

from [School secretary]
to [School faculty]
cc [School administrator]
date **Tue, Sep 30, 2008** at 5:20 PM
subject Confirmation of New Membership of School Appointments and Substantiation Committee

Dear All,

Owing to a re-shuffle of professorial-level faculty for our memberships on the School Appointments and Substantiation Committee (ASC) and the University Appointments and Substantiation Committee (UASC), the new membership of the HSS ASC for 2008/2009 is now revised as follows :

Professor William Tay (Chair)
Professor Chang-tai Hung, Division of Humanities
Professor James Kung, Division of Social Science
Professor Xingyang Wang, Division of Humanities
Professor David Zweig, Division of Social Science

On the other hand, our faculty representatives on the UASC for 2008/2009 are :
Professor Yiu-ming Fung, Division of Humanities
Professor Xueliang Ding, Division of Social Science

The new memberships on the two committees above have been proposed taking into account the advice of the Office of the VP-AA. One major advantage is that they will avoid duplication of members between the School and University levels of the academic review mechanism. I now forward the new membership of the HSS ASC as detailed above for confirmation by the School Board. If you have any feedback to offer, you are welcomed to let me know by 2 October 2008 (Thursday). If I do not hear from you by this deadline, it will be assumed that you confirm the membership now proposed for the School Appointments and Substantiation Committee. Thank you.

Let me also take this opportunity to thank most sincerely Professor William Tay for agreeing to chair the School ASC, as well as Professors Yiu-ming Fung and Xueliang Ding for consenting to take up the HSS membership on the UASC. These are all highly involving appointments which demand a lot of time from them.

Regards, [Dean]

from Carsten Holz <carstenholz@gmail.com>
to [School secretary]
date **Wed, Oct 1, 2008** at 7:44 PM
subject Re: Confirmation of New Membership of School Appointments and Substantiation Committee

I object to the appointment of William Tay.
Regards,
Carsten

from [Dean]
to socholz@ust.hk, Carsten Holz <carstenholz@gmail.com>
cc [School administrator]
date **Tue, Oct 21, 2008** at 1:27 PM
subject Fwd: Reminder: HSS School Board Meeting on 23 October at 2:30pm in Rm 3362

Dear Carsten,

Please note Item number 8 on the agenda for the HSS School Board meeting on 23 October, It is motivated by your email dated 1 October 2009 to [School secretary], where you state that you "object to the appointment of William Tay" (as chair of HSS School School Appointments and Substantiation Committee).

You will be provided with an opportunity to explain the reasons for your objection to all the SHSS Faculty Members who participate in the School Board Meeting.

Best wishes, [Dean]

from Carsten Holz <carstenholz@gmail.com>
to [Dean]
cc [School administrator]
date **Wed, Oct 22, 2008** at 4:49 PM
subject Re: Reminder: HSS School Board Meeting on 23 October at 2:30pm in Rm 3362

[Dean],

sorry, I must have overlooked this email of yours (it got spooled into the thread of the meeting of the HSS School Board in gmail) and I haven't cleaned out email that looked non-urgent in the last couple days (busy). [School administrator] pointed out your email to me earlier today and I said I hadn't gotten any email from [Dean] (your name disappeared into the thread).

1. I will not attend the meeting. I will present at a conference at CUHK.
2. I took my statement of objection to be an element of (ideally: secret) voting. It seems unusual to explain how one votes.
3. I am happy to explain the reason for my objection, and if you wish to share my reason/explanation with the School Board Meeting, please feel free to do so. I then ask you to quote me as follows: "In a case that I am in a position to fully document, I am convinced William Tay has broken university rules. See <http://ihome.ust.hk/~socholz/HKUST-SOSC.html#Review0405>, including the link to my appeal (complete documentation of the argument). In my eyes, this makes William Tay unfit to serve in any official function in this university."

Best, Carsten

from [Dean]
to Carsten Holz <carstenholz@gmail.com>
cc [School administrator]
date **Sat, Oct 25, 2008** at 3:46 PM
subject Re: Reminder: HSS School Board Meeting on 23 October at 2:30pm in Rm 3362

Carsten,

The majority of members of the School Board Meeting 23 October 2008 voted to approve of the composition of the School Appointments and Substantiation Committee, as listed in my email dated 30 September 2008 and circulated by Freda Ching, SHSS.

I read your quote to the School Board before the vote was taken. Members had a lengthy discussion, but in the end decided that the School Board was not the appropriate forum to consider your accusations against Prof. William Tay. Instead, it was suggested that your accusations would more appropriately be submitted to the VPAA for consideration by the Committee on Academic Integrity. Please see attached extract of the Faculty Handbook.

Regards, [Dean]

from Carsten Holz <carstenholz@gmail.com>
to [Dean]
cc [School administrator]
date **Wed, Oct 29, 2008** at 11:06 PM
subject Re: Reminder: HSS School Board Meeting on 23 October at 2:30pm in Rm 3362

Hi [Dean],

thanks.

(A colleague also briefly told me what happened at the meeting (without my prompting).)

