

**University Accountability Agreement (UAA)**  
**Sector-wide Performance Measures (PMs) (as at July 2021)**  
**City University of Hong Kong (CityU)**

**Table of Contents**

**Domain 1 - The quality of the student experience of teaching and learning**

- PM 1.1 Undergraduate satisfaction with the quality and value which they have gained from their teaching and learning experience
- PM 1.2 Undergraduate satisfaction with their overall learning environment
- PM 1.3 Undergraduate employment success rate
- PM 1.4 Employer satisfaction with graduates

**Domain 2 - The quality of research performance and of research postgraduate experience**

- PM 2.1 Percentage of research activities judged to be world leading or internationally excellent as assessed in the latest Research Assessment Exercise
- PM 2.2 Value of total research income
- PM 2.3 Average time-to-completion, graduation rate and employability of research postgraduates, allowing for disciplinary differences

**Domain 3 - Knowledge transfer and wider engagement**

- PM 3.1 (a) Total income from knowledge transfer via the provision of research and business services (i.e. collaborative research, contract research, consultancies & CPD)  
(b) Total income from knowledge transfer as innovative activity (i.e. income generating from intellectual property as defined in CDCF and from start-up companies)
- PM 3.2 Expenditure on public engagement activities (e.g. public lectures, performance arts, exhibitions and others as defined in CDCF)

**Domain 4 - Enhanced internationalisation**

- PM 4.1 Non-local students (in each of: undergraduate; taught postgraduate; research postgraduate) as percentage of total student numbers
- PM 4.2 Non-local students broken down by regions (Asia, Europe, North America, South America, Oceania, Africa and others)
- PM 4.3 Percentage of Hong Kong undergraduate students with non-local university-approved formal or experiential learning experience
- PM 4.4 Percentage of research outputs with international research collaboration which has resulted in a joint publication cited in the Research Assessment Exercise process as of at least international quality

## Table of Contents (Cont'd)

### **Domain 5 - Financial health and institutional sustainability**

- PM 5.1 Annual surplus as a percentage of total income
- PM 5.2 Subventions from UGC as a percentage of total income
- PM 5.3 Current ratio (i.e. current assets / current liabilities)
- PM 5.4 Coverage of university's expenditure by reserves and cash & cash equivalents (defined by Hong Kong Financial Reporting Standards):
- (i)(a) Reserves / monthly expenditure = number of months that expenditure can be supported by reserves;
  - (i)(b) Liquid reserves / monthly expenditure = number of months that expenditure can be supported by liquid reserves; and
  - (ii) Cash & cash equivalents / monthly expenditure = number of months that expenditure can be supported by cash & cash equivalents

### **Abbreviations**

#### **Study Levels**

<b>Ug</b>	Undergraduate
<b>TPg</b>	Taught postgraduate
<b>RPg</b>	Research postgraduate
<b>MPhil</b>	Master of Philosophy
<b>PhD</b>	Doctor of Philosophy

#### **Others**

<b>UGC</b>	University Grants Committee
<b>RGC</b>	Research Grants Council
<b>CDCF</b>	Common Data Collection Format
<b>CPD</b>	Continuing Professional Development
<b>DCCG</b>	Departmental Cost Centre Group
<b>FT</b>	Full-time
<b>fte</b>	Full-time equivalent
<b>hc</b>	Headcount
<b>“-”</b>	0
<b>N.A.</b>	Not applicable

**Domain 1: The quality of the student experience of teaching and learning**

**PM 1.1 Undergraduate satisfaction with the quality and value which they have gained from their teaching and learning experience**

**PM 1.2 Undergraduate satisfaction with their overall learning environment**

**Notes:**

- (i) These two PMs are based on standard UGC questions included in universities' annual graduate / student surveys. The latest available data from 2017/18 to 2019/20 academic years are presented below.
- (ii) For PM 1.1, the scores are based on the standard UGC question – *“Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of my programme and the value which I have gained from my experience of teaching and learning, taking account of the teaching and staff support which I have received and the skills which I consider that I have developed as a result.”* with a 5-point rating scale (5 – Very satisfied; 4 – Satisfied; 3 – Neutral; 2 – Dissatisfied; 1 – Very dissatisfied; 0 – Not available (i.e. no response)).
- (iii) For PM 1.2, the scores are based on the standard UGC question – *“Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the overall learning environment, taking account of the learning resources such as the Library, IT access and study space and of the opportunities afforded to engage with other students.”* with a 5-point rating scale (5 – Very satisfied; 4 – Satisfied; 3 – Neutral; 2 – Dissatisfied; 1 – Very dissatisfied; 0 – Not available (i.e. no response)).

	<b>Academic year</b>		
	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>
<b>PM 1.1</b>	3.66	3.38	3.67
<b>PM 1.2</b>	3.64	3.26	3.68
<b>No. of students responded to the questions</b>	2 707	2 380 (PM 1.1) 2 378 (PM 1.2)	1 938
<b>No. of target students</b>	3 540	3 562	3 242
<b>Response rate of the questions</b>	76%	67%	60%
<b>Survey used to collect data</b>	Graduate Employment Survey		Learning Experience Survey
<b>Target respondents</b>	2018 Ug graduates	2019 Ug graduates	2020 final year Ug students
<b>Survey period</b>	October to December 2018	October to December 2019	October 2020

**Domain 1: The quality of the student experience of teaching and learning****PM 1.3 Undergraduate employment success rate****Notes:**

- (i) UGC-funded universities conduct their individual annual graduate employment survey to collect data of graduate employment situation in the corresponding year.
- (ii) This PM presents the percentage of graduates seeking employment (i.e. excluding those who were not seeking employment for the time being, pursued further studies, emigrated or returned to place of origin) of UGC-funded FT Ug programmes who were in employment. The latest available data from 2017/18 to 2019/20 academic years are presented below.

