

**University Accountability Agreement (UAA)**  
**Sector-wide Performance Measures (PMs) (as at June 2019)**  
**The Education University of Hong Kong (EdUHK)**

**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

### **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 new, standard UGC questions included in universities' annual graduate / student surveys. The latest available data of the 2017/18 academic year 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)).

**2017/18 academic year**

	<b>PM 1.1</b>	<b>PM 1.2</b>
<b>Average score</b>	3.65	3.74
<b>No. of students responded to the questions</b>	725	724
<b>No. of target students (graduates)</b>	847	
<b>Response rate</b>	86%	85%
<b>Survey used to collect data</b>	Graduate Employment Survey	
<b>Target respondents</b>	2018 Ug graduates	
<b>Survey period</b>	September to December 2018	

**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 (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 of the 2015/16 to 2017/18 academic years are presented below.

	Academic year		
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
(a) No. of FT Ug graduates	741	826	847
(b) No. of FT Ug responded graduates	700	783	773
<i>Response rate of the question [(b) / (a)]</i>	<i>94.5%</i>	<i>94.8%</i>	<i>91.3%</i>
(c) No. of responded FT Ug graduates (excluding those who were not seeking employment for the time being, pursued further studies, emigrated or returned to place of origin)	640	697	703
(d) No. of FT Ug graduates in employment	627	689	692
(e) No. of FT Ug graduates in FT employment	587	641	651
<b>Percentage of FT Ug graduates in employment [(d) / (c)]</b>	<b>98.0%</b>	<b>98.9%</b>	<b>98.4%</b>
<b>Percentage of FT Ug graduates in FT employment [(e) / (c)]</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>92.0%</b>	<b>92.6%</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 265 EdUHK’s first degree graduates are presented below.

Performance area	Average score (5-point rating scale)	
	Overall	EdUHK
1. Language proficiency	3.75	3.69
2. Numerical competency	3.67	3.64
3. Information technology literacy	3.82	3.91
4. Analytical and problem-solving abilities	3.57	3.54
5. Work attitude	3.88	3.88
6. Inter-personal skills	3.71	3.76
7. Management skills	3.52	3.54
8. Technical knowledge required for the job	3.65	3.71
9. Knowledge of current affairs and business issues, self-learning ability and self-confidence	3.57	3.61

**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 2014.
- (ii) The next round will be RAE 2020.

**Results of RAE 2014**

<b>Research activity judged to meet the standard of:</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>4 star and 3 star</b>	<b>26%</b>
<i>4 star (world leading)</i>	4%
<i>3 star (internationally excellent)</i>	22%
Number of eligible staff	281

**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 and General Panel Guidelines for the RAE 2014.
- (b) A Panel produced an overall quality profile by assessing three distinct elements of the assessment – research outputs, external competitive peer-reviewed research grants and esteem measures – to produce a sub-profile for each element. The three sub-profiles were aggregated to form the overall quality profile for the cost centre, with the research outputs weighted 80% and the grants and esteem correlated 20% (the split for this 20% weighting varied across panels). The overall quality profile shows the proportion of research activity in a cost centre judged to meet the definitions at each starred level. The aggregate results in the above table are computed by taking weighted average of the respective quality profiles.

**Research output grading categories:**

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

**External competitive peer-reviewed research grants and esteem measures rating categories:**

4 star – exceptional  
 3 star – excellent  
 2 star – very good  
 1 star – good  
 unclassified

- (c) The number of staff covered by each panel varied significantly. The largest panel covered more than 690 eligible staff, while the smallest only covered about 110. The number of eligible staff in each university and each panel also varied.
- (d) Universities made submission to different numbers of cost centres in each panel. For example, University A made submission to only one cost centre in the Biology Panel, while University B three.
- (e) In view of (c) and (d), 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 of the 2015-16 to 2017-18 financial years are presented below.
- (ii) In line with the prevailing reporting practice of the UGC Secretariat, 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		
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
<b>Value of total research income</b>	<b>235.3</b>	<b>268.8</b>	<b>206.6</b>
Status of the projects in financial year ending 30 June:			
<i>Completed</i>	<i>44.0</i>	<i>72.6</i>	<i>73.2</i>
<i>Discontinued / suspended</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 the 2010/11 to 2012/13 academic years as at the 2017/18 academic year are presented; for employability, the latest available data of 2015/16 to 2017/18 academic years are presented.
- (ii) The average time-to-completion is analysed by the type of RPg programmes - MPhil, PhD with research-based master and PhD without research-based master with different normal 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 normal study period).
- (iv) “Normal study period” refers to:
  - (a) “two full-time-equivalent years” for MPhil studies;
  - (b) “three full-time-equivalent years” for PhD programmes of students with a research-based master degree;
  - (c) “four full-time-equivalent years” for PhD programmes of students without a research-based master degree.
- (v) In the calculation of study periods, periods of formal suspension, if any, are discounted.
- (vi) RPg employability refers to the percentage of graduates (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 2017/18 academic year.

