

**One Hundred and Thirty-Seventh Meeting
of the Social Workers Registration Board
9 May 2016, Monday, 7:00p.m., Conference Room
26th Floor, Eastern Commercial Centre**

Minutes

Present

Mr. Lun Chi-wai	Chairperson
Dr. Leung Chuen-suen	Deputy Chairperson
Mr. Wong Ka-ming	Hon. Secretary
Mr. Lo Wa-kei, Roy	Hon. Treasurer
Ms. Chu Wai-sum, Betty	Member
Mr. Chung Wai-lung, Rivalino	Member
Mr. Hui Chung-shing, Herman	Member
Mr. Kwan Wing-shing, Vincent	Member
Mr. Lam Ka-tai	Member
Ms. Luk Ka-mei	Member
Mr. Ma Kam-wah, Timothy	Member
Mr. Shiu Ka-chun	Member
Mr. Tan Tick-yee	Member
Mr. Tsang Kin-chiu	Member
Ms. Wu Lai-ling	Member

In-attendance

Mr. Leung Sui-keung	Registrar (Secretary)
Ms. Fan Lai-yee, Veronica	Assistant Registrar

Confirmation of minutes of the one hundred and thirty-sixth meeting

1. The minutes of the one hundred and thirty-sixth meeting were confirmed without amendment. The Chairperson, with the agreement of the members present, signed the minutes as constituting true records of the one hundred and thirty-sixth meeting held on 7 March 2016.

Matters arising from the one hundred and thirty-sixth meeting

Potential appeal by complainant in Complaint Case No.XXX against the Board's decision

2. The Registrar reported that it was noted from a press coverage dated 20 March 2016 that the complainant had lodged an application to the High Court for leave for judicial review against the Board's decision in Complaint Case No. XXX. As application for leave for judicial review was an ex-parte application, the solicitor for the complainant would not notify the Board unless the High Court granted leave for judicial review against the Board's decision. So far no notice of judicial review had been received by the Board.

Intention to appeal against the Board's decision on Complaint Case No.XXX

(Business information deleted)

Two Letters from (anonymised) on the proposed (anonymised)

(Business information deleted)

Views of Committee on Qualification Assessment and Registration on the suggestion on requesting tertiary institutions to submit yearly report on staff-to-student ratio on social work programmes to the Board

8. The Registrar reported to the Meeting that the letter reminding tertiary institutes to comply with the Board's Principles, Criteria and Standards for Recognizing Qualifications in Social Work for Registration of Registered Social Workers was issued on 12 April 2016.

**Application for registration lodged by (anonymised)
(Board Paper No. 37/2016)**

(Business information deleted)

**Application for renewal of registration lodged by
(anonymised) (Board Paper No. 46/2016)**

(Business information deleted)

**Report of the Special Panel on interview with (anonymised)
(Board Paper No. 38/2016)**

(Business information deleted)

**Legal advice on a case of non-compliance with Section 24
of the Social Workers Registration Ordinance (Board**

Paper No. 39/2016)

(Business information deleted)

**One case of violation of Section 34 of the Social Workers
Registration Ordinance (Board Paper No.40/2016)**

(Business information deleted)

**Draft Interim Report on Qualification Recognition
Assessment on (anonymised) (Board Paper No. 41/2016)**

(Business information deleted)

**Draft Interim Report on Qualification Recognition
Assessment on (anonymised) (Board Paper No. 42/2016)**

(Business information deleted)

Request from (anonymised) (Board Paper No. 43/2016)

(Business information deleted)

**Proposed revision in rate of honorarium for Assessment
Team Members (Board Paper No.44/2016)**

54. (Anonymised) referred to Board Paper No. 44/2016 and briefed the Meeting on the recommendations of the Committee on Qualification Assessment and Registration and of the Committee on Administration to revise the honorarium for Assessment Team Members conducting

qualification recognition assessment/review exercises for the Board. The current rate was \$2,000 per day and the recommendation was to revise the rate upward to \$3,000 per day.

55. The two Committees had examined the two options of revising the rate to \$3,000 per day and \$4,000 per day. After examining the information as set out in the appendix to Board Paper No. 44/2016, the two Committees both agreed that the option of doubling the current rate to \$4,000 per day might appear to be too drastic and the revision to \$3,000 per day would be more reasonable. Also, the revision to \$3,000 per day would be financially viable.

56. After taking into account the recommendations of the two Committees, the Meeting agreed that the honorarium for Assessment Team Members should be revised from \$2,000 per day to \$3,000 per day.