	Academic year		
	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
(a) No. of FT Ug graduates	3 540	3 562	3 570
(b) No. of FT Ug responded graduates	2 991	2 866	3 090
<i>Response rate [(b) / (a)]</i>	84.5%	80.5%	86.6%
(c) No. of responded FT Ug graduates seeking employment	2 636	2 501	2 398
(d) No. of FT Ug graduates in employment	2 572	2 372	2 341
(e) No. of FT Ug graduates in FT employment	2 372	2 115	2 233
<b>Percentage of FT Ug graduates in employment [(d) / (c)]</b>	<b>97.6%</b>	<b>94.8%</b>	<b>97.6%</b>
<b>Percentage of FT Ug graduates in FT employment [(e) / (c)]</b>	<b>90.0%</b>	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>93.1%</b>

**Domain 1: The quality of the student experience of teaching and learning****PM 1.4 Employer satisfaction with graduates****Notes:**

- (i) This PM is based on data collected from “Survey on Opinions of Employers on Performance of First Degree and Sub-degree Graduates in Year 2016” conducted by the Education Bureau. More information of the survey is at **Appendix A**.
- (ii) A total of 2 244 questionnaires were completed by the employers, covering their opinions on the performance of 2 034 first degree graduates and 210 sub-degree graduates. The average scores of all first degree graduates and 267 CityU’s first degree graduates are presented below.

Performance area	Average score (5-point rating scale)	
	Overall	CityU
Overall performance	3.70	3.60
1. Language proficiency	3.75	3.67
2. Numerical competency	3.67	3.57
3. Information technology literacy	3.82	3.73
4. Analytical and problem-solving abilities	3.57	3.47
5. Work attitude	3.88	3.79
6. Inter-personal skills	3.71	3.62
7. Management skills	3.52	3.41
8. Technical knowledge required for the job	3.65	3.52
9. Knowledge of current affairs and business issues, self-learning ability and self-confidence	3.57	3.46

**Background Information of Survey on Opinions of Employers on Performance of  
First Degree and Sub-degree Graduates in Year 2016**

Survey objectives	<p>i) To obtain the opinions of employers on major aspects of the performance of FT locally-accredited publicly-funded and self-financing first degree graduates and sub-degree graduates of 2016 employed in the work place with regard to nine major aspects of performance, i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Language proficiency in Chinese, English, Putonghua and other languages;</li> <li>● Numerical competency;</li> <li>● Information technology literacy;</li> <li>● Analytical and problem-solving abilities;</li> <li>● Work attitude;</li> <li>● Inter-personal skills;</li> <li>● Management skills;</li> <li>● Technical knowledge required for the job; and</li> <li>● Knowledge of current affairs and business issues, self-learning ability and self-confidence.</li> </ul> <p>ii) To understand employers' common practices in graduates' recruitment;</p> <p>iii) To collect employers' suggestions on institutions or the education system regarding ways of further enhancement of the quality of graduates; and</p> <p>iv) To identify changes in opinions of employers on graduates compared to previous round of survey.</p>
Survey coverage	<p>The Survey covered companies / organizations and Government bureaux / departments that had employed graduates of 2016 from FT locally-accredited first degree and sub-degree programmes of eight UGC-funded universities and other higher education institutions (Chu Hai College of Higher Education, Caritas Institute of Community Education, Hong Kong College of Technology, Hong Kong Institute of Technology, the Hang Seng University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Nang Yan College of Higher Education, Hong Kong Shue Yan University, The Open University of Hong Kong, Li Ka Shing Institute of Professional and Continuing Education, Tung Wah College, Vocational Training Council and Yew Chung College of Early Childhood Education).</p> <p>The target respondents of the Survey were the immediate supervisors of the graduates or persons at senior levels who had adequate knowledge of the performance of the graduates.</p>
Sample design and sample size	<p>All the companies / organizations and Government bureaux / departments that had employed graduates of 2016 were invited to participate in the Survey. A total of 87 Government employers and 5 926 non-Government employers were invited.</p>
Results and response rate	<p>Out of 6 013 invited employers, 3 557 were eligible employers who had employed first degree and sub-degree graduates of 2016. Among them, 1 807 employers (45 Government bureaux / departments and 1 762 non-government companies / organizations) had returned with completed questionnaires, representing a response rate of 50.8%.</p> <p>A total of 2 244 completed questionnaires were received by 23 November 2018, covering 2 034 first degree graduates and 210 sub-degree graduates.</p>

**Domain 2: The quality of research performance and of research postgraduate experience****PM 2.1 Percentage of research activities judged to be world leading or internationally excellent as assessed in the latest Research Assessment Exercise****Notes:**

- (i) This PM is based on results of the latest Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) which is RAE 2020.
- (ii) More detailed results of the RAE 2020 are available on UGC website at <https://www.ugc.edu.hk/eng/ugc/activity/research/rae/2020/results.html>.