**As of end of 2017/18 academic year**

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

DCCG	Study level	Cohort		
		2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Overall	MPhil	N.A.	N.A.	3.3 (1)
	PhD with MPhil	N.A.	N.A.	2.9 (1)
	PhD without MPhil	4.3 (7)	4.2 (13)	4.7 (4)
1. Medicine, dentistry and health	MPhil	N.A.		
	PhD with MPhil			
	PhD without MPhil			
2. Sciences	MPhil	N.A.		
	PhD with MPhil			
	PhD without MPhil			
3. Engineering and technology	MPhil	N.A.		
	PhD with MPhil			
	PhD without MPhil			
4. Business and management	MPhil	N.A.		
	PhD with MPhil			
	PhD without MPhil			
5. Social sciences	MPhil	N.A.		
	PhD with MPhil			
	PhD without MPhil			
6. Arts and humanities	MPhil	N.A.		
	PhD with MPhil			
	PhD without MPhil			
7. Education	MPhil	N.A.	N.A.	3.3 (1)
	PhD with MPhil	N.A.	N.A.	2.9 (1)
	PhD without MPhil	4.3 (7)	4.2 (13)	4.7 (4)

**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 2017/18 academic year**

Graduation rate

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

DCCG	Cohort		
	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Overall	77.8% (7/9)	86.7% (13/15)	100.0% (6/6)
1. Medicine, dentistry and health	N.A.		
2. Sciences	N.A.		
3. Engineering and technology	N.A.		
4. Business and management	N.A.		
5. Social sciences	N.A.		
6. Arts and humanities	N.A.		
7. Education	77.8% (7/9)	86.7% (13/15)	100.0% (6/6)

**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.

Percentage of FT RPg graduates in employment  
(No. of FT RPg graduates in employment / No. of FT RPg graduates)

DCCG	Graduation year		
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Overall	100.0% (4/4)	91.7% (11/12)	66.7% (4/6)
1. Medicine, dentistry and health	N.A.		
2. Sciences	N.A.		
3. Engineering and technology	N.A.		
4. Business and management	N.A.		
5. Social sciences	N.A.		
6. Arts and humanities	N.A.		
7. Education	100.0% (4/4)	91.7% (11/12)	66.7% (4/6)

Percentage of FT RPg graduates in FT employment  
(No. of FT RPg graduates in FT employment / No. of FT RPg graduates)

DCCG	Graduation year		
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Overall	100.0% (4/4)	83.3% (10/12)	66.7% (4/6)
1. Medicine, dentistry and health	N.A.		
2. Sciences	N.A.		
3. Engineering and technology	N.A.		
4. Business and management	N.A.		
5. Social sciences	N.A.		

<b>DCCG</b>	<b>Graduation year</b>		
	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18</b>
6. Arts and humanities	N.A.		
7. Education	100.0% (4/4)	83.3% (10/12)	66.7% (4/6)

**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 of the 2017-18 financial year 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) In line with the prevailing reporting practice of the UGC, 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.

**2017-18 financial year**

(HK\$ million)

<b>Income source</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Collaborative research and contract research (cumulative value in the 2017-18 financial year)	33.6
Consultancy (value received during the 2017-18 financial year)	6.9
CPD courses (value received during the 2017-18 financial year)	7.9

**Notes by EdUHK**

- The organiser of CPD courses was university proper. The income reported was tuition fee and sponsorship from organizations.

**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 and (2) **net** income from start-ups according to their financial statements. The latest available data of the 2017-18 financial year 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.).

**2017-18 financial year**

(HK\$ million)

	<b>Amount</b>
Total IP income received by the university proper	0.2
Net income from start-ups	N.A.
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.2</b>

Notes

“N.A.” denotes not applicable since EdUHK reported no start-up.

**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 of the 2017-18 financial year 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.

**2017-18 financial year**

(HK\$ million)

<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Public engagement activities except CPD courses	26.0
CPD courses	5.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>31.4</b>

Notes

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

Notes by EdUHK

- The organiser of CPD courses was university proper. There was limitation when reporting the expenditure figures so best estimates were reported instead of actual figures.



