



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Sustainable
Development
Goals

Bangkok Office
Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau
for Education



RECALLING LIBRARIANS AND TEACHERS CAREERS IN *academia:*

Co-Editors:
Libing Wang and Wesley Teter

professional
advancement
policies *and*
practices *in*
asia-pacific





United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Sustainable
Development
Goals

Bangkok Office
Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau
for Education

Asia-Pacific
ERI-NET



Education Research Institutes Network

Recalibrating Careers in Academia:

Professional Advancement Policies and Practices in Asia-Pacific

Co-Editors: Libing Wang and Wesley Teter

Published in 2017 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France

and

UNESCO Bangkok Office

© UNESCO 2017

ISBN: 978-92-9223-573-4 (print version)

ISBN: 978-92-9223-574-1 (electronic version)



This publication is available in Open Access under the Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO (CC-BY-SA 3.0 IGO) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/igo/>). By using the content of this publication, the users accept to be bound by the terms of use of the UNESCO Open Access Repository (<http://www.unesco.org/open-access/terms-use-ccbysa-en>).

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors; they are not necessarily those of UNESCO and do not commit the Organization.

Co-Editors: Wang, Libing and Teter, Wesley

Graphic Designer: Iuri Kato

TH/C3/EISD/17/001-100

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword vii

Synthesis Report

Case Studies on Professional Advancement Policies and Practices in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific 1

Chapter 01: Australia

Academic Staff Promotion in Australia: Characteristics and Concerns. 19

References. 38

Chapter 02: Cambodia

Academic Promotion of Higher Education Teaching Personnel in Cambodia 41

Background 42

Issues About the Status and Career Advancement of Academics in Cambodia vs. The 1997 UNESCO Recommendation 48

Academic Promotion in Cambodia: En Route to Reform 56

References. 70

Chapter 03: Hong Kong SAR, China

Academic Promotion of Higher Education Teaching Personnel in Hong Kong 73

Context and Background of Academic Promotion 74

National/System Policy Objectives and Their Impact on Academic Promotion 89

Structure and Criteria for Academic Promotion. 93

Evaluation and Recruitment Procedures 96

Concluding Remarks 98

References. 101

Chapter 04: India

Promotion in the Academic Profession in India: Upward Mobility of Teachers in Higher Education 105

Abstract	106
Higher Education in India	107
Academic Profession	110
Recruitment, Qualifications and Promotions of Teachers	117
Promotional Avenues and Upward Mobility of Teachers	122
Methods of Promotion/Upward Mobility	124
Promotion Through Competition (Direct Recruitment/ Open Competition).	125
Career Advancement Scheme (CAS)	127
Performance-linked Promotions and New Pay Scales	130
References.	140

Chapter 05: Indonesia

Academic Promotion of Higher Education Teaching Personnel in Indonesia 145

Abstract	146
Introduction.	147
Higher Education and Higher Education Institutions	148
The Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel in Indonesia	150
Academic Promotion of Higher Education Teaching Personnel	152
Aspects and Issues Regarding Higher Education Teaching Personnel	157
Concluding Remarks	163
References.	164
Appendix	165

Chapter 06: Japan

Academic Promotion of Higher Education Teaching Personnel in Japan 167

National Overview	168
Criteria for Academic Promotion	171
Procedures for Academic Promotion.	172
Problems and Impacts	175
Conclusion	181
References.	182

Chapter 07: Republic of Korea

Academic Promotion of Higher Education Teaching

Personnel: A Korean Case. 185

Context and Background of Academic Promotion	186
National Policy Objectives and Their Impact on Academic Promotion . . .	190
Structure, Criteria, and Implementation of Academic Promotion: Case Studies of Three Universities	200
Concluding Remarks: Current Issues and Challenges.	217
References.	225

Chapter 08: Malaysia

Academic Promotion in Malaysian Public Universities: Amidst Changing Priorities and Multiple Reward Systems 229

Introduction	230
Perspectives on Academic Promotion	233
The Promotion System in Malaysian Public Universities	236
Criteria for Academic Promotion in Malaysian Public Universities	240
Procedures for Evaluating and Promoting Higher Education Teaching Personnel	249
Issues and Challenges in Academic Promotion	260
Impacts of Academic Promotion Mechanisms	273
Conclusion	278
Reference	279

Chapter 09: Philippines

Academic Promotion of Higher Education Teaching

Personnel in the Philippines. 291

Context and Background.	292
National System of Academic Promotion in State Universities and Colleges	300
Issues and Challenges.	313
Concluding Remarks	317
Acknowledgments	319
References.	319

Chapter 10: Sri Lanka

Academic Promotion in Higher Education Institutions within the Purview of the University Grants Commission of Sri Lanka – A Review.	321
References.	331

Chapter 11: Thailand

Academic Promotion of Higher Education Teaching Personnel in Thailand	333
Context and Background of Academic Promotion	334
National Policy Objectives and Their Impact on Academic Promotion	339
Structure and Criteria for Academic Promotion.	342
Challenges and Implications of Evaluation Criteria for Academic Promotion	362
Concluding Remarks	368
References.	372

Appendix:

UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel (1997 Recommendation)	375
--	-----

FOREWORD

TEACHERS ARE at the centre of quality higher education systems. Yet too often we do not measure effective teaching in higher education – we measure contact hours and content delivery. Similarly, performance metrics and university rankings are often based on faculty research outputs such as journal publications and research grants. While research productivity is critically important to quality higher education, any narrow conceptions of quality do not represent the range of knowledge, skills and competencies required of faculty today. From global climate change to sustainable development, the challenges we face are deeply interconnected and require a reinvigorated debate about the future role of the academic profession – one that effectively balances quality teaching, research and service. Each of these three pillars is fundamental to the academic profession and to addressing our complex global challenges.

In September 2015, the international community launched the 17 Sustainable Development Goals. Goal four is known as Education 2030, which aims to *ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all*. This includes equitable and increased access to quality higher education. To reach this goal and its corresponding targets, we need everyone to be involved, including our most talented and passionate higher education teaching personnel.

Education 2030 recognizes that we need sufficient numbers of high quality teachers using learner-centred, active and collaborative pedagogical approaches. To meet this need, we must first explore how to effectively train, hire and promote the next generation of scholars. These goals are central to UNESCO's mission, including its norms

and standards, such as the *1997 Recommendation Concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel*. The 1997 Recommendation is the international standard for higher education systems worldwide to ensure teaching personnel have the appropriate status and professional development opportunities they deserve.

To explore these issues and how the 1997 Recommendation is being implemented in Asia and the Pacific, UNESCO Bangkok convened experts over the course of two years to collect and review case studies on the status of higher education teaching personnel in public research-intensive universities. The participating experts were part of UNESCO Bangkok's Education Research Institutes Network (ERI-Net). Founded in 2009, ERI-Net is UNESCO Bangkok's forum for researchers and national education think tanks to address timely issues and share their expertise with UNESCO, the Asia-Pacific community, and beyond.

With a focus on professional advancement policies and practices in Asia-Pacific, UNESCO Bangkok and ERI-Net's aim was to collect promising practices and assess emerging challenges on how higher education teaching personnel are recruited, evaluated and promoted in the region. Each of these issues has tremendous implications for how we measure progress towards Education 2030 and promote quality teaching more generally.

The resulting case studies include important issues that are fundamental to UNESCO's mandate, including to promote gender equality. The 1997 Recommendation and UNESCO as a whole are committed to ensure gender equality, such as equal opportunity and treatment of women as higher education teaching personnel. Together, the ERI-Net case studies extend beyond gender and also address concerns of teaching personnel with disabilities as well as the fair treatment of part-time staff and other potentially vulnerable people.

UNESCO Bangkok would like to thank the National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN), Universiti Sains Malaysia for hosting the first ERI-Net expert meeting on academic promotion in May 2014. This meeting was followed by the second ERI-Net expert meeting on the topic in November, which was generously hosted by the College of Education at Zhejiang University in Hangzhou, China. UNESCO Bangkok is grateful to the hosts and authors for their support, persistence and thoughtful contributions to this review.

Given the scale of this challenge, ERI-Net experts contributing to this collection took invaluable steps to help assess professional advancement policies and practices of higher education teaching personnel in Asia and the Pacific. Going forward, we hope this research effort contributes to a robust debate within the region about the future of the teaching profession in higher education and the critical importance of effective teaching, research, and service in addressing the world's most pressing and interconnected development challenges. UNESCO Bangkok will join you on this journey to promote quality education.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Gwang-Jo Kim". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letter 'G' being particularly large and stylized.

Gwang-Jo Kim
Director
UNESCO Bangkok

SYNTHESIS REPORT:

CASE STUDIES ON PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN ASIA-PACIFIC

**Libing Wang
Wesley Teter**

UNESCO Asia-Pacific Regional Bureau for Education

FOR MORE than two decades, the Asia and Pacific region has benefited from unprecedented economic growth, bringing more people out of poverty faster than any other region or time in history.¹ Sound policies and increasing access to higher education have helped to develop a foundation for continuous economic growth. However, mass enrolment in higher education and the diversification of institutions have also contributed to sharp distinctions in the quality of education and have challenged the status of higher education teaching personnel, including individuals engaged to teach, undertake research, or provide educational services in a higher education institution or programme. The critical importance of these issues was recognized during the 2009 World Conference on Higher Education.² As the only United Nations agency with a mandate in higher education, the World Conference called on UNESCO to enhance the attractiveness of academic careers and ensure adequate working conditions in line with international standards.

In particular, UNESCO, within its five functions as a laboratory of ideas, catalyst for international cooperation, standard-setter, capacity-builder, and clearinghouse should help Member States address the professional status of higher education teaching personnel. For nearly twenty years, the 1997 UNESCO Recommendation Concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel (1997 Recommendation) has served as a policy framework to safeguard the rights and freedoms, duties and responsibilities, as well as the terms and conditions of employment, for higher education teaching personnel, including recruitment, appraisal and promotion. Above all, the 1997 Recommendation highlights the decisive role of teaching personnel in the advancement of society.