**Results of RAE 2020**

Panel	No. of eligible staff	Percentage of research activities judged to meet the standard of:		
		4 star <i>(world leading)</i>	3 star <i>(internationally excellent)</i>	4 star and 3 star
1. Biology	33	13	38	51
2. Health Sciences	--	--	--	--
3. Physical Sciences	90	26	60	86
4. Electrical & Electronic Engineering	44	28	50	78
5. Computer Science / Information Technology	33	35	53	88
6. Engineering	54	32	61	93
7. Built Environment	43	8	40	48
8. Law	23	15	54	69
9. Business & Economics	123	27	35	62
10. Social Sciences	85	14	42	56
11. Humanities	45	5	59	64
12. Creative Arts, Performing Arts & Design	27	34	44	78
13. Education	6	6	6	12

**Note:**

“--” denotes that there is no eligible staff member in the relevant panel.

## Reading guides:

- (a) The results are not for comparison purposes and not to be used in a standalone manner. This should be read in conjunction with the Guidance Notes, General Panel Guidelines and Panel-specific Guidelines on Assessment Criteria and Working Methods for the RAE 2020.
- (b) A Panel produced an overall quality profile by assessing three distinct elements of the assessment – research outputs, impact and environment – to produce a sub-profile for each element. The three sub-profiles of a unit of assessment will be aggregated to form the overall quality profile for the unit of assessment, with the research outputs weighted 70%, impact weighted 15% and environment weighted 15%. The overall quality profile and the sub-profiles show the proportion of research activity in the submission judged to meet the definitions of starred levels. The results at university level by panel in the above table are computed by aggregating the results based on number of submissions.

## Overall quality profile categories:

- 4 star – world leading
- 3 star – internationally excellent
- 2 star – international standing
- 1 star – limited standing
- unclassified

- (c) In accordance with Guidance Notes for the RAE 2020 paragraph 4.4 –

*Universities' assignment of eligible academic staff to a research area and respective units of assessment can be subject to re-assignment by the UGC in case of an anomaly, such as the assignment of certain staff members to a research area and unit of assessment and yet a major part or even all of their research outputs are in the field of other research area(s) or unit(s) of assessment or RAE panel(s). The re-assignment will be based on the recommendations of relevant RAE panel(s) and clarifications made by universities concerned, if any. The re-assignment made will be final in forming the RAE results and no appeal on this will be considered.*

The numbers of eligible staff shown in the above table have incorporated re-assignments by the UGC, if applicable, based on the recommendations of relevant RAE panels after considering the clarifications made by the universities concerned.

- (d) The number of staff covered by each panel varied significantly. The largest panel covers 650 or more eligible staff, while the smallest only covers about 100. The number of eligible staff in each university and each panel also varies.
- (e) Universities have made submission to different number of units of assessment in each panel. For example, University A has made submission to only one unit of assessment in the Biology Panel, while University B two.
- (f) In view of (d) and (e) above, it is neither fair nor appropriate to compare the quality profiles of different universities.



**Domain 2: The quality of research performance and of research postgraduate experience****PM 2.2 Value of total research income****Notes:**

- (i) This PM shows the annual research income / value of both research grants and contracts received by the university proper, irrespective of the funding source (such as UGC, RGC, HKSAR Government, private funds, non-local sources, etc). The latest available data from 2017-18 to 2019-20 financial years are presented below.
- (ii) The value refers to the cumulative value / funding received instead of the total value of the research projects (i.e. excluding funds of particular research grants / contracts which are not yet received by the university).
- (iii) This PM covers new and on-going research projects in a particular financial year ending 30 June. On-going projects include projects that were completed, suspended or discontinued within that financial year. For reference, we also show the breakdown of the value of research grants / contracts that were completed, suspended or discontinued during the financial year.

(HK\$ million)

	Financial year		
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
<b>Value of total research income</b>	<b>1,361.9</b>	<b>1,511.9</b>	<b>1,794.0</b>
Status of the projects in financial year ending 30 June:			
<i>Completed</i>	<i>245.3</i>	<i>375.8</i>	<i>282.0</i>
<i>Discontinued / suspended</i>	<i>9.6</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>8.4</i>

**Domain 2: The quality of research performance and of research postgraduate experience****PM 2.3 Average time-to-completion, graduation rate and employability of research postgraduates, allowing for disciplinary differences****Notes:**

- (i) This PM covers RPg students who studied UGC-funded FT RPg programmes. For average time-to-completion and graduation rate of RPg students, the latest available data of three cohorts of students admitted from 2012/13 to 2014/15 academic years as at the 2019/20 academic year are presented; for employability, the latest available data from 2017/18 to 2019/20 academic years are presented.
- (ii) The average time-to-completion is analysed by the type of RPg programmes – MPhil, PhD for student with research-based master (i.e. MPhil or equivalent) (PhD with MPhil) and PhD for student without research-based master (PhD without MPhil) with different normative study periods.
- (iii) Graduation rate refers to the percentage of a cohort of FT RPg students who have successfully completed the study within a specified period of time (i.e. two years after the normative study period).
- (iv) “Normative study period” refers to:
  - (a) “two full-time-equivalent years” for MPhil;
  - (b) “three full-time-equivalent years” for PhD with MPhil;
  - (c) “four full-time-equivalent years” for PhD without MPhil.
- (v) In the calculation of study periods, periods of formal suspension, if any, are discounted.
- (vi) RPg employability refers to the percentage of graduates seeking employment (excluding those who were not seeking employment for the time being, pursued further studies, emigrated or returned to place of origin) of FT RPg programmes who were in employment.
- (vii) Disciplinary differences for this PM are presented by the current seven DCCGs under CDCF, namely:
  - (1) Medicine, dentistry and health
  - (2) Sciences
  - (3) Engineering and technology
  - (4) Business and management
  - (5) Social sciences
  - (6) Arts and humanities
  - (7) Education