**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 of the 2016/17 to 2018/19 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		
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Ug	7.7% (363 / 4 726)	8.4% (395 / 4 726)	8.9% (422 / 4 735)
TPg	0.9% (5 / 542)	1.2% (7 / 577)	0.9% (5 / 562)
RPg	72.6% (45 / 62)	72.4% (55 / 76)	70.2% (66 / 94)

**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 of the 2016/17 to 2018/19 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>2016/17</b>	Asia	411	99.5%
	<i>The Mainland of China</i>	382	92.5%
	Europe	1	0.2%
	North America	-	-
	Central & South America	-	-
	Oceania	-	-
	Africa	1	0.2%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2017/18</b>	Asia	453	99.1%
	<i>The Mainland of China</i>	418	91.5%
	Europe	2	0.4%
	North America	1	0.2%
	Central & South America	-	-
	Oceania	-	-
	Africa	1	0.2%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>2018/19</b>	Asia	488	99.0%
	<i>The Mainland of China</i>	436	88.4%
	Europe	4	0.8%
	North America	-	-
	Central & South America	-	-
	Oceania	-	-
	Africa	1	0.2%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Notes**

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

**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 of the 2017/18 academic year 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 2018, the percentage of Ug students who have had non-local learning experience during his/her Ug study since admission.

**2017/18 academic year**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Ug students with any of the non-local learning experience 1-7 below*</b>	<b>2 282</b>	<b>62.2%</b>
Number of Ug students as of 31 August 2018	3 667	100%
Breakdown of non-local learning experience of Ug students:		
1. Outgoing exchange experience	512	14.0%
2. Outgoing visiting experience	-	-
3. Internships experience	312	8.5%
4. Study/field trip experience	1 302	35.5%
5. Experiential learning experience	1 383	37.7%
6. International events	11	0.3%
7. Others	-	-

**Notes**

- \* 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.

**Notes by EdUHK**

- This table is based on the consolidated data from relevant faculties / departments / offices of the University.

**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) The data is not available from the RAE 2014 and the data requirement will be incorporated in the RAE 2020.

**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%	4.7%	7.8%	3.9%	0.1% (Note i)	0.5%	0.3% (Note ii)	0.7%
<b>5.2</b> <u>Subventions from UGC as Percentage of Total Income</u> Subventions from UGC / Total Income [(c)/(b) x 100]	57.7%	57.5%	58.3%	57.9%	56.6%	57.5%	56.1%	54.7%
<b>5.3</b> <u>Current Ratio</u> Current Assets / Current Liabilities [(f)/(g)]	3.0	2.6	2.9	2.9	2.9 (Note iii)	2.9 (Note iii)	2.9 (Note iii)	3.0 (Note iii)
<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)]	26.7	23.9	23.4	22.6	20.2	20.4	20.9	21.5
(i)(b) "Liquid" Reserves / Monthly Expenditure = No. of months that expenditure can be supported by "Liquid" Reserves [(i)/(e)]	9.0	8.2	8.7	8.8	7.9 (Note i)	8.0	8.3	8.6
(ii) Cash & Cash Equivalents / Monthly Expenditure = No. of months that expenditure can be supported by Cash & Cash Equivalents [(j)/(e)]	13.0	12.5	12.5	10.0	9.1	9.4	9.7	10.0

	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)	134	70	130	65	1 (Note i)	9	4 (Note ii)	12
Total Income (b)	1,439	1,506	1,664	1,672	1,779	1,778	1,731	1,696
Subventions from UGC (c)	831	866	970	969	1,007	1,023	971	928
Total Expenditure (d)	1,306	1,436	1,534	1,607	1,777	1,769	1,727	1,684
Monthly Expenditure (e) = (d) /12	109	120	128	134	148	147	144	140
Current Assets (f)	1,466	1,554	1,703	1,818	1,850 (Note iii)	1,859 (Note iii)	1,864 (Note iii)	1,876 (Note iii)
Current Liabilities (g)	485	591	587	635	635 (Note iii)	635 (Note iii)	635 (Note iii)	635 (Note iii)
Total Funds / Reserves (h)	2,907	2,864	2,990	3,025	2,993	3,003	3,007	3,019
Total "Liquid" Funds / Reserves (i)	977	980	1,110	1,174	1,176	1,185	1,189	1,202
Cash and Bank Deposits (j)	1,416	1,500	1,601	1,343	1,344	1,384	1,389	1,401

Sources for actual figures: 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 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 EdUHK:**

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

- (i) The decrease in the surplus is due to more spending on upgrading infrastructure and additional expenditure in enhancing the teaching capacity as well as curriculum review.
- (ii) The decrease in surplus is due to the planned repair & maintenance for student hostels in the year 2020/21.
- (iii) There is no material variation for the net current assets / current ratio of the Group and the University according to the financial projections.