Through its standards-setting instruments, such as the 1997 Recommendation (see Appendix), UNESCO recognizes that a fair and open system of professional advancement policies and practices is essential to quality higher education and sustainable development. In November 2015, the UNESCO General Conference further elaborated on this recommendation through the endorsement of the Sustainable

¹ Packard, T. G. and Van Nguyen, T. 2014. *East Asia Pacific at Work: Employment, Enterprise, and Well-being*. World Bank: Washington, DC.

² UNESCO. 2009. *Communiqué - The New Dynamics of Higher Education and Research for Societal Change and Development*. The 2009 World Conference on Higher Education, Paris.

Development Goals and the Education 2030 Framework for Action. Education 2030 calls for quality education including teacher policies and regulations to ensure that teaching personnel are empowered, fairly recruited and compensated, well trained, professionally qualified, motivated, equitably and efficiently distributed across the whole education system, and supported with well-resourced and effectively governed education systems.

Quality higher education also requires systems for managing teachers, governance, accountability mechanisms and strong public financial management. A fair and transparent education system of professional advancement policies and practices is recognized as a hallmark of good governance. Along these lines, the 1997 Recommendation states that:

“Higher education teaching personnel should enjoy: a just and open system of career development including fair procedures for appointment, tenure where applicable, promotion, dismissal, and other related matters; and an effective, fair and just system of labour relations within the institution, consistent with the international standards.”

UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel (adopted 11 November 1997)

These concerns are relevant to the more established higher education systems as well as to the emerging systems. For example, significant inequalities within the Asia-Pacific region can undermine regional cooperation and the advancement of science, technology, education and culture. Such inequalities can contribute to flows of talented staff and students from the less well-endowed systems to those with more resources. While widely recognized as important, the professional status and accountability of higher education teaching personnel, including recruitment, appraisal, and promotion have yet to receive significant attention in terms of research and analysis within the Asia-Pacific region.

At UNESCO Bangkok’s 2013 Annual Meeting of the Education Research Institutes Network (ERI-Net) held from 17-19 October in Bangkok, Thailand, ERI-Net members agreed to address the issue by focusing on professional advancement policies and practices of higher education teaching personnel. After development of a joint research framework during an ERI-Net meeting in Penang, Malaysia the following May, eleven case studies were presented at the ERI-Net Annual

Meeting in Hangzhou, China from 26-28 November 2014. Together, the case studies represent the culmination of ERI-Net's research to date.

In the following section, it will be helpful to first discuss the research design for the case studies on recruitment, appraisal and promotion policies and practices in Asia and the Pacific. This includes the primary research questions. The second section explores the policy context of academic promotion in Asia-Pacific. This overview sets the context to describe academic hierarchies and criteria for advancement, which are elaborated in each of the individual case studies. The fourth section discusses the procedures for academic promotion, including how policies are operationalized in each higher education system. While still preliminary, the final section identifies key lessons learned and opportunities for further research. To begin, the next section outlines the research design and overarching research questions guiding this review.

I. Research design

Facing the need to reshape higher education to meet rapidly evolving social and economic challenges, ERI-Net researchers focused their case studies on professional advancement policies and practices, including how academic staff are evaluated and promoted. ERI-Net researchers reviewed policies and practices from the following eleven countries/regions: Australia, Cambodia, China³, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (China), Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, and Thailand.

In consultation with the ERI-Net Secretariat at UNESCO Bangkok, researchers agreed on a common research framework (see Appendix). The goals of this effort were to document issues and raise awareness of the 1997 Recommendation, collect and analyse innovative policies, and develop a technical document on academic career development to benefit all Member States in Asia-Pacific. In addition, undertaking a study on the status of academic personnel can stimulate awareness of their fundamental role in higher education.

In the context of this review, higher education teaching personnel includes:

³ The case study for China was presented but not finalized.

“those persons in institutions or programmes of higher education who are engaged to teach and/or to undertake scholarship and/or to undertake research and/or to provide educational services to students or to the community at large.”

- 1997 Recommendation

Given the wide ranging diversity of institutions within Asia-Pacific, ERI-Net researchers focused their case studies primarily on teaching personnel at public research-intensive higher education institutions. However, the reviews vary in terms of breadth and depth. To ensure the case studies reflect national-level priorities, researchers were given significant flexibility to determine how many institutions would be assessed as well as appropriate investigative approaches (e.g. the case study from Thailand involved faculty interviews as well as document analysis). Given the preliminary nature of this study, the related challenges and opportunities in each case study reflect different types of higher education systems throughout the region.

Based on the research framework, the case studies explore academic promotion in four main areas:

- i. Policy context;
- ii. Academic hierarchy and criteria for promotion;
- iii. Procedures for evaluation and promotion;
- iv. Implications and lessons learned.

To better understand how policy makers and institutional leaders operationalize academic promotion policies and the 1997 Recommendation, ERI-Net researchers used the key areas above to develop four research questions. Given the diversity of the Asia-Pacific region, each case study is unique but guided by the following overarching questions.

1. Policy context in Asia-Pacific: How do governments and higher education stakeholders operationalize academic promotion? This question aims to explore the current policy context, level of centralization, and the relationship with academic promotion practices. Related factors include:
 - a. Institutional and national policies that govern academic promotion (i.e. exploring policy goals related to institutional autonomy and decentralization);

- b. How policy impacts teaching staff morale, behaviour, and campus culture;
 - c. Any major confounding issues related to academic promotion, including dimensions from the 1997 Recommendation such as: status and working conditions; individual rights and freedoms; terms and conditions of employment; terms and conditions of employment of women, disabled, and part-time higher education teaching personnel; negotiation of terms and conditions of employment; and security of employment; and
 - d. Managerial considerations cited in the 1997 Recommendation including: appraisal, professionalism, accountability, discipline, and dismissal.
2. Criteria for advancement: What are the structures and criteria for academic promotion in public research-intensive universities? According to the 1997 Recommendation, higher education institutions should ensure that performance evaluations are based only on academic criteria of competence in research, teaching, and other academic or professional duties as interpreted by academic peers. Related research areas include:
- a. Description of the academic hierarchy and related requirements for each level;
 - b. Developing a list of criteria used for performance evaluation and academic promotion;
 - c. How do promotion criteria impact professional performance and the ability of institutions to achieve their stated mission?
3. Procedures: How are promotion decisions made? Fair procedures for assessing academic personnel are central to teaching, learning, and the research process. As such, higher education institutions should ensure that performance evaluation procedures and academic promotion practices are based on fair criteria and a just and open system of career development. What are the specific procedures and who is engaged in the decision-making process?
4. Implications: What are the key obstacles and lessons learned related to professional advancement policies and practices? Trends such as massification and the internationalization of higher

education have significantly impacted traditional roles and tasks of higher education teaching personnel. Going forward, what are the emerging trends and needs related to academic promotion in higher education?

Building on these core questions, the ERI-Net research group can contribute to the goal of deepening a shared understanding of quality education in the Asia and Pacific region (i.e. Education 2030) at a time when the academic profession is confronting new challenges in shaping universities for the twenty-first century. The following section explores the underlying policy context from the perspective of government and higher education stakeholders.

II. Exploring the policy context of academic promotion in Asia-Pacific

Based on research question one, initial findings from the ERI-Net case studies highlight several common challenges related to academic promotion policies in Asia and the Pacific. Such challenges include creating appropriate incentives and an accountability system that effectively harnesses the energy of faculty members based on appropriate national and institutional level goals. The 1997 Recommendation recognizes the diversity of administrative arrangements that apply to higher education teaching personnel, including whether the regulations of civil service apply to them.

Regardless of the administrative context, teaching personnel constitute an exceptionally valuable cultural and scientific asset that deserves fair and transparent criteria for career advancement. This sentiment was captured well by ERI-Net researcher, Dr. Martin Hayden from Southern Cross University in Australia who agreed that academic promotion policies should reflect teaching personnel as “culturally valued and well regarded.” This hope is a fundamental value expressed in the 1997 Recommendation and explored throughout the ERI-Net case studies.

In this regard, the case studies present a diverse region yet common challenge with regards to effectively balancing research, teaching, and service, the core functions of research-intensive universities. The case studies highlight the range of approaches to the management and status of teaching personnel, from civil service status in countries such as Cambodia, Malaysia, and Indonesia (with Thailand having a so-called ‘two-tier system’ with both government officials and university employees

as teaching personnel) to the highly autonomous management approaches in Hong Kong SAR, China and Australia. Overall, the cases provide different perspectives on how governments and higher education stakeholders approach the issue of academic promotion.

For example, because universities in Australia manage their own academic staff policies, there is no centralized standard for making academic promotion decisions. However, several core principles are widely shared among peer institutions which contribute to a decentralized yet nationally coherent system for academic promotion policies. Meanwhile, Malaysian academics employed in public universities are considered public civil servants and therefore are bound by the rules and regulations of the civil service.

In Cambodia, public teaching personnel are also civil servants. According to the government's current strategic plan for education (2014-2018), teaching personnel play not only a critical role in response to increasing access, but are also central to ensuring the quality of higher education overall. The modern development of higher education in Cambodia is relatively recent and uneven compared to other countries, even within South-East Asia, so the current review of academic promotion policy is well-timed.

In Indonesia, an academic is a professional educator and scientist with the main task of transforming, generating, and disseminating scientific knowledge and technology through education, research, and community service. Academic promotion therefore takes into account his or her performance both as a civil servant and as a member of the university community.

Strategies to enhance competitiveness

Throughout the Asia-Pacific region, policies regulating academic promotion tend to focus on research productivity. In practice, this include incentivizing publications in “high impact” journals and prestigious funding opportunities. While this may seem most appropriate for a research-intensive university, the emphasis on research productivity is also used as a measure of overall institutional quality and part of a drive to compete in international rankings.