**RPg average time-to-completion****Notes:**

- (i) Since some UGC-funded RPg programmes are mapped to more than one DCCG, students (hc) of these programmes are counted across the DCCGs concerned on a pro rata basis. Thus the student numbers by DCCG may be in decimal figures which are rounded to the nearest whole number, and figures with magnitude of less than 0.5 are marked with “\*”. As such, figures may not add up to the corresponding totals owing to rounding.
- (ii) “N.A.” denotes no student graduated as of the end of 2019/20 academic year.

**As of end of 2019/20 academic year**

Average no. of years in fte (Total no. of RPg graduates)

DCCG	Study level	Cohort		
		2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Overall	MPhil	1.8 (2)	2.1 (4)	1.8 (2)
	PhD with MPhil	2.9 (100)	3.0 (139)	3.0 (157)
	PhD without MPhil	3.8 (43)	4.0 (43)	3.9 (39)
1. Medicine, dentistry and health	MPhil	N.A.		
	PhD with MPhil			
	PhD without MPhil			
2. Sciences	MPhil	N.A.	2.0 (1)	N.A.
	PhD with MPhil	2.9 (26)	2.9 (45)	2.9 (64)
	PhD without MPhil	3.7 (17)	3.9 (11)	3.9 (12)
3. Engineering and technology	MPhil	2.1 (1)	N.A.	1.6 (1)
	PhD with MPhil	2.9 (36)	2.9 (47)	2.9 (49)
	PhD without MPhil	3.8 (17)	3.9 (23)	3.8 (18)
4. Business and management	MPhil	1.6 (1)	N.A.	N.A.
	PhD with MPhil	2.8 (11)	3.0 (12)	3.1 (16)
	PhD without MPhil	3.9 (5)	4.1 (4)	4.0 (7)
5. Social sciences	MPhil	N.A.	2.1 (3)	1.9 (1)
	PhD with MPhil	3.1 (18)	3.2 (23)	3.1 (17)
	PhD without MPhil	4.2 (5)	4.3 (4)	4.1 (2)
6. Arts and humanities	MPhil	N.A.		
	PhD with MPhil	3.0 (10)	3.0 (11)	3.0 (11)
	PhD without MPhil	N.A.	4.0 (1)	2.7 (*)
7. Education	MPhil	N.A.		
	PhD with MPhil			
	PhD without MPhil			

**RPg graduation rate****Notes:**

- (i) Since some UGC-funded RPg programmes are mapped to more than one DCCG, students (hc) of these programmes are counted across the DCCGs concerned on a pro rata basis. Thus the student numbers by DCCG may be in decimal figures which are rounded to the nearest whole number, and figures with magnitude of less than 0.5 are marked with “\*”. As such, figures may not add up to the corresponding totals owing to rounding.
- (ii) “N.A.” denotes no student admitted in that academic year.

**As of end of 2019/20 academic year**

Graduation rate

(No. of students completed the study within time / No. of students admitted in that cohort)

DCCG	Cohort		
	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
Overall	90.6% (145/160)	86.1% (186/216)	82.5% (198/240)
1. Medicine, dentistry and health	N.A.		
2. Sciences	93.1% (42/45)	90.5% (57/63)	91.2% (76/83)
3. Engineering and technology	93.4% (54/57)	89.7% (70/78)	81.3% (68/84)
4. Business and management	89.2% (17/19)	90.1% (16/18)	79.9% (23/28)
5. Social sciences	85.5% (23/27)	75.1% (30/41)	74.0% (20/27)
6. Arts and humanities	97.8% (10/10)	92.0% (12/14)	68.7% (12/17)
7. Education	N.A.		

**RPg employability****Notes:**

- (i) Since some UGC-funded RPg programmes are mapped to more than one DCCG, students (hc) of these programmes are counted across the DCCGs concerned on a pro rata basis. Thus the student numbers by DCCG may be in decimal figures which are rounded to the nearest whole number, and figures with magnitude of less than 0.5 are marked with “\*”. As such, figures may not add up to the corresponding totals owing to rounding.
- (ii) “N.A.” denotes no student graduated in that year.

- (A) Percentage of FT graduates in employment  
(No. of FT graduates in employment / No. of FT graduates)
- (B) Percentage of FT graduates in FT employment  
(No. of FT graduates in FT employment / No. of FT graduates)

DCCG	Graduation year					
	2017/18		2018/19		2019/20	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)
Overall	91.0% (81/89)	83.1% (74/89)	96.9% (94/97)	93.8% (91/97)	95.3% (81/85)	87.1% (74/85)
1. Medicine, dentistry and health	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	100.0% (1/1)	100.0% (1/1)
2. Sciences	87.7% (29/33)	85.4% (28/33)	97.1% (33/34)	91.2% (31/34)	97.5% (39/40)	91.2% (36/40)
3. Engineering and technology	94.6% (35/37)	83.8% (31/37)	95.0% (38/40)	95.0% (38/40)	93.3% (28/30)	82.0% (25/30)
4. Business and management	80.0% (4/5)	80.0% (4/5)	100.0% (8/8)	100.0% (8/8)	100.0% (3/3)	100.0% (3/3)
5. Social sciences	88.2% (8/9)	85.3% (7/9)	100.0% (12/12)	91.8% (11/12)	100.0% (7/7)	98.6% (7/7)
6. Arts and humanities	100.0% (6/6)	66.7% (4/6)	100.0% (3/3)	100.0% (3/3)	80.0% (4/5)	60.0% (3/5)
7. Education	N.A.					

