Math about math courses: the situation is similar only if Engineering hired 6.6 Math PhDs and were forced by the Math dept. to have the 6.6 Math PhDs in Engineering teach only non-math Engineering.

Regarding the "3 principles" formulated between ECON and SOSC that the summary says that you mentioned, I attach the original communications between ECON and SOSC laying down the dictates given by ECON to SOSC (there are no "3" "principles"), together with my comments on them.

Best,

Carsten

On Wed, Jun 4, 2014 at 7:56 PM, Tony F Chan <[tonyfchan@ust.hk](mailto:tonyfchan@ust.hk)> wrote:

Dear Carsten,

Attached is a summary of our meeting. I'd like to have your confirmation that the essence of the meeting has been captured before I send it to Council Chair and ask our EVPP to follow up.

Tony



**Meeting Summary\_P + Prof Holz\_June 2 2014\_ final revised version 3.docx**

16K

---

**Tony F Chan** <[tonyfchan@ust.hk](mailto:tonyfchan@ust.hk)>

Sat, Jun 14, 2014 at 4:40 PM

To: Carsten Holz <[carstenholz@gmail.com](mailto:carstenholz@gmail.com)>

Cc: Wei SHYY <[weishyy@ust.hk](mailto:weishyy@ust.hk)>, Ernest CHAN <[ernestchan@ust.hk](mailto:ernestchan@ust.hk)>

Dear Carsten,

May I have your consent on the summary attached to the following email?

Tony

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Carsten Holz** <[carstenholz@gmail.com](mailto:carstenholz@gmail.com)>

Sun, Jun 15, 2014 at 6:48 AM

To: Tony F Chan <[tonyfchan@ust.hk](mailto:tonyfchan@ust.hk)>

Dear Professor Chan,

re the summary you emailed 10 June, the phrasing again was unexpected and I didn't want to respond rashly.

(1) I have no problem with you insisting on the matter being an academic matter, but I cannot agree to something that I do not fully understand. (Academic matter rather than what kind of matter, and why?) Would you be willing to simply make it *\*your\** point?

The revised summary has seven bullet points:

The first one is your summary of my grievance (your language, 'real "grievance"', to me appears incorrect, but this is your expression of your view and I don't need to share it).

The second point is that we (supposedly) agree on structural problem and academic matter.

The third through fifth points summarize statements of mine.

The sixth and seventh points, we (supposedly) agree on.

Would you be willing to simply add another bullet point along the lines of "President stated that the dispute on economic course offerings is an academic matter." Then drop the academic matter from the second bullet point, where we agree on structural problem.

(2) I checked everything that I could find re the Senate on the HKUST website. Nowhere is there any mentioning that a faculty member can bring anything to the Senate, or to the CUS. Not even the Senate Standing Orders have any such mentioning. Since I am not a member of the Senate, I cannot bring anything to the Senate.

From the regulatory framework that I have access to, I conclude that a faculty member has no right, nor are there any procedures, to bring any matter to the Senate or CUS.

Therefore, I cannot agree to items "2." and "3." from the (currently) sixth bullet point. Please drop them.

If you wish, you can assert as your point that you think this is a Senate matter, and ideally say how the matter can be brought to the Senate. If your statements violate the university rules, I will point that out to the Council Chairman.

The only rules that I can refer to are the Grievance Procedures, and my grievance against you is effectively addressed, for example, by you referring the matter to the EVPP (sixth bullet point, item 1); Grievance Procedures, paragraph 17.c.

Paragraph 17 also gives you other choices, and I do not have the right to tell you which one to choose. Therefore, if you refer the matter to the EVPP, my grievance against you is resolved, whether I like the way it is resolved or not. (If I don't like it, I can request the establishment of a Hearing Committee, Grievance Procedures paragraph 19, but given the complexity of my grievance against you about the handling of another grievance, and given my experience with a President-appointed committee before, I currently have no intention to invoke paragraph 19.)

Best,

Carsten

[Quoted text hidden]