For example, some countries have developed detailed strategies to improve their higher education systems in order to transform flagship institutions into “world class universities”. In Sri Lanka, for example,

academic appointments should be sufficiently rigorous to command respect of the students and of their peers – nationally and internationally – thereby enhancing the image and profile of the university. In the Republic of Korea and elsewhere in the region, some universities offer high bonuses for a paper published in renowned international journals, thereby incentivizing a specific type of research output. The individual case studies explore the implications of this sometimes narrow view of quality.

Briefly, some ERI-Net researchers noted that an intense focus on research productivity and its link to academic promotion arose from the emergence of international rankings of universities, which among other dimensions emphasize research output. Key drivers such as international rankings, while outside the scope of this review, can adversely impact academic life, especially for part-time faculty who may be more vulnerable.

Status of part-time faculty

In some higher education systems, part-time faculty are reported to have an unequal status and face greater pressure to perform. For example, in the Republic of Korea, the ERI-Net case study highlights a discrepancy between part-time and full-time faculty members in terms of their status and treatment. Similarly in the Philippines, as reported, if faculty are untenured, they face the prospect of unemployment if they do not publish within a defined period of time (e.g. five years).

The 1997 Recommendation, as a policy tool to enhance the status of higher education teaching personnel, addresses some of these concerns, including the employment conditions of part-time faculty. It states that:

“Higher education teaching personnel employed regularly on a part-time basis should: (a) receive proportionately the same remuneration as higher education teaching personnel employed on a full-time basis and enjoy equivalent basic conditions of employment; (b) benefit from conditions equivalent to those of higher-education teaching personnel employed on a full-time basis...”

- 1997 Recommendation

To further explore how these issues are operationalized, the following section highlights the academic hierarchies and specific criteria used for career advancement in Asia-Pacific.

III. Academic hierarchies and criteria for advancement

In terms of academic hierarchy, no standard structure exists either in the 1997 Recommendation or across the Asia-Pacific region (Table 1). While diverse, the titles of assistant professor, associate professor and professor are common throughout most of the research-intensive public universities assessed in the case studies.

Another common link that many researchers reported is a shift from strong teaching to strong research and innovation-based criteria as faculty progress towards becoming a full professor. For example, in the case in India different weights for teaching, research and service are associated with different stages – again with an increasing emphasis on research based on academic rank.

Table 1: Overview of academic hierarchies in Asia-Pacific*

Country/region	Common academic hierarchies at public research-intensive universities
Australia	associate lecturer, lecturer, senior lecturer, associate professor, professor
Cambodia	assistant professor, associate professor, professor
China	assistant teacher, lecturer, associate professor, professor
Hong Kong SAR	assistant professor, associate professor, professor, chair professor
India	tutors/demonstrators, lecturers, senior lecturers, readers, professors, high academic grade professors (Stage 6)
Indonesia	assistant lecturer, lecturer, senior lecturer, professor
Malaysia	lecturer, senior lecturer, associate professor, professor
Philippines	instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor
Republic of Korea	instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor
Sri Lanka	lecturer, senior lecturer (grades 11, 1, and 11/1), associate professor, professor, senior professor
Thailand	assistant lecturer, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, (professor of highest level, formerly known as Sor. 11)

* While not an exhaustive list, this table summarises academic hierarchies reported in the case studies on public research-intensive universities.

Performance evaluation criteria

In terms of performance evaluation criteria, higher education institutions should ensure that performance evaluations for teaching personnel are based only on academic criteria or professional duties as interpreted by academic peers (see next section for an overview of performance evaluation procedures). While not standardized, such performance evaluation criteria typically include:

- individual performance in research;
- teaching load and supervision;
- contribution to institutional administration;
- social service.

For example, in Thailand, evaluation criteria are based on academic criteria covering the assessment of teaching and research performance. With regards to teaching assessment, some universities draw on a more detailed assessment of teaching than was evident in other cases. The measures for teaching include examples such as: the ability to stimulate thinking, synthesising and critical thinking skills, or the ability to develop and improve existing teaching plans. The criteria were assessed as part of four primary measures including number of teaching hours per academic year, the quality of classroom teaching, the quality of teaching materials or written supplements, and the quality of academic outputs. But, how to actually measure these outcomes in a transparent and consistent manner is less clear.

In Malaysia, teaching and learning often include additional objective measures such as: number of courses taught, number of credits for the courses, number of students per course, academic advising, other academic workloads, undergraduate student supervisory and curriculum, and innovation in course delivery.

Meanwhile, assessment criteria across much of Japan's universities appear quite thorough, yet studies have found that such frameworks are not widely utilized in the decision-making process (see case study on Japan). This apparent lack of implementation can lead to professional stagnation or inertia, whereby faculty are promoted primarily on the basis of seniority rather than academic merit alone.

In Sri Lanka, promotion to the posts of associate professor and professor were amended in the late 1990's to ensure a balanced contribution between: teaching and academic development; research, scholarship and creative work, and dissemination of knowledge and contribution to institutional, regional, national and international development. Such criteria can significantly impact academic life on campus. They are also quite thorough and challenging to assess.

In the Republic of Korea, criteria for performance-based funding programmes also impact teaching personnel, including criteria to assess the number of publications by faculty members, adding weight to papers published in international journals, and increasing the proportion of courses taught in English. Criteria more specifically related to academic promotion include: higher weight to papers published in international journals (e.g. Science Citation Index (SCI) journals) compared to national publications; the proportion of courses taught in English; and measures of industry and university cooperation. As will be explained in the following section, such criteria can have a significant influence on domestic research needs as well as funding for university systems as a whole.

Overall, in the case studies collected, evaluation criteria reflected an underlying concern for fairness (e.g. an impartial merit-rating system) and drive to enhance academic staff performance. However, as reflected in the context of each case study, implementation remains a challenge. Researchers cited burdensome self-evaluation reports, ineffective measures for teaching performance, and other concerns related to how promotion decisions are made.

IV. Procedures: How promotion decisions are made

Academic promotion is recognition of the faculty members' accomplishments, growth, and development as a teacher, scholar, and his or her service in support of the university's mission. Typical evaluation procedures involve self-assessment, input from a faculty council, external peer review, and final approval from institutional leadership. Based on the 1997 Recommendation (Section C.47 on Appraisal), performance evaluation procedures should include:

- evaluation based only on academic criteria of competence in research, teaching and other academic or professional duties as interpreted by academic peers;

- evaluation procedures take due account of the difficulty inherent in measuring personal capacity, which seldom manifests itself in a constant and unfluctuating manner;
- evaluation that involves any kind of direct assessment of the work of higher education teaching personnel, by students and/or fellow colleagues and/or administrators, such assessment is objective and the criteria and the results are made known to the individual(s) concerned;
- results of appraisal of higher education teaching personnel are also taken into account when establishing the staffing of the institution and considering renewal of employment; and
- higher education teaching personnel have the right to appeal to an impartial body against assessments which they deem to be unjustified.

For example, in the case of Malaysia, a candidate for promotion will complete the required forms, provide all supporting documents and submit a scoring sheet to check the eligibility to apply for academic promotion. The application will be screened by the dean and a designated faculty committee. Once the initial review is complete, the application will be sent to an external assessor for evaluation and comment before a final decision is taken by the university board. Similarly in China, many universities have organized academic review committees and have collaborated with external experts for peer review in order to achieve a justifiable result. One question this raises is the role or relative importance of external performance evaluations during the performance review process, an issue that was not reviewed in detail and could be explored in future research (see next section).

In general, throughout the performance review process, the demand for evidence imposes a heavy workload on applicants seeking promotion. In Australia, not only do applicants need to provide details of the quality and impact of their research, but they must also document their achievements in teaching, including student and peer feedback, and they must also demonstrate how they have served the university, whether through administrative leadership or more broadly. While many case studies reported a merit-based process, several highlighted instances of promotion based primarily on seniority, where there is little doubt who will be promoted and when.

The 1997 Recommendation highlights that higher education institutions should endeavour to open their governance systems in order to be accountable. In the interest of quality and excellence, institutions should ensure that faculty are treated fairly and justly, and without discrimination. Values such as academic freedom and fundamental human rights can be highlighted by implementing policies and procedures that ensure the equitable treatment of women and minorities and by eliminating sexual and racial harassment. The goal of such measures is to ensure that higher education personnel are not impeded in their work in the classroom or in their research capacity by violence, intimidation or harassment. Some case studies reflect concerns of gender bias in the application process and even instances of harassment, which highlights an ongoing need to consider the interests and priorities of both women and men throughout the recruitment, assessment and appeal process. Where possible, case studies provided sex-disaggregated data and statistics.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the right to appeal promotion decisions is largely in place, although delays are a significant concern in some systems. These policies and appeal mechanisms are central to the effective governance of higher education institutions. The related implications of promotion policies are explored further in the following concluding section.

IV. Implications and lessons learned

The case studies submitted by ERI-Net researchers document the rich diversity of academic promotion policies and criteria across Asia-Pacific. While not representative of the wide range of higher education institutions in the region, there are a number of important implications and lessons learned that are reflected in the case studies that follow.

Intense focus on research productivity

First, there is intense focus on research productivity, sometimes at the expense of teaching and service. In the context of research-intensive universities, the importance of teaching performance may be undervalued in the academic promotion process. By drawing on lessons learned from institutions and systems throughout the region, new and effective measures for evaluating teaching performance can be honed and shared. Several of the ERI-Net case studies outline ways of ensuring that teaching and learning is actively connected to research

– the goal being to continuously strive towards enhancing the quality and relevance of university education overall.

In addition, some academic promotion policies in the Asia-Pacific region may be unintentionally encouraging short-term research. Along these lines, pressure to publish may be linked to lower quality research outputs (i.e. quantity vs. quality) and an aversion to longer-term research efforts, which may not lead to immediate publications or research outputs. The implications of incentivizing “recognized international research journals” can also have long-term implications for domestic-level research needs and priorities. Emphasis on international (i.e. English-language publications) and high impact journals may limit incentives and rewards for domestic research, which raises questions about the role and function of regional research institutions.