**Domain 3: Knowledge transfer and wider engagement****PM 3.1(a) Total income from knowledge transfer via the provision of research and business services (i.e. collaborative research, contract research, consultancies, CPD)****Notes:**

- (i) The latest available data from 2017-18 to 2019-20 financial years are presented below.
- (ii) Income from collaborative research and contract research refers to the annual income of research contracts received by the university proper, irrespective of the funding source (e.g. UGC, RGC, HKSAR Government, private funds, non-local sources, etc.). Research grants (e.g. block grants, RGC research grants under various research schemes) are not included.
- (iii) The value of annual research income refers to the cumulative income received instead of the total value of the research projects (i.e. excluding funds of particular research contracts which are not yet received by the university).
- (iv) This PM covers new and on-going research projects in a particular financial year ending 30 June. On-going projects include projects that were completed, suspended or discontinued within that financial year.
- (v) Income from consultancy and CPD courses refer to the income received during the particular financial year.
- (vi) As many CPD courses are not provided by the university proper, for this PM, coverage of CPD courses covers courses organised by the university group, i.e. including the university proper, its subsidiaries or / and self-financing arms.

(HK\$ million)

Income source	Financial year		
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Collaborative research and contract research (cumulative value in the financial year)	86.2	83.0	66.0
Consultancy (value received during the financial year)	7.3	6.3	8.4
CPD courses (value received during the financial year)	164.6	859.6	892.4

## Notes by CityU:

- In 2017-18, the organiser of CPD courses only covered the School of Continuing and Professional Education (SCOPE) of City University of Hong Kong (university proper).
- - Starting from 2018-19, the CPD courses offered by the university proper were also covered.

**Domain 3: Knowledge transfer and wider engagement****PM 3.1(b) Total income from knowledge transfer as innovative activity (i.e. income generated from both intellectual property as defined in CDCF and from start-up companies)****Notes:**

- (i) This PM is based on data of (1) total intellectual property (IP) income received by the university proper which are regularly collected through CDCF and (2) **net** income from start-ups according to their financial statements which are new data collected through CDCF. The latest available data from 2017-18 to 2019-20 financial years are presented below.
- (ii) Under CDCF, a “start-up” is a company that has been established by university staff, graduates or students. During the reporting period, it should be still operationally dependent of the university (e.g. university has a participating role in the management of the company; university serves on the Board of Directors of the company; university has a decision-making role of the company, etc.).

(HK\$ million)

	Financial year		
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Total IP income received by the university proper	14.0	1.3	7.6
Net income from start-ups	-0.5	-1.3	-1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>6.3</b>

**Notes:**

- Figures may not add up to the corresponding totals owing to rounding.
- “0.0” denotes less than \$0.5 million.

**Domain 3: Knowledge transfer and wider engagement****PM 3.2 Expenditure on public engagement activities (e.g. public lectures, performance arts, exhibitions and others as defined in CDCF)****Notes:**

- (i) The latest available data from 2017-18 to 2019-20 financial years are presented below.
- (ii) In line with the prevailing reporting practice of the UGC, this PM presents the expenditure incurred by the university proper only, except for CPD courses. As many CPD courses are not provided by the university proper, for this PM, coverage of CPD courses cover courses organised by the university group, i.e. including the university proper, its subsidiaries and self-financing arms.
- (iii) For this PM, expenditure refers to the direct cost arising from the reported activities. Overhead expenses incurred regardless of the occurrence of the reported activities are not included.

(HK\$ million)

Expenditure	Financial year		
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Public engagement activities except CPD courses	9.2	13.4	4.6
CPD courses	78.8	368.1	370.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>88.1</b>	<b>381.5</b>	<b>374.8</b>

## Note:

- Figures may not add up to the corresponding totals owing to rounding.

## Notes by CityU:

- In 2017-18, the organiser of CPD courses only covered the School of Continuing and Professional Education (SCOPE) of City University of Hong Kong (university proper).
- Starting from 2018-19, the CPD courses offered by the university proper were also covered.



**Domain 4: Enhanced internationalisation****PM 4.1 Non-local students (in each of: undergraduate; taught postgraduate; research postgraduate) as percentage of total student numbers****Notes:**

- (i) The latest available data from 2018/19 to 2020/21 academic years are presented below.
- (ii) This PM covers non-local students studying UGC-funded Ug, TPg and RPg programmes. Incoming exchange students are not included.
- (iii) RPg figures include only students funded by UGC within normal study periods. If RPg students are financed by universities using both UGC and external funds, they will be counted towards different sources on a pro-rata basis.