Discussion by Committee on Administration on bilingual policy (Board Paper No.45/2016)

57. (Anonymised) referred to Board Paper No. 45/2016 and briefed the Meeting on the discussion by the Committee on Administration on implementation of bilingual policy for dissemination of information to RSWs and to the public. The Committee on Administration examined in detail the pros and cons of employing additional staff and contracting out translation work as set out in the appendix of the Board Paper.

58. Taking into account the need to consider the feedback from RSWs and the public on the new scope of dissemination of information through the Board's web-site, the Committee on Administration considered that it would be pre-mature at this stage to adopt the option of employing additional staff to carry out translation work. The Committee therefore recommended that the option of contracting out translation work should be adopted.

59. The Committee also considered the scope of provision of bilingual documents for dissemination of information through the Board's web-site. The Committee recommended that as a first step, the Board's Newsletter should be translated from Chinese to English by a translation service provider.

60. As to whether more documents should be prepared in bilingual format, the Committee recommended that the issue should be brought up for review one year later.

61. After considering the recommendation of the Committee on Administration as set out in the above, the Meeting agreed that for the time being, the Board's Newsletter would be translated into English. The issue on implementation of bilingual policy for dissemination of information would be brought up for review one year later.

Any Other Business

(A) Category 2 applications

62. The Chairperson expressed that he would like to have some discussion on Category 2 applications. Recently one application for Category 2 registration was submitted to the Board and the applicant was a social work student who had not yet graduated from the programme. The applicant was offered social work employment by an agency. He wanted to know whether such applications should be approved by the Board.

63. The Registrar clarified that the case quoted by the Chairperson was a case lodged by a final year social work student and it was different from the application in which the applicant had not received any social work training.

64. (Anonymised) expressed that for fresh social work graduates, applications for registration as Category 2 RSWs would be approved so long as they were accepted by employing agencies to take up social work posts. The award of recognized social work qualifications was a matter of time only. They would become Category 1 RSWs eventually.

65. The Registrar supplemented that these Category 2 RSWs would be changed to Category 1 RSWs upon receipt of graduation lists from tertiary institutes.

66. (Anonymised) enquired what was the issue involved in approving Category 2 applications lodged by fresh social work graduates.

67. The Chairperson responded that for Category 1 applications, the issue was simple. The applicants possessed

social work qualifications which were recognized by the Board for registration. For Category 2 RSWs, they did not possess social work qualifications recognized by the Board but they were performing social work duties. The fact that the applicants would soon graduate from the social work programmes and the fact that they were performing social work duties were different matters. There would be problem if the same standard was adopted in approving Category 1 and Category 2 applications. As such, it was necessary to know whether the applicant was actually performing social work duties before approving the application.

68. (Anonymised) referred to the suggestion from the Labour and Welfare Bureau for the Board to make rules under Section 9(1) of the Social Workers Registration Ordinance to address the problem of Category 2 applications and the legal advice that the Board could not curb Category 2 applications merely by making rules without effecting amendment to Section 17(2) of the Ordinance. (Anonymised) expressed that for Category 2 applications lodged by social work graduates who would soon graduate from social work courses recognized by the Board for registration of RSWs, it would be acceptable for the Board to approve such applications. (Anonymised) concern was on applications lodged by applicants who did not have any recognized social work qualifications and had not received any social work training. He asked whether the Board could refuse these applications if the requirements under Section 17(2) of the Ordinance were met, i.e. that the applicant was occupying a social work post or had been accepted to a social work post.

69. (Anonymised) responded that according to the wordings of Section 17(2) of the Ordinance, the Board could not refuse the application if the requirement of occupying a social work post or being accepted to a social work post was met.

70. (Anonymised) responded that the applicant had to satisfy the Board that the post to be occupied by him was really a social work post. In this respect, the Board might ask questions on the post if there was doubt.

(B) Time for Board Meetings

71. The Chairperson informed Board Members that the 138th Board Meeting would be held on 27 June 2016 at 7:00p.m.

72. (Anonymised) asked when the Board would convene Board Meeting during office hours.

73. The Chairperson replied that after checking with the elected Board Members, it transpired that some elected Board Members had to attend work at schools in June and July 2016 and therefore it was not possible to re-schedule the 138th Board Meeting to normal office hours.

Date of Next Meeting

74. The Meeting confirmed that the 138th Board Meeting would be held on Monday, 27 June 2016 at 7:00p.m.

75. There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 9:35p.m.

Chairperson

23 May 2016