Need to strengthen the link between governance and academic promotion strategies

As is evident in the case studies presented, defining excellence and relevant criteria for academic promotion are key policy challenges for the future of higher education systems in the region. Effective communication of evaluation mechanisms between faculty and administrators may contribute to open governance practices and the long-term development of higher education in the Asia-Pacific region.

Going forward, there are emerging opportunities to strengthen the link between higher education governance and academic career advancement mechanisms. This perspective is central to the 1997 Recommendation and efforts to create a just and open system of career development, including fair procedures for appointment, tenure where applicable, promotion, dismissal, and related matters. Such policies recognize teaching in higher education as a profession and form of public service that requires expert knowledge and specialized skills acquired and maintained through lifelong research and development

Future research is needed to monitor application of the 1997 Recommendation

The case studies that follow captured an initial yet incomplete picture of the 1997 Recommendation in practice. While effective academic promotion policies and procedures are central to quality higher education, there are many more dimensions to the status of higher

education teaching personnel that are not included in this review, such as preparation for the profession, individual rights and freedoms including academic freedom, publication rights, and the international exchange of information, as well as the role of external peer review in performance evaluations.

While continuing to monitor the full application of the 1997 Recommendation and new frameworks for action such as Education 2030, UNESCO Bangkok will take stock of existing policies and mechanisms so that a more complete picture can be consolidated at the regional level to assist all Member States in Asia-Pacific. Going forward, policy makers, university administrators and the research community can play a central role in developing and monitoring effective recruitment, appraisal and academic promotion practices based on the 1997 Recommendation and other internationally agreed standards.

Based on the ERI-Net research to date, defining excellence and relevant criteria for the professional advancement of teaching personnel is central to the development and sustainability of quality higher education.



Libing Wang

Dr. Libing Wang is Chief of Section for Educational Innovation and Skills Development at UNESCO Bangkok, the Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education. His areas of responsibility with UNESCO cover higher education, teacher education, ICT in education, TVET, Education for Sustainable Development, and research and

foresight in Asia and the Pacific region. Prior to joining UNESCO, he was a Professor of Comparative Education at Zhejiang University, People's Republic of China. His career in China was closely related to UNESCO as he had served as director of UNESCO-APEID Associated Centre at Zhejiang University for more than ten years. He was secretary of the Global University Network for Innovation: Asia and the Pacific (GUNI-AP) from 2002 to 2012, and had coordinated the operation of the regional network since its inception in 2002. He was a member of the Asia-Pacific regional follow-up committee to the 1998 World Conference on Higher Education and a long-time consultant to the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO. Dr. Wang got his doctoral degree in Comparative Education in 1994 at Hangzhou University, People's Republic of China. He was a visiting fellow at the University of Sussex and University of Warwick in the United Kingdom in the early and late 1990s. He published widely in the areas of comparative education, higher education policies, and teacher education.



Wesley Teter

Wesley Teter is a Senior Consultant at UNESCO Bangkok, the Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education in the Section for Educational Innovation and Skills Development. He consults with Member States throughout Asia and the Pacific on the recognition of qualifications in higher education, as well as on National

Qualifications Frameworks (NQF), Open Educational Resources, MOOCs, and more. Mr. Teter is a research practitioner with extensive experience in network management, collaborative governance, and international mobility – from 2005 to 2016 he was based in Berlin, Budapest, New Delhi, Hong Kong and Bangkok. He is a Ph.D. Candidate in the Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong and serves as a Visiting Scholar in the Master of Public Administration Program in Public Policy and Public Administration at Mahidol University in Thailand (2017).

ACADEMIC STAFF PROMOTION IN AUSTRALIA:

CHARACTERISTICS AND CONCERNS

Martin Hayden

Lismore, Australia



Martin Hayden

Mr. Martin Hayden is Professor of Higher Education in the School of Education at Southern Cross University. His principal area of teaching is in the Secondary program, where he is responsible for a foundation unit in Education Studies. His research interests are in the areas of higher education, concerning student participation, student finances and university governance. He joined the University in October 1993, when he was appointed Professor and Director of Teaching and Learning. In 2002, he moved to the School of Education and was Head of School until the end of 2005. From 1998 until 2002, he was Chair of the Academic Board and a member of the University Council. Prior to joining the University, he held a senior academic appointment at La Trobe University in Melbourne.

ACADEMIC PROMOTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION TEACHING PERSONNEL IN CAMBODIA

**Leang Un,
Bonarin Hem,
Seng Sangha.**

Phnom Penh, Cambodia



Leang Un

Mr. Leang Un, PhD, graduated in Social and Behavioural Science from the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Currently, he is a deputy director of the Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport (MoEYS) and chief of the Innovative and Development Grants of the Higher Education Quality and Capacity Improvement Project,

co-funded by the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) and the World Bank. In addition to his administrative role, his research interests focus on education policy and the contribution of education to the development after the post-conflict period.



Bonarin Hem

Professor Bonarin Hem has worked for Paññāsāstra University of Cambodia (PUC) for more than ten years. He is currently Associate Dean of Academic Program Office and Chair of IQA Sub-technical Committee along with his additional teaching assignments for undergraduate and graduate programs at the Faculty of Education. Over the last twenty years of work experience

in higher education, Prof. Bonarin has held positions in teaching and management at universities. His research interests focus mainly on educational leadership, curriculum development, and human rights perceived from educational perspectives.



Seng Sangha

Mr. Seng Sangha, assistant researcher, former Institute of Foreign Languages, Royal University of Phnom Penh graduate, earned his Master's degree from Northern Illinois University in 2009. His education focuses on Literacy Education with the emphasis in ESL/Bilingual Education. He had been teaching English to university students in Cambodia since his return from the United

States. Since 2011, he has worked for the Department of Higher Education, MoEYS. In his current capacity, besides his day-to-day work, he has been involved in several research projects regarding regional credit transfer systems and tracer studies for university graduates in Cambodia. In addition, he has been involved in translation projects on basic research skills conducted by his department and the Open Institute, a local NGO.

**ACADEMIC PROMOTION
OF HIGHER EDUCATION
TEACHING PERSONNEL
IN HONG KONG**

**Roger Chao Jr.
Gerard Postiglione**

Hong Kong SAR, China



Roger Y. Chao Jr.

Mr. Roger Y. Chao Jr. has a PhD in Asian and International Studies from the City University of Hong Kong. He is currently a Senior Consultant for the International Centre for Higher Education Innovation, a UNESCO Category 2 Centre. He was formerly the higher education specialist for UNESCO Myanmar, and has continued to be engaged

in various consultancies with UNESCO. He has actively been publishing on regionalization and internationalization of higher education, higher education policies, comparative and international education, and sociology of education in various platforms including international peer-reviewed journal, edited volumes, and international media.



Gerard A. Postiglione

Mr. Gerard A. Postiglione is Chair Professor of Higher Education, and former associate dean in the Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong. He published over 150 journal articles and book chapters, and 16 books. He has been a consultant for Asian Development Bank, United National Development Programme, Organization of Economic Cooperation and

Development, World Bank, and other agencies. His recent books include Shin, J. C., Postiglione, G. A., & Huang F. T. (ed.). and Mass higher education development in East Asia: Strategy, quality, and challenges, and Postiglione, G. A. & Jung, J. (ed.). The changing academic profession in Hong Kong: Governance, productivity, and global integration.

PROMOTION IN THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION IN INDIA:

UPWARD MOBILITY OF TEACHERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

**Jandhyala B G Tilak,
A. Mathew**

New Delhi, India



Jandhyala B. G. Tilak

Mr. Jandhyala B. G. Tilak, Professor is currently Vice Chancellor, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi, India. Professor Tilak has an M.A. Degree (Economics) Gold medalist from Andhra University and Ph.D. (Economics of Education) from the Delhi School of Economics; was on the research and teaching

faculty of University of Delhi, Indian Institute of Education, University of Virginia and the Hiroshima University (Japan); was also on the research staff of the World Bank. He is also a Visiting Professor in Economics, Sri Sathya Sai University; Hony. Visiting Fellow at Centre for International Cooperation in Education, Hiroshima University; and has authored/edited dozen books and about 300 research papers in the area of economics of education and development studies, published in reputed journals.



A. Mathew

Dr. A. Mathew received an M.Phil. and Ph.D. in Education from Jawaharlal Nehru University; served on the faculty of National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, and National Institute of Adult Education; worked with UNDP and UNESCO as a Resource Person of Education Community of Solution Exchange; Served as NUEPA Fellow and is

currently Senior Fellow, ICSSR. Has authored/edited more than half a dozen books and published more than 100 research monographs, papers, Occasional Papers, and articles in reputed journals on studies in educational development, education policy, formal, non-formal education, higher education and adult education/literacy movement in India.

**ACADEMIC PROMOTION
OF HIGHER EDUCATION
TEACHING PERSONNEL
IN INDONESIA**

Helmi

Padang, Indonesia



Helmi

Professor Helmi served as Vice Rector for Planning, Institutional Development, and Cooperation at Andalas University, Indonesia from 2010–2016. He is a social scientist by training (BS in Socio-economic of agriculture; Masters in Social development studies; and Ph.D. in Agrarian Development focused on public policy). He was actively involved in

activities of various international organizations, including UNESCO (sustainability science and social inclusion), ASEAN Secretariat and Bappenas Indonesia (youth development index), The Ford Foundation (applied research for policy reform), Asian Development Bank (integrated water resources management and irrigated agriculture development), and UNDP (Global Water Partnership). He taught and did research in the following subjects: Social Entrepreneurship; The Politics of Public Policy; Dynamics of Rural Regional Development; Agriculture and Foods Policy; Integrated Natural Resources Management Policy and Planning; Sustainable Agriculture Development; Lobby and Negotiation; Philosophy of Science. His latest publication is: Integrating Social Entrepreneurship in the Design Principles of Long Enduring Institutions, a chapter contribution in a newly published book from Elsevier on *Sustainable Natural Resources Management in Dynamic Asia*.