Percentage of non-local students  
(No. of non-local students (fte) / Total no. of students (fte))

Study level	Academic year		
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
Ug	12.1% (1 549 / 12 764)	13.5% (1 737 / 12 870)	14.6% (1 812 / 12 402)
TPg	- (0 / 53)	- (0 / 53)	- (0 / 53)
RPg	92.9% (1 065 / 1 146)	94.3% (1 250 / 1 326)	94.3% (974 / 1 033)

**Domain 4: Enhanced internationalisation****PM 4.2 Non-local students, broken down by regions (Asia, Europe, North America, South America, Oceania, Africa and others)****Notes:**

- (i) The latest available data from 2018/19 to 2020/21 academic years are presented below.
- (ii) This PM covers non-local students studying UGC-funded Ug, TPg and RPg programmes. Incoming exchange students are not included.
- (iii) RPg figures include only students funded by UGC within normal study periods. If RPg students are financed by universities using both UGC and external funds, they will be counted towards different sources on a pro-rata basis.

<b>Academic year</b>	<b>Place of origin</b>	<b>No. of non-local students (fte)</b>	<b>As percentage of total non-local students</b>
<b>2018/19</b>	Asia	2 445	93.5%
	<i>The Mainland of China</i>	1 719	65.8%
	Europe	65	2.5%
	North America	18	0.7%
	Central & South America	6	0.2%
	Oceania	2	0.1%
	Africa	78	3.0%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2 614</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2019/20</b>	Asia	2 800	93.7%
	<i>The Mainland of China</i>	1 938	64.9%
	Europe	76	2.6%
	North America	22	0.7%
	Central & South America	8	0.3%
	Oceania	2	0.1%
	Africa	79	2.6%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2 987</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2020/21</b>	Asia	2 638	94.7%
	<i>The Mainland of China</i>	1 876	67.3%
	Europe	67	2.4%
	North America	21	0.7%
	Central & South America	8	0.3%
	Oceania	1	0.0%
	Africa	51	1.8%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2 786</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Notes:**

- Figures may not add up to the corresponding totals owing to rounding.
- "0.0%" denotes value less than 0.05%.

**Domain 4: Enhanced internationalisation****PM 4.3 Percentage of Hong Kong undergraduates with non-local university-approved formal or experiential learning experience****Notes:**

- (i) The latest available data from 2017/18 to 2019/20 academic years are presented below.
- (ii) This PM covers all local and non-local students of UGC-funded Ug programmes, excluding incoming exchange students. The non-local learning experience refers to university-approved formal or experiential learning experience without the requirement of the experience being ‘credit-bearing’ or ‘formally assessed’. CDCF collects seven types of non-local learning experience - 1) exchange, 2) visits, 3) internships, 4) study/field trip, 5) experiential learning experience, 6) international events including conference, competition, forum and 7) others.
- (iii) This PM reflects the snap-shot situation of all Ug students as of 31 August of respective academic year. i.e. as of 31 August 2020 for 2019/20 academic year, the percentage of Ug students who have had non-local learning experience during his/her Ug study since admission.

Number of students with non-local learning experience  
(Percentage of students with non-local learning experience)

	<b>Academic year</b>		
	<b>2017/18</b>	<b>2018/19</b>	<b>2019/20</b>
<b>Ug students with any of the non-local learning experience 1-7 below*</b>	<b>5 535 (44.4%)</b>	<b>5 692 (45.0%)</b>	<b>4 099 (32.2%)</b>
Number of Ug students as of 31 August of respective academic year	12 475 (100%)	12 661 (100%)	12 739 (100%)
<b>Breakdown of non-local learning experience of Ug students:</b>			
1. Outgoing exchange experience	2 146 (17.2%)	1 992 (15.7%)	1 760 (13.8%)
2. Outgoing visiting experience	1 586 (12.7%)	1 425 (11.3%)	835 (6.6%)
3. Internships experience	1 612 (12.9%)	1 578 (12.5%)	970 (7.6%)
4. Study/field trip experience	1 267 (10.2%)	1 983 (15.7%)	1 521 (11.9%)
5. Experiential learning experience	227 (1.8%)	231 (1.8%)	177 (1.4%)
6. International events	173 (1.4%)	259 (2.0%)	186 (1.5%)
7. Others	567 (4.5%)	558 (4.4%)	381 (3.0%)

**Note:**

- \* The Ug students who have more than one type of non-local learning experience are counted once. For each type of experience, students participated in more than one time are counted once. As such, figures may not add up to the totals.

**Note by CityU:**

- Information is based on the records drawn from the central systems or provided by the organising departments. This however does not fully cover all the non-local learning experience ever taken by students since admission. Emphases have been placed in collecting data on immersive non-local learning experience of 4 weeks and above in previous years.

**Domain 4: Enhanced internationalisation****PM 4.4 Percentage of research outputs with international research collaboration which has resulted in a joint publication cited in the Research Assessment Exercise process as of at least international quality****Notes:**

- (i) This PM is based on results of the latest RAE which is RAE 2020.
- (ii) Under this PM, a research collaboration is classified as either local or international / non-local at the time of publication or production of the research output. An international research collaboration refers to collaboration between two or more co-authors (institutions / individuals) whose primary affiliations should be from at least two different countries / regions at the time of publication or production of the outputs. In considering the ‘primary affiliation’ of a co-author, it should refer to the institution at which he / she holds a full-time paid appointment at the time of publication or production of the output. If the primary affiliation of a co-author is unknown to the submitting UGC-funded universities, any affiliated institution of the co-author listed at the time of publication or production of the output could be considered as the ‘primary affiliation’ of the co-author. Research outputs of at least international quality refers to research outputs graded at least 2 star (2\*, “international standing in terms of originality, significance and rigour”) or above under RAE 2020.
- (iii) If a collaboration involves a Hong Kong co-author (institution / individual) together with one or more non-Hong Kong (i.e. non-local) co-authors (including a co-author from the Mainland of China), this collaboration should be regarded as an international collaboration under this PM.
- (iv) The data definitions for this PM are developed with reference to the Framework and Guidance Notes for RAE 2020. Universities should refer to the Guidance Notes for RAE 2020 for definitions of ‘period of assessment for research output’ and ‘research output’. That said, the definition adopted by and data collected for this PM would not affect the definitions, procedures, assessment or results of the RAE 2020. Any information collected for the purpose of this PM would not be conveyed to and considered by the RAE 2020 Assessment Panels.