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

- (A) The financial projections are based on the assumptions / mechanism that: -
  - \* The figures for the year 2018/19 is projected with reference to the actual income and expenditure incurred during the year.
  - \* For the year 2019/20 to 2021/22:
    - (a) UGC Block Grant for 2019/20 to 2021/22 is based on the Allocation letter from UGC.
    - (b) UGC Earmarked Grant is based on the grant of projects on hand. No new projects have been assumed.
    - (c) UGC Matching Grant: Subvention income and expenditure is assumed over the 3 years as a result of the launch of the 8<sup>th</sup> MG Scheme.
    - (d) Tuition Fee Income is based on the number of programmes offered and the estimated number of students enrolled in those programmes.
    - (e) Other income is assumed to be more or less the same as 2018/19.
    - (f) Operating expenses, including staff costs, are based on the allocated budget and historical pattern. For operating expenses supported by UGC Earmarked Grant, the amount of expenditure is based on the projects on hand. No new projects have been assumed.
    - (g) Surpluses will result in increase in cash & cash equivalents and UGC / Other Funds.
    - (h) Held-to-maturity financial assets will be turned to cash & cash equivalents upon maturity.

**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%	4.6%	7.7%	3.8%	0.1% (Note i)	0.6%	0.3% (Note ii)	0.7%
<b>5.2</b> <u>Subventions from UGC as Percentage of Total Income</u> Subventions from UGC / Total Income [(c)/(b) x 100]	56.4%	56.2%	57.0%	56.5%	55.2%	56.2%	54.7%	53.3%
<b>5.3</b> <u>Current Ratio</u> Current Assets / Current Liabilities [(f)/(g)]	3.0	2.6	2.9	2.9	2.9 (Note iii)	2.9 (Note iii)	2.9 (Note iii)	3.0 (Note iii)
<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)]	26.3	23.6	23.1	22.2	20.0	20.1	20.6	21.2
(i)(b) "Liquid" Reserves / Monthly Expenditure = No. of months that expenditure can be supported by "Liquid" Reserves [(i)/(e)]	9.0	8.2	8.7	8.7	7.9 (Note i)	8.0	8.3	8.5
(ii) Cash & Cash Equivalents / Monthly Expenditure = No. of months that expenditure can be supported by Cash & Cash Equivalents [(j)/(e)]	12.9	12.5	12.4	10.0	9.1	9.4	9.7	10.0

	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)	132	71	131	66	2 (Note i)	10	5 (Note ii)	13
Total Income (b)	1,472	1,542	1,703	1,715	1,822	1,822	1,775	1,740
Subventions from UGC (c)	831	866	970	969	1,007	1,023	971	928
Total Expenditure (d)	1,340	1,472	1,572	1,650	1,820	1,812	1,769	1,727
Monthly Expenditure (e) = (d) /12	112	123	131	137	152	151	147	144
Current Assets (f)	1,493	1,582	1,733	1,852	1,885 (Note iii)	1,895 (Note iii)	1,901 (Note iii)	1,914 (Note iii)
Current Liabilities (g)	490	597	593	645	645 (Note iii)	645 (Note iii)	645 (Note iii)	645 (Note iii)
Total Funds / Reserves (h)	2,936	2,893	3,020	3,056	3,026	3,036	3,041	3,054
Total "Liquid" Funds / Reserves (i)	999	1,003	1,134	1,199	1,202	1,212	1,217	1,230
Cash and Bank Deposits (j)	1,443	1,528	1,630	1,376	1,379	1,420	1,426	1,439

Sources for actual figures: 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 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 EdUHK:**

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

- (i) The decrease in the surplus is due to more spending on upgrading infrastructure and additional expenditure in enhancing the teaching capacity as well as curriculum review.
- (ii) The decrease in surplus is due to the planned repair & maintenance for student hostels in the year 2020/21.
- (iii) There is no material variation for the net current assets / current ratio of the Group and the University according to the financial projections.

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

- (A) The financial projections are based on the assumptions / mechanism that: -
  - \* The projections for subsidiaries are based on the incomes & expenditures for the year 2017/18 as these subsidiaries are rather stable and do not have a significant impact on the Group's financial positions.