**ACADEMIC PROMOTION
OF HIGHER EDUCATION
TEACHING PERSONNEL
IN JAPAN**

Taro Mochizuki

Osaka, Japan

Taro Mochizuki



Prof. Dr. Taro Mochizuki, Regional Director of the ASEAN Center for Academic Initiatives, created for the purpose of supporting Osaka University's outreach in the ASEAN region, has been working at the office in Bangkok, the Kingdom of Thailand, since April 2014, and has been developing public relations by networking with academic institutions in the

region, aiming at recruiting outstanding students from ASEAN countries and enhancing the international presence of Osaka University.

**ACADEMIC PROMOTION
OF HIGHER EDUCATION
TEACHING PERSONNEL:
A KOREAN CASE**

Kiyong Byun

Seoul, Republic of Korea



Kiyong Byun

Mr. Kiyong Byun is a Professor in the Department of Education and Director of the Higher Education Policy Research Institute at Korea University. He earned a PhD in Educational Policy and Management (higher education concentration) from University of Oregon (Eugene) in the US. His scholarly interest is higher education policy, in particular,

higher education governance, internationalization and globalization of higher education. Throughout his career, he worked for various governmental and international organizations, including the Ministry of Education (1992-2008) of Republic of Korea and OECD IMHE (Institutional Management in Higher Education: 2002~2005) programme in Paris, France.

ACADEMIC PROMOTION IN MALAYSIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES:

AMIDST CHANGING PRIORITIES AND MULTIPLE REWARD SYSTEMS

**Ibrahim Che Omar,
Aida Suraya Md. Yunus,
Norzaini Azman,
Ahmad Nurulazam Md Zain**

Penang, Malaysia



Ibrahim Che Omar

Professor Dato' Dr. Hj. Ibrahim Che Omar, *D.Eng.,P.S.K.,J.M.N.,DPSK (Kel)*, FASc, is currently the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research and Innovation) Universiti Malaysia Kelantan (UMK), a senior professor in Industrial Biotechnology and the Fellow, Science Academy Malaysia (ASM). He holds Doctor of Engineering (DEng) from

Hiroshima University, Japan. In his area of specialization of Industrial Biotechnology, he has completed over 30 research projects with 26 research awards, 10 academic awards, and 5 patents. He has published over 15 books and 400 research articles in journals and research proceedings. He was recognised as one of the top research scientists in Malaysia by ASM. Besides as a recipient of Language Award for his contribution in scientific writing, ia also a fellow of The National Institute on Higher Education Research (IPPTN). He is currently the Vice President of The Association of Research and Policy Development in Higher Education (PenDaPaT). A founder of the Malaysian Journal of Microbiology (MJM), Advisory Board of MJM, Asian Federation of Biotechnology, Journal of Industrial Technology and Editorial Board of 8 international journals, is also The Chief Editor of the Journal of Tropical Natural Resources. As one of the pioneers at UMK, he is responsible for the establishment of the Faculty of Agro Industry and Natural Resources, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Faculty of Earth Science, Faculty of Agro Based Industry, UMK-IPTA Centre of Excellence on ECER, MARA Entrepreneurship Science Foundation Programme, UMK Professor Council, Regional Network on Poverty Eradication (RENPER), Institute for Poverty Eradication (InsPEk), Research Management Centre, Post Graduate Centre, the establishment of UMK Jeli Campus and in the setting up of the Faculty of Bioengineering and Technology in 2016.



Aida Suraya Md. Yunus

Professor Dr. Aida Suraya Md. Yunus is a Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). Prior to appointment as dean, she was the director of the Centre for Academic Development (CADE) of UPM and the Chairman for the Council for Directors of

Teaching Learning Centres of Malaysian Public Universities. Dr Aida Suraya is an associate researcher with the Institute of Mathematical Research (INSPEM) and research fellow with the National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN). Her research work includes international collaboration with the Innovative Research Universities network of Australia, Research Institute for Higher Education (RIHE) of Hiroshima University and UNESCO Education Research Institutes Networks (ERI-Net) in the Asia-Pacific. She is part of numerous committees and task forces at the Ministry of Higher Education, among others working on the instrument for HiCOE for Teaching and Learning, Shift #9 of MEB on globalized online learning, national committee for MOOC development, and development of guideline for credit transfer of MOOC.



Norzaini Azman

Professor Dato Dr. Norzaini Azman is Professor of higher education at the Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. She also serves as an Associate Research Fellow at the National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN). She is currently the Secretary to the Malaysian Society for Research and Higher Education Policy Development (PenDaPaT)

(2015–2017). Her main research interests include policy and governance of higher education, the academic profession, and higher education leadership. She has collaborated with the Malaysian Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysian Higher Education Leadership Academy, International Educational Planning, Paris; the Asian Development Bank, SEMEO-RIHED and UNESCO Bangkok and the Malaysia–Australia Institute in various research projects. She has authored books on academic leadership, academic mobility and succession planning in the Malaysian university system and chapters and articles on higher education policies, the academic profession and academic leadership in local and international journals and books.



Ahmad Nurulazam Md Zain

Professor Dr. Ahmad Nurulazam Md Zain has a PhD in Curriculum and Instruction in Science from Michigan State University. As a Professor in Science Education at the School of Educational Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia, he has more than 25 years of teaching and research experience in USM and including a short stint at King's College London. He was

the Director of National Higher Education Research Institute (IPPTN), a national research institute located in Universiti Sains Malaysia and was responsible in doing policy research for the Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. His involvement in IPPTN began in 2000, as an Associate Research Fellow. For more than fifteen years of involvement in IPPTN, he has published numerous articles and research monographs for IPPTN that have been useful for the Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. His research areas include science education, higher education and computer education. He has directed and involved in research projects funded by the World Bank, OECD, Danish Cooperation for Environment and Development (DANCED), Ministry of Education, Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysian Electricity Supply Industry Trust Account (MESITA), Ministry of Youth and Sports, Ministry of Energy, Water and Communications, and Universiti Sains Malaysia. Several research projects are still in progress. His works have been published in national and international journals. He has also written chapters in books and monographs that have been published at both national and international level.

**ACADEMIC PROMOTION
OF HIGHER EDUCATION
TEACHING PERSONNEL
IN THE PHILIPPINES**

Ethel Agnes P. Valenzuela

Manila, Philippines



Ethel Agnes Pascua-Valenzuela

Dr. Ethel Agnes P. Valenzuela is the Deputy Director of Programme and Development for the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education (SEAMEO) Secretariat and is currently based in Bangkok, Thailand. She is a Technical Panel Expert of the Commission on Higher Education in Distance Education and Transnational Education. She is also a Board member of the Philippine Educational Measurement and Evaluation Association. She holds a doctoral degree from the De La Salle University, Philippines on Educational Management (1999). Throughout her career, Dr. Valenzuela served in inter-governmental and government organizations, including serving as Head/Senior Specialist of the Educational Research and Innovation Office at SEAMEO INNOTECH (2006-2015); UNESCO Commissioner in Education (2005-2010); Director IV of Student Services and International Affairs of the Commission on Higher Education (1995-2006) and a Senior Lecturer at the University of the Philippines College of Education in Diliman, Quezon City (2009-2015). Her research interest is teacher education policy, international and transnational higher education and academic mobility.

**ACADEMIC PROMOTION
IN HIGHER EDUCATION
INSTITUTIONS WITHIN
THE PURVIEW OF
THE UNIVERSITY GRANTS
COMMISSION OF SRI LANKA -
A REVIEW**

Ranjith Senaratne

Colombo, Sri Lanka



Ranjith Senaratne

Mr. Ranjith Senaratne carried out his doctoral Ranjith Senaratne holds a PhD from the University of Agriculture in Vienna. He is Professor and Chair of Crop Science at the University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka with over thirty-five years of experience in university education. He has served as Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture and Vice-Chancellor, University

of Ruhuna and as the Chairman of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Directors in 2006 with over twenty years of administrative experience in higher education. He has conducted research in biological nitrogen fixation, nutrient cycling in multiple cropping systems, nutrient dynamics in agro-forestry systems and restoration of degraded lands, and has over 75 publications to his credit. He has also been the President of the Agriculture & Forestry Section of the Sri Lanka Association for the Advancement of Science. The University of Durham in the UK conferred a doctoral degree (honoris causa) on him in recognition of his outstanding contribution in education, science, community development and international cooperation. He has also served as Chairman of the Ocean University of Sri Lanka and as Vice Chairman of the University Grants Commission, Sri Lanka.

**ACADEMIC PROMOTION
OF HIGHER EDUCATION
TEACHING PERSONNEL
IN THAILAND**

Nopraenu S. Dhirathiti

Bangkok, Thailand



Nopraenue Sajjarax Dhirathiti

Ms. Nopraenue Sajjarax Dhirathiti is Associate Professor and Director for the Master's Degree Programme in Public Policy and Public Administration, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Mahidol University, Thailand. She also currently serves as Deputy Dean for International Relations and Corporate Social

Communication at the Faculty of Graduate Studies, Mahidol University. She holds a PhD in Politics and International Studies from the University of Warwick. She served as Senior Programme Officer at the ASEAN University Network Secretariat during 1997-1998 and also as Senior Specialist on Higher Education Research at SEAMEO RIHED during 2007-2009 before joining Mahidol. Her research interest is lifelong learning policy, the harmonization and internationalization of higher education.

APPENDIX:
UNESCO RECOMMENDATION
CONCERNING THE STATUS OF
HIGHER-EDUCATION
TEACHING PERSONNEL
(1997 RECOMMENDATION)

UNESCO

Resolution adopted on the report of Commission II at the
26th plenary meeting, on 11 November 1997.

The General Conference,

Having examined document 29 C/12, containing the draft recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel, *Approves* the said Recommendation in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States and international conventions covered by the terms of Article IV, paragraph 4, of the Constitution.