	Percentage*
Research outputs with international research collaboration which has resulted in a joint publication <sup>^</sup> cited in the RAE process as of at least international quality	<b>97%</b>

**Notes:**

<sup>^</sup> The reported number of submitted research outputs from CityU with international research collaboration which has resulted in a joint publication is 1 317.

\* Rounded to the nearest integer.

**Domain 5: Financial health and institutional sustainability at University Level<sup>1</sup>**

	Actual figures						Projections	
	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
<b>5.1</b> <u>Annual Surplus as a Percentage of Total Income</u> Annual Surplus / Total Income [(a)/(b) x 100]	9.3%	3.2%	18.1%	8.9%	4.5%	10.8%	1.5%	0.9%
						(Note i)	(Note iii)	(Note iii)
<b>5.2</b> <u>Subventions from UGC as Percentage of Total Income</u> Subventions from UGC / Total Income [(c)/(b) x 100]	49.6%	56.0%	49.5%	52.6%	53.2%	52.7%	54.8%	54.6%
<b>5.3</b> <u>Current Ratio</u> Current Assets / Current Liabilities [(f)/(g)]	2.5	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
<b>5.4</b> <u>Coverage of universities' expenditure by reserves and cash &amp; cash equivalents</u>								
(i)(a) Reserves / Monthly Expenditure = No. of months that expenditure can be supported by Reserves [(h)/(e)]	21.7	20.8	22.5	22.5	21.7	22.0	23.0	23.7
(i)(b) "Liquid" Reserves / Monthly Expenditure = No. of months that expenditure can be supported by "Liquid" Reserves [(i)/(e)]	14.4	13.8	16.0	16.4	16.0	16.4	17.0	16.9
(ii) Cash & Cash Equivalents / Monthly Expenditure = No. of months that expenditure can be supported by Cash & Cash Equivalents [(j)/(e)]	5.6	3.2	3.6	2.5	8.3	4.1	4.0	4.0
						(Note ii)		

	Actual figures						Projections (Note A)	
	2014/15 HK\$'M	2015/16 HK\$'M	2016/17 HK\$'M	2017/18 HK\$'M	2018/19 HK\$'M	2019/20 HK\$'M	2020/21 HK\$'M	2021/22 HK\$'M
Surplus / (deficit) for the year (a)	415	141	976	454	231	639	78	50
						(Note i)	(Note iii)	(Note iii)
Total Income (b)	4,447	4,421	5,398	5,127	5,176	5,918	5,250	5,282
Subventions from UGC (c)	2,207	2,477	2,673	2,695	2,756	3,117	2,877	2,885
Total Expenditure (d)	4,033	4,279	4,422	4,673	4,945	5,279	5,172	5,232
Monthly Expenditure (e) = (d) / 12	336	357	368	389	412	440	431	436
Current Assets (f)	6,412	5,396	6,660	6,382	9,102	10,255	10,358	10,462
Current Liabilities (g)	2,581	1,877	2,198	2,235	2,335	2,612	2,664	2,717
Total Funds / Reserves (h)	7,309	7,413	8,302	8,737	8,933	9,671	9,911	10,334
Total "Liquid" Funds / Reserves (i)	4,833	4,936	5,912	6,366	6,596	7,237	7,315	7,365
Cash and Bank Deposits (j)	1,891	1,133	1,315	971	3,417	1,793	1,724	1,744
						(Note ii)		

Sources for actual figures: 2014/15, 2015/16, 2016/17, 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/20 Financial Reports of UGC-funded universities.

Projection figures were provided by university.

Figures may not add up due to rounding.

<sup>1</sup> The financial information only covers those activities at university level (i.e. excluding subsidiaries).

## **Domain 5: Financial health and institutional sustainability at University Level<sup>1</sup>**

### **Notes by CityU:**

#### **Explanations / justifications for items with year-by-year variances of +/- 15%**

- (i) The increase in the surplus for the year between 2018/19 and 2019/20 is due to the one-off income from the 8th Matching Grant Scheme and the sizeable donation in 2019/20.
- (ii) The HDF was placed into bank deposits which increased the balance of Cash and Bank Deposits at the end of 2018/19. The balance of Cash and Bank Deposits was decreased in 2019/20 due to investment of HDF in other financial instruments since April 2020.
- (iii) CityU considered that the year-by-year variance beyond 2019/20 is minimal in terms of percentage to Total Income. Without the effect of the 8<sup>th</sup> Matching Grant Scheme, the surplus in 2020/21 and 2021/22 is originally projected at a breakeven level. Due to COVID-19 since early 2020, some learning, teaching and research activities of the University have been severely affected and might cause underspending in 2020/21.

