

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

Courseware Development Grant (2019-22)

Scheme 1 – Micro Modules

Final Report

Please return by email to CUHK cdgs@cuhk.edu.hk

PART I: Summary of Project

- 1. Title: ‘Humanizing’ LGBT Rights Cases in Hong Kong**
- 2. Principal Supervisor(s) and Co-supervisor(s) and the respective Unit(s).**

Name	Post	Unit/ Department	No. of funded TDLEG (of any funding scheme including the CDG for micro-modules) serving as a Principal Supervisor				No. of funded TDLEG (of any funding scheme including the CDG for micro-modules) serving as a Co-Supervisor			
			12-15 Trien- nium	15-16 roll- over year	16-19 Trien- nium	19-22 Trien- nium	12-15 Trien- nium	15-16 roll- over year	16-19 Trien- nium	19-22 Trien- nium
			(Please specify the number in the relevant boxes)							
Principal Supervisors										
Stuart Hargreaves	Assoc Prof.	Faculty of Law				1				
Co-supervisors										
Rehan Abeyratne	Assoc Prof.	Faculty of Law								1

3. Project Duration: from Jan 2021 to March 2022

4. Project objectives:

- The project objective was to create a series of micromodules for students studying constitutional law courses at CUHK, focusing on some core LGBT rights cases. The micromodules consist of video interviews with the claimants in those cases placed alongside written summaries of the relevant case law including hyperlinks to various relevant sources available online.

5. Activities, processes and outcomes:

- Parties to key cases were interviewed
- Those interviews were edited into thematic chunks, and transcripts were created in order to improve student understanding
- The edited videos were uploaded to the course website on Blackboard alongside a text summary of the relevant case written by the PI and Co-I. Links to relevant legislation, other jurisprudence, and media commentary (in both English and Chinese) were included in each micromodule.
- In the JD version of the course (LAWS6015), students were directed to the presence of the micromodules and encouraged to view them when studying equality rights
- In the LLB version of the course (LAWS1100), the micromodules were more deeply integrated into the lesson plan and directly discussed during tutorials related to equality rights
- Students were asked to complete a multi-part questionnaire regarding their views on the function of the micromodules

6. Deliverables: (please provide details under this section and the relevant summary statistics in the tables in Part IV)

- The project has been successful. Five micromodules were developed, providing students with an in-depth understanding of a critical and rapidly-developing area of Hong Kong jurisprudence. In combining video, text, and personal reflection by the students, they recognized the varying pedagogical needs of students. Given the topic, the micromodules advance at least three of CUHK’s stated goals in the 2025 Strategic Plan – education, student experience, social responsibility & sustainable development. They further represent a commitment to inclusion and diversity in the classroom on the part of the PI and co-I.

#	Topic	MM Name	Language	Duration (in minutes)	Styles	Used in Courses
1	Gender Identity	Henry Tse	English	20	Interview + Case Summary & Links to other Resources	LAWS6015, LAWS1100
2	Age of Consent for Same-sex Couples	Billy Leung	English	20	Interview + Case Summary & Links to other Resources	LAWS6015, LAWS1100
3	Public Housing Rights for Same-sex Couples Married Overseas	Nick Infinger	English	20	Interview + Case Summary & Links to other Resources	LAWS6015, LAWS1100
4	Benefits for Civil Servants for Same-sex Couples Married Overseas	Angus Leung	English	20	Interview + Case Summary & Links to other Resources	LAWS6015, LAWS1100
5	Intestate Law for Same-sex Couples Married Overseas	Henry Li	English	20	Interview + Case Summary & Links to other Resources	LAWS6015, LAWS1100

Total: 5 MMs; 100 minutes; Average length of each MM: 20 minutes

- Each video contains 4 parts, with the interviewee answering questions related to their case under the headings of “Background”, “Process”, “Outcome”, and “Future”