Annex: Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel

Preamble

The General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), meeting in Paris from 21 October to 12 November 1997, at its 29th session,

Conscious of the responsibility of states for the provision of education for all in fulfilment of Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948),

Recalling in particular the responsibility of the states for the provision of higher education in fulfilment of Article 13, paragraph 1(c), of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966),

Conscious that higher education and research are instrumental in the pursuit, advancement and transfer of knowledge and constitute an exceptionally rich cultural and scientific asset,

Also conscious that governments and important social groups, such as students, industry and labour, are vitally interested in and benefit from the services and outputs of the higher education systems,

Recognizing the decisive role of higher- education teaching personnel in the advancement of higher education, and the importance of their contribution to the development of humanity and modern society,

Convinced that higher-education teaching personnel, like all other citizens, are expected to endeavour to enhance the observance in society of the cultural, economic, social, civil and political rights of all peoples,

Aware of the need to reshape higher education to meet social and economic changes and for higher-education teaching personnel to participate in this process,

Expressing concern regarding the vulnerability of the academic community to untoward political pressures which could undermine academic freedom,

Considering that the right to education, teaching and research can only be fully enjoyed in an atmosphere of academic freedom and autonomy for institutions of higher education and that the open communication of findings, hypotheses and opinions lies at the very heart of higher education and provides the strongest guarantee of the accuracy and objectivity of scholarship and research,

Concerned to ensure that higher-education teaching personnel enjoy the status commensurate with this role,

Recognizing the diversity of cultures in the world,

Taking into account the great diversity of the laws, regulations, practices and traditions which, in different countries, determine the patterns and organization of higher education,

Mindful of the diversity of arrangements which apply to higher-education teaching personnel in different countries, in particular according to whether the regulations concerning the public service apply to them,

Convinced nevertheless that similar questions arise in all countries with regard to the status of higher-education teaching personnel and that these questions call for the adoption of common approaches and so far as practicable the application of common standards which it is the purpose of this Recommendation to set out,

Bearing in mind such instruments as the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960), which recognizes that UNESCO has a duty not only to proscribe any form of discrimination in education, but also to promote equality of opportunity and treatment for all in education at all levels, including the conditions under which it is given, as well as the Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers (1966) and the UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Scientific Researchers (1974), as well as the instruments of the International Labour Organization on freedom of association and the right to organize and to collective bargaining and on equality of

opportunity and treatment,

Desiring to complement existing conventions, covenants and recommendations contained in international standards set out in the appendix with provisions relating to problems of particular concern to higher education institutions and their teaching and research personnel,

Adopts the present Recommendation on 11 November 1997.

I. Definitions

1. For the purpose of this Recommendation:
 - a. ‘higher education’ means programmes of study, training or training for research at the post-secondary level provided by universities or other educational establishments that are approved as institutions of higher education by the competent state authorities, and/or through recognized accreditation systems;
 - b. ‘research’, within the context of higher education, means original scientific, technological and engineering, medical, cultural, social and human science or educational research which implies careful, critical, disciplined inquiry, varying in technique and method according to the nature and conditions of the problems identified, directed towards the clarification and/or resolution of the problems, and when within an institutional framework, supported by an appropriate infrastructure;
 - c. ‘scholarship’ means the processes by which higher-education teaching personnel keep up to date with their subject, engage in scholarly editing, disseminate their work and improve their pedagogical skills as teachers in their discipline and upgrade their academic credentials;
 - d. ‘extension work’ means a service by which the resources of an educational institution are extended beyond its confines to serve a widely diversified community within the state or region regarded as the constituent area of the institution, so long as this work does not contradict the mission of the institution. In teaching it may include a wide range of activities such as extramural, lifelong and distance education delivered through evening classes, short courses, seminars and

institutes. In research it may lead to the provision of expertise to the public, private and non-profit sectors, various types of consultation, and participation in applied research and in implementing research results;

- e. ‘institutions of higher education’ means universities, other educational establishments, centres and structures of higher education, and centres of research and culture associated with any of the above, public or private, that are approved as such either through recognized accreditation systems or by the competent state authorities;
- f. ‘higher-education teaching personnel’ means all those persons in institutions or programmes of higher education who are engaged to teach and/or to undertake scholarship and/or to undertake research and/or to provide educational services to students or to the community at large.

II. Scope

- 2. This Recommendation applies to all higher-education teaching personnel.

III. Guiding principles

- 3. The global objectives of international peace, understanding, cooperation and sustainable development pursued by each Member State and by the United Nations require, *inter alia*, education for peace and in the culture of peace, as defined by UNESCO, as well as qualified and cultivated graduates of higher education institutions, capable of serving the community as responsible citizens and undertaking effective scholarship and advanced research and, as a consequence, a corps of talented and highly qualified higher-education teaching personnel.
- 4. Institutions of higher education, and more particularly universities, are communities of scholars preserving, disseminating and expressing freely their opinions on traditional knowledge and culture, and pursuing new knowledge without constriction by prescribed doctrines. The pursuit of new knowledge and its application lie at the heart of the mandate of such institutions of higher education. In higher education institutions where original

research is not required, higher-education teaching personnel should maintain and develop knowledge of their subject through scholarship and improved pedagogical skills.

5. Advances in higher education, scholarship and research depend largely on infrastructure and resources, both human and material, and on the qualifications and expertise of higher-education teaching personnel as well as on their human, pedagogical and technical qualities, underpinned by academic freedom, professional responsibility, collegiality and institutional autonomy.
6. Teaching in higher education is a profession: it is a form of public service that requires of higher education personnel expert knowledge and specialized skills acquired and maintained through rigorous and lifelong study and research; it also calls for a sense of personal and institutional responsibility for the education and welfare of students and of the community at large and for a commitment to high professional standards in scholarship and research.
7. Working conditions for higher-education teaching personnel should be such as will best promote effective teaching, scholarship, research and extension work and enable higher-education teaching personnel to carry out their professional tasks.
8. Organizations which represent higher-education teaching personnel should be considered and recognized as a force which can contribute greatly to educational advancement and which should, therefore, be involved, together with other stakeholders and interested parties, in the determination of higher education policy.
9. Respect should be shown for the diversity of higher education institution systems in each Member State in accordance with its national laws and practices as well as with international standards.

IV. Educational objectives and policies

10. At all appropriate stages of their national planning in general, and of their planning for higher education in particular, Member States should take all necessary measures to ensure that:
 - a. higher education is directed to human development and to the progress of society;

- b. higher education contributes to the achievement of the goals of lifelong learning and to the development of other forms and levels of education;
 - c. where public funds are appropriated for higher education institutions, such funds are treated as a public investment, subject to effective public accountability;
 - d. the funding of higher education is treated as a form of public investment the returns on which are, for the most part, necessarily long term, subject to government and public priorities;
 - e. the justification for public funding is held constantly before public opinion.
11. Higher-education teaching personnel should have access to libraries which have up-to-date collections reflecting diverse sides of an issue, and whose holdings are not subject to censorship or other forms of intellectual interference. They should also have access, without censorship, to international computer systems, satellite programmes and databases required for their teaching, scholarship or research.
 12. The publication and dissemination of the research results obtained by higher-education teaching personnel should be encouraged and facilitated with a view to assisting them to acquire the reputation which they merit, as well as with a view to promoting the advancement of science, technology, education and culture generally. To this end, higher-education teaching personnel should be free to publish the results of research and scholarship in books, journals and databases of their own choice and under their own names, provided they are the authors or co-authors of the above scholarly works. The intellectual property of higher-education teaching personnel should benefit from appropriate legal protection, and in particular the protection afforded by national and international copyright law.
 13. The interplay of ideas and information among higher-education teaching personnel throughout the world is vital to the healthy development of higher education and research and should be actively promoted. To this end higher-education teaching personnel should be enabled throughout their careers to participate in international gatherings on higher education or research, to travel abroad without political restrictions and to use the Internet or video-conferencing for these purposes.

14. Programmes providing for the broadest exchange of higher-education teaching personnel between institutions, both nationally and internationally, including the organization of symposia, seminars and collaborative projects, and the exchange of educational and scholarly information should be developed and encouraged. The extension of communications and direct contacts between universities, research institutions and associations as well as among scientists and research workers should be facilitated, as should access by higher-education teaching personnel from other states to open information material in public archives, libraries, research institutes and similar bodies.
15. Member States and higher education institutions should, nevertheless, be conscious of the exodus of higher-education teaching personnel from the developing countries and, in particular, the least developed ones. They should, therefore, encourage aid programmes to the developing countries to help sustain an academic environment which offers satisfactory conditions of work for higher-education teaching personnel in those countries, so that this exodus may be contained and ultimately reversed.
16. Fair, just and reasonable national policies and practices for the recognition of degrees and of credentials for the practice of the higher education profession from other states should be established that are consistent with the UNESCO Recommendation on the Recognition of Studies and Qualifications in Higher Education of 1993.

V. Institutional rights, duties and responsibilities

A. Institutional autonomy

17. The proper enjoyment of academic freedom and compliance with the duties and responsibilities listed below require the autonomy of institutions of higher education. Autonomy is that degree of self-governance necessary for effective decision-making by institutions of higher education regarding their academic work, standards, management and related activities consistent with systems of public accountability, especially in respect of funding provided by the state, and respect for academic freedom and

human rights. However, the nature of institutional autonomy may differ according to the type of establishment involved.

18. Autonomy is the institutional form of academic freedom and a necessary precondition to guarantee the proper fulfilment of the functions entrusted to higher-education teaching personnel and institutions.
19. Member States are under an obligation to protect higher education institutions from threats to their autonomy coming from any source.
20. Autonomy should not be used by higher education institutions as a pretext to limit the rights of higher-education teaching personnel provided for in this Recommendation or in other international standards set out in the appendix.
21. Self-governance, collegiality and appropriate academic leadership are essential components of meaningful autonomy for institutions of higher education.

