

**Explanatory Notes to the Assessment Criteria
of maritime-related courses / examinations
under Professional Training and Examination Refund Scheme (Maritime)**

To facilitate course provider / examination authority to prepare application under the Professional Training and Examination Refund Scheme (Maritime), this Explanatory Notes provide yardsticks and examples for the assessment criteria for reference –

1. The course / examination should address to manpower and/or development needs of the maritime sector in Hong Kong. Assessment will be made with reference to the course / examination objectives, target participants as well as number of participants, in particular Hong Kong participants, in the past three years.

2. The course / examination should help enhance the competency of in-service practitioners through –
 - (a) fulfilment of legislative and/or professional requirements in the maritime industry; or

 - (b) acquisition of certification, accreditation, etc. on maritime specific subjects that can be identified in standards, manuals or guidelines established by professional or trade bodies in the maritime industry, such as International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS), International Maritime Dangerous Goods (IMDG) Code, International Maritime Organization (IMO) conventions, etc.

3. The professional qualification to be awarded should be recognised by the maritime industry.

In considering whether the course / examination and the corresponding qualification to be awarded are recognised by the maritime industry, reference may be made with the following –

- (a) recognition by the Government, such as Marine Department (MD) and Labour Department;
 - (b) recognition by professional or trade bodies (associations / societies / institutes, etc.) in the maritime industry, such as IMO, The Institute of Chartered Shipbrokers (ICS), The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong (CILTHK), etc.; and
 - (c) sufficient demonstration by course provider / examination authority the reputation and receptiveness of the course / examination in the maritime industry. For example, course provider / examination authority may demonstrate its present and past partnership or collaboration with industry associations / organisations or their corporate members.
4. The curriculum should be of relevance and the teaching staff should be of quality.
- (a) A curriculum, as sufficiently presented in its course outline, teaching materials or supplementary information, etc., containing any of the following elements may be considered relevant to the maritime industry –
 - (i) maritime specific subjects in the pre-defined categories, such as seafaring (deck / engine), ship operations / management, navigation, naval architecture, maritime law, shipbroking, ship surveying, etc.;
 - (ii) maritime specific subjects that can be identified in standards, manuals or guidelines established by professional or trade bodies (associations / societies / institutes, etc.) in the maritime industry;
 - (iii) training on or certification of a specific skill required in jobs in the maritime industry, such as shipboard cargo handling, bunkering, shipboard radiotelephony, radar operations, passenger crowd management, maritime resource management, etc.; and

- (iv) general professional skills with a focus in the maritime industry, such as marine engineering, ship finance, marine insurance, audit and quality assurance in maritime safety, etc.
- (b) In considering the quality of teaching staff, reference may be made to the following –
 - (i) whether the teaching staff is from accredited training centres or courses from professional or trade bodies in the maritime industry;
 - (ii) whether the teaching staff is recognised by the Government or maritime industry;
 - (iii) whether the teaching staff is/was industry practitioner with credible experience; and
 - (iv) whether course evaluation reflects consistent and satisfactory performance of the teaching staff.
- 5. There should be a quality assurance mechanism for the course / examination.
 - (a) The quality assurance mechanism may be demonstrated by the accreditation from relevant professional or trade bodies in the maritime industry or the Government, such as approved training courses by MD.
 - (b) Course provider / examination authority is encouraged to seek common education accreditation, such as recognition under the Qualifications Framework accredited by the Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications, or other widely recognised quality assurance accreditation or certifications.
 - (c) Course provider / examination authority may develop its own quality assurance mechanism to meet training objectives with sufficient demonstration in the application for consideration. Quality assurance approaches may include a robust mechanism for course / examination development with periodic review, appointment criteria of course instructor, systemic collection of

feedback from participants, staff or instructors, etc. which provides performance indicators and identifies areas for improvement.

6. The professional or academic standing of course provider / examination authority should be recognised by the maritime industry and/or comply with the relevant legislative / professional requirements.

The following list of organisations, as well as those accredited, certified, associated or recognised by them, may be regarded as having demonstrated its professional and/or academic standing –

- (a) Government;
- (b) statutory bodies and their subsidiaries;
- (c) University Grants Committee (UGC)-funded universities, such as The University of Hong Kong (HKU), The Chinese University of Hong Kong, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU), etc.;
- (d) continuing and professional education arms of the UGC-funded universities, such as PolyU Hong Kong Community College, HKU School of Professional and Continuing Education, etc.;
- (e) Vocational Training Council and its member institutes, such as Technological and Higher Education Institute of Hong Kong, Institute of Professional Education and Knowledge, Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education, Maritime Services Training Institute, etc.;
- (f) self-financing higher education institutions that provide locally-accredited or continuous learning programmes registered with or exempted by the Education Bureau, such as The Hang Seng University of Hong Kong, UOW College Hong Kong, etc.
- (g) professional / trade bodies or their accredited training centres;
- (h) maritime industry practitioners.

Course provider / examination authority falls outside the above list is required to provide the institute profile, including but not limited to

establishment year, teaching staff portfolio, past participants, partnering organisations, course list, etc., for assessment.

7. Course provider / examination authority, or any one of its responsible persons, directors, instructors, employees, agents and sub-contractors in respect of the course / examination, should not have engaged, be engaging, or be reasonably believed to have engaged or be engaging in acts or activities that are likely to cause or constitute the occurrence of offences endangering national security, public interest of Hong Kong, public morals, public order or public safety.

The course / examination should not contain any information, material or otherwise that may have the effect or give rise to circumstances described above.