7. Key Performance Indicators and Evaluation:

- Students were asked to anonymously complete a survey with the following 10 statements and asked on a scale of 1 to 5 (strongly disagree -> strongly agree) whether they agreed with them:
 - S1) The purpose of the project is clear
 - S2) The recorded interviews are clear and understandable
 - S3) The recorded interviews added a valuable dimension to the cases
 - S4) The recorded interviews were comprehensive in their coverage of the cases and the factors surrounding them
 - S5) The written case summaries were clear and concise
 - S6) The written case summaries aided my understanding of the cases
 - S7) The links to contemporary media accounts were helpful
 - S8) Overall, the micromodules enhanced my understanding of LGBT rights in Hong Kong
 - S9) These micromodules should be included in constitutional law courses at CUHK Law
 - S10) Such micromodules would be useful for other cases in constitutional law / other courses
- In LAWS1100, 39 students responded to the survey.
 - For S1, 21 students strongly agreed and 18 agreed.
 - For S2, 23 students strongly agreed, 15 agreed, and 1 neither agreed nor disagreed.
 - For S3, 22 students strongly agreed and 17 agreed.
 - For S4, 17 students strongly agreed, 20 agreed, and 2 neither agreed nor disagreed.
 - For S5, 22 students strongly agreed and 17 agreed.
 - For S6, 21 students strongly agreed and 18 agreed.
 - For S7, 14 students strongly agreed, 20 agreed, and 5 neither agreed nor disagreed.
 - For S8, 21 students strongly agreed and 18 agreed.
 - For S9, 22 students strongly agreed, 14 agreed, and 3 neither agreed nor disagreed.
 - For S10, 23 students strongly agreed, 14 agreed, and 2 neither agreed nor disagreed.
- In LAWS 6015, 4 students responded to the survey.
 - For S1, 3 students strongly agreed and 1 agreed.
 - For S2, 3 students strongly agreed and 1 agreed.
 - For S3, 4 students strongly agreed.
 - For S4, 4 students strongly agreed.
 - For S5, 4 students strongly agreed.
 - For S6, 4 students strongly agreed.
 - For S7, 4 students strongly agreed.
 - For S8, 4 students strongly agreed.
 - For S9, 2 students strongly agreed, 1 agreed, and 1 neither agreed nor disagreed.
 - For S10, 3 students strongly agreed and 1 neither agreed nor disagreed.

8. Reflection

The project has been a clear success – as indicated in the statistics above virtually all students who completed the survey in both the LLB (LAWS1100) and JD (LAWS6015) constitutional courses have an extremely positive response to both the project itself and its potential for wider application

in other courses. However, it is notable that far fewer students in the JD course responded to the survey than the LLB, despite the JD class being larger. This likely points to the importance of the micromodules being directly incorporated into the classroom environment rather than being simply offered up as a resource for students to explore on their own volition. Because of the way the teaching allocation process worked *after* approval for the grant had been received, the PI taught only a portion of LAWS6015, and that portion did not include the classes on equality rights. Thus, while students were made aware of the micromodules the course instructor responsible for delivery the segments on equality rights (and who was not part of this project) did not directly rely upon them during teaching. This likely explains the poor take-up rate reflected in the survey.

In contrast, the Co-I was responsible for teaching the entirety of LAWS1100, and was thus able to directly control the way in which the micromodules were used in the classroom. Students were asked to read the case summaries and watch the interviews in the Billy Leung and Angus Leung micromodules. The materials in the other three micromodules were assigned as optional reading/viewing. In the lecture for that unit, the Co-I discussed these cases in depth. The lecture covered not only the legal principles and reasoning in the court judgments, but also the applicants' subjective experience of the judicial process. Towards the end of the lecture, the instructor showed brief clips from the micromodules to the class via Zoom as part of a broader discussion on the future of LGBT rights in Hong Kong. In the tutorial sessions that followed – four sessions in total, all taught by the Co-I – students were asked to explain how Billy Leung and Angus Leung viewed themselves prior to filing their cases, and how their self-perceptions changed as their cases were covered in the media, and as the legal landscape on LGBT rights in Hong Kong shifted. Students were also invited to express their views on the future of LGBT rights in Hong Kong, and to state their points of agreement and disagreement with the five interviewees in the micromodules. Students participated actively in the tutorial discussions, showing that they had deeply engaged with the materials in the micromodules and had formed their own opinions thereafter.