B. Institutional accountability

22. In view of the substantial financial investments made, Member States and higher education institutions should ensure a proper balance between the level of autonomy enjoyed by higher education institutions and their systems of accountability. Higher education institutions should endeavour to open their governance in order to be accountable. They should be accountable for:
 - a. effective communication to the public concerning the nature of their educational mission;
 - b. a commitment to quality and excellence in their teaching, scholarship and research functions, and an obligation to protect and ensure the integrity of their teaching, scholarship and research against intrusions inconsistent with their academic missions;
 - c. effective support of academic freedom and fundamental human rights;
 - d. ensuring high quality education for as many academically qualified individuals as possible subject to the constraints of the resources available to them;

- e. a commitment to the provision of opportunities for lifelong learning, consistent with the mission of the institution and the resources provided;
- f. ensuring that students are treated fairly and justly, and without discrimination;
- g. adopting policies and procedures to ensure the equitable treatment of women and minorities and to eliminate sexual and racial harassment;
- h. ensuring that higher education personnel are not impeded in their work in the classroom or in their research capacity by violence, intimidation or harassment;
- i. honest and open accounting;
- j. efficient use of resources;
- k. the creation, through the collegial process and/or through negotiation with organizations representing higher-education teaching personnel, consistent with the principles of academic freedom and freedom of speech, of statements or codes of ethics to guide higher education personnel in their teaching, scholarship, research and extension work;
- l. assistance in the fulfilment of economic, social, cultural and political rights while striving to prevent the use of knowledge, science and technology to the detriment of those rights, or for purposes which run counter to generally accepted academic ethics, human rights and peace;
- m. ensuring that they address themselves to the contemporary problems facing society; to this end, their curricula, as well as their activities, should respond, where appropriate, to the current and future needs of the local community and of society at large, and they should play an important role in enhancing the labour market opportunities of their graduates;
- n. encouraging, where possible and appropriate, international academic co-operation which transcends national, regional, political, ethnic and other barriers, striving to prevent the scientific and technological exploitation of one state by another, and promoting equal partnership of all the academic communities of the world in the pursuit and use of knowledge and the preservation of cultural heritages;

- o. ensuring up-to-date libraries and access, without censorship, to modern teaching, research and information resources providing information required by higher-education teaching personnel or by students for teaching, scholarship or research;
 - p. ensuring the facilities and equipment necessary for the mission of the institution and their proper upkeep;
 - q. ensuring that when engaged in classified research it will not contradict the educational mission and objectives of the institutions and will not run counter to the general objectives of peace, human rights, sustainable development and environment.
23. Systems of institutional accountability should be based on a scientific methodology and be clear, realistic, cost-effective and simple. In their operation they should be fair, just and equitable. Both the methodology and the results should be open.
24. Higher education institutions, individually or collectively, should design and implement appropriate systems of accountability, including quality assurance mechanisms to achieve the above goals, without harming institutional autonomy or academic freedom. The organizations representing higher-education teaching personnel should participate, where possible, in the planning of such systems. Where state-mandated structures of accountability are established, their procedures should be negotiated, where applicable, with the institutions of higher education concerned and with the organizations representing higher-education teaching personnel.

VI. Rights and freedoms of teaching personnel

A. Individual rights and freedoms: civil rights, academic freedom, publication rights, and the international exchange of information

25. Access to the higher education academic profession should be based solely on appropriate academic qualifications, competence and experience and be equal for all members of society without any discrimination.

26. Higher-education teaching personnel, like all other groups and individuals, should enjoy those internationally recognized civil, political, social and cultural rights applicable to all citizens. Therefore, all higher-education teaching personnel should enjoy freedom of thought, conscience, religion, expression, assembly and association as well as the right to liberty and security of the person and liberty of movement. They should not be hindered or impeded in exercising their civil rights as citizens, including the right to contribute to social change through freely expressing their opinion of state policies and of policies affecting higher education. They should not suffer any penalties simply because of the exercise of such rights. Higher-education teaching personnel should not be subject to arbitrary arrest or detention, nor to torture, nor to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. In cases of gross violation of their rights, higher-education teaching personnel should have the right to appeal to the relevant national, regional or international bodies such as the agencies of the United Nations, and organizations representing higher-education teaching personnel should extend full support in such cases.
27. The maintaining of the above international standards should be upheld in the interest of higher education internationally and within the country. To do so, the principle of academic freedom should be scrupulously observed. Higher-education teaching personnel are entitled to the maintaining of academic freedom, that is to say, the right, without constriction by prescribed doctrine, to freedom of teaching and discussion, freedom in carrying out research and disseminating and publishing the results thereof, freedom to express freely their opinion about the institution or system in which they work, freedom from institutional censorship and freedom to participate in professional or representative academic bodies. All higher-education teaching personnel should have the right to fulfil their functions without discrimination of any kind and without fear of repression by the state or any other source. Higher-education teaching personnel can effectively do justice to this principle if the environment in which they operate is conducive, which requires a democratic atmosphere; hence the challenge for all of developing a democratic society.
28. Higher-education teaching personnel have the right to teach without any interference, subject to accepted professional principles

including professional responsibility and intellectual rigour with regard to standards and methods of teaching. Higher-education teaching personnel should not be forced to instruct against their own best knowledge and conscience or be forced to use curricula and methods contrary to national and international human rights standards. Higher- education teaching personnel should play a significant role in determining the curriculum.

29. Higher-education teaching personnel have a right to carry out research work without any interference, or any suppression, in accordance with their professional responsibility and subject to nationally and internationally recognized professional principles of intellectual rigour, scientific inquiry and research ethics. They should also have the right to publish and communicate the conclusions of the research of which they are authors or co-authors, as stated in paragraph 12 of this Recommendation.
30. Higher-education teaching personnel have a right to undertake professional activities outside of their employment, particularly those that enhance their professional skills or allow for the application of knowledge to the problems of the community, provided such activities do not interfere with their primary commitments to their home institutions in accordance with institutional policies and regulations or national laws and practice where they exist.

B. Self-governance and collegiality

31. Higher-education teaching personnel should have the right and opportunity, without discrimination of any kind, according to their abilities, to take part in the governing bodies and to criticize the functioning of higher education institutions, including their own, while respecting the right of other sections of the academic community to participate, and they should also have the right to elect a majority of representatives to academic bodies within the higher education institution.
32. The principles of collegiality include academic freedom, shared responsibility, the policy of participation of all concerned in internal decision-making structures and practices, and the development of consultative mechanisms. Collegial decision-making should encompass decisions regarding the administration and

determination of policies of higher education, curricula, research, extension work, the allocation of resources and other related activities, in order to improve academic excellence and quality for the benefit of society at large.

VII. Duties and responsibilities of higher-education teaching personnel

33. Higher-education teaching personnel should recognize that the exercise of rights carries with it special duties and responsibilities, including the obligation to respect the academic freedom of other members of the academic community and to ensure the fair discussion of contrary views. Academic freedom carries with it the duty to use that freedom in a manner consistent with the scholarly obligation to base research on an honest search for truth. Teaching, research and scholarship should be conducted in full accordance with ethical and professional standards and should, where appropriate, respond to contemporary problems facing society as well as preserve the historical and cultural heritage of the world.
34. In particular, the individual duties of higher- education teaching personnel inherent in their academic freedom are:
 - a. to teach students effectively within the means provided by the institution and the state, to be fair and equitable to male and female students and treat those of all races and religions, as well as those with disabilities, equally, to encourage the free exchange of ideas between themselves and their students, and to be available to them for guidance in their studies. Higher-education teaching personnel should ensure, where necessary, that the minimum content defined in the syllabus for each subject is covered;
 - b. to conduct scholarly research and to disseminate the results of such research or, where original research is not required, to maintain and develop their knowledge of their subject through study and research, and through the development of teaching methodology to improve their pedagogical skills;
 - c. to base their research and scholarship on an honest search for knowledge with due respect for evidence, impartial reasoning

and honesty in reporting;

- d.** to observe the ethics of research involving humans, animals, the heritage or the environment;
- e.** to respect and to acknowledge the scholarly work of academic colleagues and students and, in particular, to ensure that authorship of published works includes all who have materially contributed to, and share responsibility for, the contents of a publication;
- f.** to refrain from using new information, concepts or data that were originally obtained as a result of access to confidential manuscripts or applications for funds for research or training that may have been seen as the result of processes such as peer review, unless the author has given permission;
- g.** to ensure that research is conducted according to the laws and regulations of the state in which the research is carried out, that it does not violate international codes of human rights, and that the results of the research and the data on which it is based are effectively made available to scholars and researchers in the host institution, except where this might place respondents in peril or where anonymity has been guaranteed;
- h.** to avoid conflicts of interest and to resolve them through appropriate disclosure and full consultation with the higher education institution employing them, so that they have the approval of the aforesaid institution;
- i.** to handle honestly all funds entrusted to their care for higher education institutions for research or for other professional or scientific bodies;
- j.** to be fair and impartial when presenting a professional appraisal of academic colleagues and students;
- k.** to be conscious of a responsibility, when speaking or writing outside scholarly channels on matters which are not related to their professional expertise, to avoid misleading the public on the nature of their professional expertise;

- I. to undertake such appropriate duties as are required for the collegial governance of institutions of higher education and of professional bodies.
35. Higher-education teaching personnel should seek to achieve the highest possible standards in their professional work, since their status largely depends on themselves and the quality of their achievements.
36. Higher-education teaching personnel should contribute to the public accountability of higher education institutions without, however, forfeiting the degree of institutional autonomy necessary for their work, for their professional freedom and for the advancement of knowledge.

VIII. Preparation for the profession

37. Policies governing access to preparation for a career in higher education rest on the need to provide society with an adequate supply of higher-education teaching personnel who possess the necessary ethical, intellectual and teaching qualities and who have the required professional knowledge and skills.
38. All aspects of the preparation of higher-education teaching personnel should be free from any form of discrimination.
39. Amongst candidates seeking to prepare for a career in higher education, women and members of minorities with equal academic qualifications and experience should be given equal opportunities and treatment.