#### **Assumptions / mechanism of the financial projections**

- (A) The financial projections are based on the assumptions / mechanism that: -
  - \* Surplus for 2020/21 to 2021/22 is derived based on the projected income and expenditure level for the year.
  - \* The subventions from UGC for 2020/21 and 2021/22 are projected based on available information on hand. The tuition fees level for UGC-funded and slight increase in fees level for self-financing programmes.
  - \* Total Expenditure for 2020/21 to 2021/22 - To maintain the quality of the teaching and research and all support activities, the University will continue to regularly replace, upgrade, or purchase new equipment, library materials, and other non-salary items at current level.
  - \* Current Assets and Current Liabilities - At minimum changes.
  - \* Total Funds / Reserves - The projected surplus is attributable to the changes in Total Funds / Reserves.
  - \* Total "Liquid" Funds / Reserves - Based on Total Funds / Reserves with adjustments of Deferred Capital Funds.
  - \* Cash and Bank Deposits - Forecast is at optimal level of cash holding required by the University.

**Domain 5: Financial health and institutional sustainability at Consolidated Level**

	Actual figures						Projections	
	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
<b>5.1</b> <u>Annual Surplus as a Percentage of Total Income</u> Annual Surplus / Total Income [(a)/(b) x 100]	9.0%	3.2%	17.5%	8.4%	4.1%	10.6%	2.0%	1.5%
						(Note i)	(Note iii)	(Note iii)
<b>5.2</b> <u>Subventions from UGC as Percentage of Total Income</u> Subventions from UGC / Total Income [(c)/(b) x 100]	46.6%	55.9%	48.2%	50.8%	51.4%	50.8%	52.9%	52.5%
<b>5.3</b> <u>Current Ratio</u> Current Assets / Current Liabilities [(f)/(g)]	3.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8
<b>5.4</b> <u>Coverage of universities' expenditure by reserves and cash &amp; cash equivalents</u>								
(i)(a) Reserves / Monthly Expenditure = No. of months that expenditure can be supported by Reserves [(h)/(e)]	23.0	20.9	21.9	21.7	20.9	21.2	22.3	22.9
(i)(b) "Liquid" Reserves / Monthly Expenditure = No. of months that expenditure can be supported by "Liquid" Reserves [(i)/(e)]	16.0	13.9	15.6	15.8	15.5	15.9	16.5	16.4
(ii) Cash & Cash Equivalents / Monthly Expenditure = No. of months that expenditure can be supported by Cash & Cash Equivalents [(j)/(e)]	2.9	3.3	3.6	2.5	8.1	4.1	4.1	4.0
						(Note ii)		

	Actual figures						Projections (Note A)	
	2014/15 HK\$'M	2015/16 HK\$'M	2016/17 HK\$'M	2017/18 HK\$'M	2018/19 HK\$'M	2019/20 HK\$'M	2020/21 HK\$'M	2021/22 HK\$'M
Surplus / (deficit) for the year (a)	424	143	973	447	220	652	111	86
						(Note i)	(Note iii)	(Note iii)
Total Income (b)	4,737	4,428	5,545	5,307	5,357	6,130	5,491	5,549
Subventions from UGC (c)	2,207	2,477	2,673	2,695	2,756	3,117	2,907	2,915
Total Expenditure (d)	4,314	4,285	4,573	4,860	5,137	5,478	5,380	5,463
Monthly Expenditure (e) = (d) / 12	359	357	381	405	428	457	448	455
Current Assets (f)	6,482	5,436	6,612	6,430	9,127	10,293	10,396	10,500
Current Liabilities (g)	1,696	1,860	2,248	2,239	2,341	2,628	2,681	2,735
Total Funds / Reserves (h)	8,259	7,461	8,346	8,777	8,958	9,705	9,978	10,437
Total "Liquid" Funds / Reserves (i)	5,769	4,975	5,948	6,396	6,614	7,267	7,378	7,464
Cash and Bank Deposits (j)	1,037	1,178	1,374	1,025	3,481	1,889	1,820	1,840
						(Note ii)		

Sources for actual figures: 2014/15, 2015/16, 2016/17, 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/20 Financial Reports of UGC-funded universities.

Projection figures were provided by university.

Figures may not add up due to rounding.

## **Domain 5: Financial health and institutional sustainability at Consolidated Level**

### **Notes by CityU:**

#### **Explanations / justifications for items with year-by-year variances of +/- 15%**

- (i) Same as the variance explanation at University Level - The increase in the surplus for the year between 2018/19 and 2019/20 is due to the one-off income from the 8th Matching Grant Scheme and the sizeable donation in 2019/20.
- (ii) The HDF was placed into bank deposits which increased the balance of Cash and Bank Deposits at the end of 2018/19. The balance of Cash and Bank Deposits was decreased in 2019/20 due to investment of HDF in other financial instruments since April 2020.
- (iii) Same as the variance explanation at University Level - CityU considered that the year-by-year variance beyond 2019/20 is minimal in terms of percentage to Total Income. Without the effect of the 8<sup>th</sup> Matching Grant Scheme, the surplus in 2020/21 and 2021/22 is originally projected at a breakeven level. Due to COVID-19 since early 2020, some learning, teaching and research activities of the University have been severely affected and might cause underspending in 2020/21. Some contributions/balances generated from subsidiaries are projected at Consolidated Level.

#### **Assumptions / mechanism of the financial projections**

- (A) The financial projections are based on the assumptions / mechanism that: -
  - \* The projections aggregate the projections at University's Level and subsidiaries and adjust by some known eliminations.