In terms of new opportunities, several of the interviewees expressed an interest in working with the PI and Co-I on an expansion of the project in the future. This might include a public-facing website, public lectures on the evolution of LGBT rights-related law in Hong Kong, and translation of more materials into Chinese. Of course, much of this would be dependent on financial support from the university or another institution.

9. Dissemination/Diffusion/Sharing of Good Practices: (please provide details under this section and the relevant summary statistics in the tables in Part IV)

- The PI will present these results at CUHK's "Directions in Legal Education" Conference in June 2022
- Based upon input received from that Conference, the PI will draft a paper summarizing the project, results, and lessons and submit to an appropriate journal (eg the Journal of Legal Education) in Q4 of 2022.
- (the above time scale is due to the fact that LAWS1100 only runs in term 2, so KPI etc were not available until late March 2022).

10. Impact

There are two core lessons that can be drawn from the project. First, that students appreciate and benefit from different methods of instruction in learning jurisprudence beyond "reading the case". Second, for micromodules such as these to have the most impact, they need to be tightly integrated into the pedagogy of the course rather than simply made available as a resource. This latter lesson is likely applicable across fields rather than relevant only to the teaching of law.

11. External collaborations

Name of collaborating institutions	Local/Non-local (please specify)

Please provide details and a self-reflection of the collaboration.

12. Engagement of students as Partners in the project (please provide details under this section and the relevant summary statistics in Table 5 in Part IV)

- An undergraduate student was engaged to help liaise with the interviewees and to assist in transcribing the interviews.

PART II: Lessons learnt from the project

- As noted, the key factor in success is ensuring the tight integration between the micromodules and the lecture content. This means that even if a large database of case-based micromodules is created that can be drawn upon by others, successful use will require effective buy-in and commitment from the actual lecturer in the classroom. Top quality production values and deep links are of a little use if students themselves are not convinced of the need to watch them. With sufficient resources the project is sustainable over time beyond these few cases – it is our belief that students in various law courses would benefit from understanding how the law impacts real people beyond the pages of a textbook or legal judgment. This of course could come in multiple ways beyond micromodules – widely available clinical legal education for instance would let students deal with actual legal problems. But this requires long term funding and commitment from the university or UGC to level beyond the scope of one-time courseware grants.

PART III: Financial data*

(a) Funds awarded from CDG:	\$ 64430.00
(b) Total expenditure:	\$ 23773.50
(c) Surplus/ deficit (i.e. (a) – (b))	\$ 40656.50 (surplus)

Comment for committee – the surplus is in part because ELITE overestimated their costs for inclusion in the initial budget, and in part because the PI and Co-I recorded two of the interviews themselves as ELITE was unavailable at the same time as the interviewees.

In the case of deficit, please specify other source(s) and amount of funding secured (please specify _____) \$ _____

Expenditure:

Item	Budget as per application	Expenditure	Balance
Student Helper	9450	2173.50	7276.50
ELITE video recording & post-production	49980	21600	28380
Misc in case of overshoot	5000	0	5000
Total:	64430	23773.50	40656.50

* Please attach the final/latest financial statement of your project as provided by the Finance Office and make sure that the amount listed above tallies with the relevant information as included in the financial statement.

PART IV: Information for public access

Brief write-ups of individual projects (should be submitted as a separate document, which will be attached to the University's Final Report for submission to the UGC) and other information under Part IV of this report will be uploaded to a publicly accessible CUHK CDG website.

1. Keywords

Please provide five keywords (in order of relevance to your project) to describe your project.

