

## VIEW COMMENTS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWER

Project Number : 16603621

Project Title : Academic Freedom at the Hong Kong University of Science &amp; Technology

PI Name : Prof Holz, Carsten A.

### Section A : Detailed Comments

#### 1. Please comment on the objective(s) of the proposal, and whether the research agenda adequately addresses the objective(s)?

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

##### Comments:

The reviewer agrees that discussing and measuring academic freedom is significantly important to every academic community and highly relevant to the present situation of Hong Kong. Nonetheless, the PI has not stated very clearly his research objectives but presented pages on "motivations" instead, of which the writing sounds so emotional that the reviewer finds it hard to judge the strength and depth of his objectives.

#### 2. Please comment on the Research Design and Methodology.

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

##### Comments:

The PI states that he will apply breakdown of academic freedom developed in previous studies to design a survey to be conducted in HKUST. Nonetheless, he hasn't stated how the surveys will be conducted, nor has he provided further details such as how large the sample will be. He realizes that discussion about academic freedom involves not only the opinions of university faculty, but also institutional procedures and policies. But it seems that he has no intention or plans to conduct systematic collection and analysis of policies concerned, nor would he put into consideration the opinions of university management.

#### 3. Please comment on the feasibility of the proposed research.

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

##### Comments:

If the research design involves only an opinion survey in one local university, it is highly feasible. But such a research plan is far from being academically sound and adequate.

#### 4. What do you consider to be the most original or innovative aspect of the proposed research? What advances would the research result bring about to the related field if the proposed research is successful?

##### Comments:

In terms of research ideas and methodology, the reviewer does not see any originality and innovativeness in this proposal.

#### 5. Please comment on the reasonableness of the proposed budget and manpower planning and project duration.

##### Comments:

Reasonable for this research design, which is one-dimensional and straight forward.

### 6. Overall Comments

##### Overall Comment :

No scholars will deny the importance of discussing and evaluating the state of academic freedom of a society. But exactly for the sake of maintaining academic freedom, interested scholars should offer a well balanced and comprehensive research review and designs to achieve convincing outcomes. This research proposal is disappointing.

##### Strength:

This research proposal might alert RGC of the concern of university faculty about the state of academic freedom in Hong Kong.

##### Weaknesses:

Same as overall comments.

##### Suggested improvements:

Rewrite the proposal if the PI really takes it very seriously.

### Section B : Summary of Assessment

#### The project :

Scientific/scholarly merit	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duration Proposed	Too Long	Appropriate	Too Short		
	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
Impact of Research	High	Moderate	Low	None	

	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
--	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

**The principal investigator :**

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Ability to undertake the proposal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Track record in field	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Return](#)