A couple of observations at my end:

When the email announcement of the appointment came ("If I do not hear from you by this deadline, it will be assumed that you confirm the membership now proposed for the School Appointments and Substantiation Committee.") I took this as a voting process and voted against. -- While I am trying to stay away from all university admin, I felt I had no choice in this matter because if I didn't act it would be explicitly interpreted as I confirming. I am not confirming something that I am against.

When you later wrote to me about raising the issue at the School Board Meeting I saw no reason not to explain why I had objected.

It now seems to me that your announcement email back then was a motion, which should then be seconded?, and voted on. In this regard, my objection would then create the space for

discussion etc., along the lines of what seems to have happened at the School Board Meeting. This seems a very appropriate process to me.

There is two asides: (1) non-secret voting is, in my experience at HKUST, the equivalent of the North Korean leader asking for a show of hands of who disagrees with his appointment; (2) if the motion/objection/discussion/voting process were the correct process, then the previous dean's response to my previous objection and request for secret voting, 16 months ago, was outright wrong -- and nobody upstairs, all the way to the very top, who all saw what happened, corrected it.

Re your statement "the School Board was not the appropriate forum to consider your accusations" -- in my view, I didn't ask the School Board to *consider* my *accusations.* I said "3. I am happy to explain the reason for my objection, and if you wish to share my reason/explanation with the School Board Meeting, please feel free to do so. I then ask you to quote me as follows:..." To me, that's *not* "asking to consider." Whether something is to be called an accusation or not, I won't fight about. --- All the info, including the dean's (William Tay's) original letter and all references to university regulations are on the web.

Thanks for the info re the possibility of an academic integrity complaint by me: Point 2, "Definition," does not cover the evaluation of one faculty member by another faculty member.

FYI: The dean's (William Tay's) decision led the VPAA to turn down that promotion. I appealed against that decision --- and in my understanding for academic reviews/ promotion reviews, the relevant process is an appeal process, and not an academic integrity process. The VPAA responded that I appealed too late. His (the previous VPAA's) letter to me had stated that I "should" appeal within 3 weeks (which I didn't). I don't think the VPAA's response is correct, because that letter did not say "must," it said "should." In the case of "should," I expect that later appeals are accepted (and "should" means "it is desired") or that later appeals are acceptable under specified circumstances (but none are specified). At this point, I feel I have exhausted all processes within this organization.

Aside: When I, in addition, see how my appeal this summer re the full professorship was handled, I conclude that this univ. has nothing that I would call "appeal" process.

In my now repeated experience, the concept of a university that has the greatest explanatory power for what I am experiencing in this university is a concept of a mafia. In that respect, I wish to explicitly acknowledge that I think your treating the appointment as a motion is a very clean procedure.

Regards,
Carsten

On **Fri, Nov 7, 2008** at 6:12 PM, [School administrator] wrote:

> To : All School Board Members
> From : [School administrator]
> Re : Draft Minutes of School Board Meeting on 23 October 2008

>

> Dear School Board Members,

>

> The draft minutes of the School Board Meeting held on 23 October 2008, which
> have become cleared with the Chairman etc., are now forwarded in attachment
> for your reference. All advice for amendments is welcomed. Thank you.

>

> [School administrator]

Carsten Holz <carstenholz@gmail.com>

Request for correction Re: Draft Minutes of School Board Meeting on 23 October 2008
1 message

Carsten Holz <carstenholz@gmail.com>

Wed, Nov 12, 2008

To: [School secretary]

Bcc: [School faculty]

Dear [School administrator masquerading as School secretary]

the minutes in the section "Membership of HSS Appointments and Substantiation Committee" insinuate that I brought a complaint against William Tay to the School Board Meeting. That is incorrect.

The facts are:

- (1) The dean said that he assumes I confirm the appointment of William Tay and gave me the chance to contradict him, which I did.
- (2) When asked by the dean to explain why I am contradicting him, I explained.

I never brought any accusation against William Tay to the School Board. (point 28)
When I was asked to explain myself, I did. (point 26) I have not adopted any procedures in any matter. (point 28)

The complete email communication is appended below.

To address the incorrect minutes, I suggest to add a paragraph at the end of this section in the minutes saying:

> Carsten Holz wishes to assert the following: When he was informed that he is assumed to confirm the appointment of William Tay and was given a chance to contradict this claim, he chose to contradict the claim. When he was asked to explain his reasons for contradicting the claim, he gave his reasons in writing as: "In a case that I am in a position to fully document, I am convinced William Tay has broken university rules. See <http://ihome.ust.hk/~socholz/HKUST-SOSC.html#Review0405>, including the link to my appeal (complete documentation of the argument). In my eyes, this makes William Tay unfit to serve in any

official function in this university."

He never brought any accusations against anyone to the School Board. He never asked the School Board to discuss his personal reasons for objecting to the selection of anyone to any committee.<

In any subsequent use of a sentence such as "If I do not hear from you by this deadline, it will be assumed that you confirm..." by the school or division, I herewith do *not* confirm (nor disconfirm, nor abstain).

Regards,
Carsten