(Most relevant) Keyword 1: LGBT rights

Keyword 2: equality

Keyword 3: jurisprudence

Keyword 4: human rights

(Least relevant) Keyword 5: law

2. Summary statistics

Table 1: Publicly accessible online resources (if any)
<p>(a) Project website:</p> <p><i>If a publicly accessible project website has been constructed, please provide the URL</i></p>
<p>(b) Webpage(s):</p> <p><i>If information of your project is summarized in a webpage (say a page in the department's or faculty's website), please provide the URL(s) in here</i></p>
<p>(c) Others (please specify):</p>

Table 2: Resource accessible to a target group of students (if any)			
<i>If resources (e.g. software) have been developed for a target group of students (e.g. in a course, in a department) to gain access through specific platforms (e.g. CU Learning Management System (Blackboard), Facebook), please specify.</i>			
<u>Course Code/ Target Students</u>	<u>Term & Year of offering</u>	<u>Approximate No. of students</u>	<u>Platform</u>

LAWS1100	All 1 st year LLB students	75	Blackboard
LAWS6015	All 1 st year JD students	200	Blackboard

Table 3: Presentation (if any)		
<i>Please classify each of the (oral/poster) presentations into one and only one of the following categories</i>	Number	
(a) In workshop/retreat within your unit (e.g. department, faculty)	On-line	<i>Face to Face</i>
	<i>Please insert no</i>	<i>Please insert no</i>
(b) In workshop/retreat organized for CUHK teachers (e.g. CLEAR workshop, workshop organized by other CUHK units)	On-line	<i>Face to Face</i>
	<i>Please insert no</i>	<i>Please insert no</i>
(c) In Teaching and Learning Innovation Expo jointly organized by CLEAR and ITSC	On-line	<i>Face to Face</i>
	<i>Please insert no</i>	<i>Please insert no</i>
(d) In any other event held in HK (e.g. UGC symposium, talks delivered to units of other institutions)	On-line	<i>Face to Face</i>
	<i>Please insert no</i>	<i>Please insert no</i>
(e) In international conference Directions in Legal Education Conference (forthcoming, June 2022)	On-line	<i>Face to Face</i>
	<i>TBD</i>	<i>TBD</i>
(f) Others (please specify)	On-line	<i>Face to Face</i>
	<i>Please insert no</i>	<i>Please insert no</i>

Table 4: Publication (if any)	
<i>Please classify each piece of publications into one and only one of the following categories</i>	Number

(a) Project CD/DVD	<i>Please insert no</i>
(b) Project leaflet	<i>Please insert no</i>
(c) Project booklet	<i>Please insert no</i>
(d) A section/chapter in a booklet/book distributed to a limited group of audience	<i>Please insert no</i>
(e) Conference proceeding	<i>Please insert no</i>
(f) A chapter in a book accessible internationally	<i>Please insert no</i>
(g) A paper in refereed journal - as noted above, if concept is well-received at Legal Education conference in June 2023, the PI plans to submit a related paper in Q4 2022	1
(h) Others (please specify)	<i>Please insert no</i>

Table 5: Engaging students as partners (if any)		
		Number
(a) participated in designing the teaching and learning resources	postgraduate students	<i>Please insert no</i>
	undergraduate students	<i>Please insert no</i>
(b) participated in supporting the implementation of the project	postgraduate students	<i>Please insert no</i>
	undergraduate students	1
(c) participated in evaluating the project outcomes	postgraduate students	4
	undergraduate students	39
(d) participated in disseminating the project outcomes	postgraduate students	<i>Please insert no</i>
	undergraduate students	<i>Please insert no</i>
(e) Others (please specify)		<i>Please insert no</i>

SHORT WRITEUP FOR CDGS WEBSITE:

This project sought to expand students' understanding and appreciation of series of key LGBT rights cases in Hong Kong through the use of five micromodules. Each micromodule featured an interview with a party to a case, placed alongside a textual summary of the key legal principles at play and links to contemporary media in both English and Chinese discussing the outcome. The goal was to encourage students to better recognize the law as a living social process that has dramatic impacts on the lives of people, rather than simply being a series of principles to be memorized.