IX. Terms and conditions of employment

A. Entry into the academic profession

40. The employers of higher-education teaching personnel should establish such terms and conditions of employment as will be most conducive for effective teaching and/or research and/or scholarship and/or extension work and will be fair and free from discrimination of any kind.
41. Temporary measures aimed at accelerating de facto equality for disadvantaged members of the academic community should not be considered discriminatory, provided that these measures are

discontinued when the objectives of equality of opportunity and treatment have been achieved and systems are in place to ensure the continuance of equality of opportunity and treatment.

42. A probationary period on initial entry to teaching and research in higher education is recognized as the opportunity for the encouragement and helpful initiation of the entrant and for the establishment and maintenance of proper professional standards, as well as for the individual's own development of his/her teaching and research proficiency. The normal duration of probation should be known in advance and the conditions for its satisfactory completion should be strictly related to professional competence. If such candidates fail to complete their probation satisfactorily, they should have the right to know the reasons and to receive this information sufficiently in advance of the end of the probationary period to give them a reasonable opportunity to improve their performance. They should also have the right to appeal.
43. Higher-education teaching personnel should enjoy:
 - a. a just and open system of career development including fair procedures for appointment, tenure where applicable, promotion, dismissal, and other related matters;
 - b. an effective, fair and just system of labour relations within the institution, consistent with the international standards set out in the appendix.
44. There should be provisions to allow for solidarity with other institutions of higher education and with their higher-education teaching personnel when they are subject to persecution. Such solidarity may be material as well as moral and should, where possible, include refuge and employment or education for victims of persecution.

B. Security of employment

45. Tenure or its functional equivalent, where applicable, constitutes one of the major procedural safeguards of academic freedom and against arbitrary decisions. It also encourages individual responsibility and the retention of talented higher-education teaching personnel.

46. Security of employment in the profession, including tenure or its functional equivalent, where applicable, should be safeguarded as it is essential to the interests of higher education as well as those of higher-education teaching personnel. It ensures that higher-education teaching personnel who secure continuing employment following rigorous evaluation can only be dismissed on professional grounds and in accordance with due process. They may also be released for *bona fide* financial reasons, provided that all the financial accounts are open to public inspection, that the institution has taken all reasonable alternative steps to prevent termination of employment, and that there are legal safeguards against bias in any termination of employment procedure. Tenure or its functional equivalent, where applicable, should be safeguarded as far as possible even when changes in the organization of or within a higher education institution or system are made, and should be granted, after a reasonable period of probation, to those who meet stated objective criteria in teaching, and/or scholarship, and/or research to the satisfaction of an academic body, and/or extension work to the satisfaction of the institution of higher education.

C. Appraisal

47. Higher education institutions should ensure that:
- a. evaluation and assessment of the work of higher-education teaching personnel are an integral part of the teaching, learning and research process, and that their major function is the development of individuals in accordance with their interests and capacities;
 - b. evaluation is based only on academic criteria of competence in research, teaching and other academic or professional duties as interpreted by academic peers;
 - c. evaluation procedures take due account of the difficulty inherent in measuring personal capacity, which seldom manifests itself in a constant and unfluctuating manner;
 - d. where evaluation involves any kind of direct assessment of the work of higher-education teaching personnel, by students and/or fellow colleagues and/or administrators, such assessment is objective and the criteria and the results are made known to the individual(s) concerned;

- e. the results of appraisal of higher-education teaching personnel are also taken into account when establishing the staffing of the institution and considering the renewal of employment;
- f. higher-education teaching personnel have the right to appeal to an impartial body against assessments which they deem to be unjustified.

D. Discipline and dismissal

- 48. No member of the academic community should be subject to discipline, including dismissal, except for just and sufficient cause demonstrable before an independent third-party hearing of peers, and/or before an impartial body such as arbitrators or the courts.
- 49. All members of higher-education teaching personnel should enjoy equitable safeguards at each stage of any disciplinary procedure, including dismissal, in accordance with the international standards set out in the appendix.
- 50. Dismissal as a disciplinary measure should only be for just and sufficient cause related to professional conduct, for example: persistent neglect of duties, gross incompetence, fabrication or falsification of research results, serious financial irregularities, sexual or other misconduct with students, colleagues, or other members of the academic community or serious threats thereof, or corruption of the educational process such as by falsifying grades, diplomas or degrees in return for money, sexual or other favours or by demanding sexual, financial or other material favours from subordinate employees or colleagues in return for continuing employment.
- 51. Individuals should have the right to appeal against the decision to dismiss them before independent, external bodies such as arbitrators or the courts, with final and binding powers.

E. Negotiation of terms and conditions of employment

- 52. Higher-education teaching personnel should enjoy the right to freedom of association, and this right should be effectively promoted. Collective bargaining or an equivalent procedure should be promoted in accordance with the standards of the International Labour Organization (ILO) set out in the appendix.

53. Salaries, working conditions and all matters related to the terms and conditions of employment of higher-education teaching personnel should be determined through a voluntary process of negotiation between organizations representing higher-education teaching personnel and the employers of higher- education teaching personnel, except where other equivalent procedures are provided that are consistent with international standards.
54. Appropriate machinery, consistent with national laws and international standards, should be established by statute or by agreement whereby the right of higher-education teaching personnel to negotiate through their organizations with their employers, whether public or private, is assured. Such legal and statutory rights should be enforceable through an impartial process without undue delay.
55. If the process established for these purposes is exhausted or if there is a breakdown in negotiations between the parties, organizations of higher-education teaching personnel should have the right to take such other steps as are normally open to other organizations in the defence of their legitimate interests.
56. Higher-education teaching personnel should have access to a fair grievance and arbitration pro- cedure, or the equivalent, for the settlement of disputes with their employers arising out of terms and conditions of employment.

F. Salaries, workload, social security benefits, health and safety

57. All financially feasible measures should be taken to provide higher-education teaching personnel with remuneration such that they can devote themselves satisfactorily to their duties and allocate the necessary amount of time for the continuing training and periodic renewal of knowledge and skills that are essential at this level of teaching.
58. The salaries of higher-education teaching per- sonnel should:
 - a. reflect the importance to society of higher education and hence the importance of higher-education teaching personnel as well as the different responsibilities which fall to them from the time of their entry into the profession;

- b. be at least comparable to salaries paid in other occupations requiring similar or equivalent qualifications;
 - c. provide higher-education teaching personnel with the means to ensure a reasonable standard of living for themselves and their families, as well as to invest in further education or in the pursuit of cultural or scientific activities, thus enhancing their professional qualifications;
 - d. take account of the fact that certain posts require higher qualifications and experience and carry greater responsibilities;
 - e. be paid regularly and on time;
 - f. be reviewed periodically to take into account such factors as a rise in the cost of living, increased productivity leading to higher standards of living, or a general upward movement in wage or salary levels.
59. Salary differentials should be based on objective criteria.
60. Higher-education teaching personnel should be paid on the basis of salary scales established in agreement with organizations representing higher-education teaching personnel, except where other equivalent procedures consistent with international standards are provided. During a probationary period or if employed on a temporary basis qualified higher-education teaching personnel should not be paid on a lower scale than that laid down for established higher-education teaching personnel at the same level.
61. A fair and impartial merit-rating system could be a means of enhancing quality assurance and quality control. Where introduced and applied for purposes of salary determination it should involve prior consultation with organizations representing higher-education teaching personnel.
62. The workload of higher-education teaching personnel should be fair and equitable, should permit such personnel to carry out effectively their duties and responsibilities to their students as well as their obligations in regard to scholarship, research and/or academic administration, should provide due consideration in terms of salary for those who are required to teach beyond their regular workload, and should be negotiated with the organizations representing higher-education teaching personnel, except where

other equivalent procedures consistent with international standards are provided.

63. Higher-education teaching personnel should be provided with a work environment that does not have a negative impact on or affect their health and safety and they should be protected by social security measures, including those concerning sickness and disability and pension entitlements, and measures for the protection of health and safety in respect of all contingencies included in the conventions and recommendations of ILO. The standards should be at least as favourable as those set out in the relevant conventions and recommendations of ILO. Social security benefits for higher-education teaching personnel should be granted as a matter of right.
64. The pension rights earned by higher-education teaching personnel should be transferable nationally and internationally, subject to national, bilateral and multilateral taxation laws and agreements, should the individual transfer to employment with another institution of higher education. Organizations representing higher- education teaching personnel should have the right to choose representatives to take part in the governance and administration of pension plans designed for higher-education teaching personnel where applicable, particularly those which are private and contributory.

G. Study and research leave and annual holidays

65. Higher-education teaching personnel should be granted study and research leave, such as sabbatical leave, on full or partial pay, where applicable, at regular intervals.
66. The period of study or research leave should be counted as service for seniority and pension purposes, subject to the provisions of the pension plan.
67. Higher-education teaching personnel should be granted occasional leave with full or partial pay to enable them to participate in professional activities.
68. Leave granted to higher-education teaching personnel within the framework of bilateral and multilateral cultural and scientific exchanges or technical assistance programmes abroad should be considered as service, and their seniority and eligibility for

promotion and pension rights in their home institutions should be safeguarded. In addition, special arrangements should be made to cover their extra expenses.

69. Higher-education teaching personnel should enjoy the right to adequate annual vacation with full pay.

H. Terms and conditions of employment of women higher-education teaching personnel

70. All necessary measures should be taken to promote equality of opportunity and treatment of women higher-education teaching personnel in order to ensure, on the basis of equality between men and women, the rights recognized by the international standards set out in the appendix.

I. Terms and conditions of employment of disabled higher-education teaching personnel

71. All necessary measures should be taken to ensure that the standards set with regard to the conditions of work of higher-education teaching personnel who are disabled are, as a minimum, consistent with the relevant provisions of the international standards set out in the appendix.

J. Terms and conditions of employment of part-time higher-education teaching personnel

72. The value of the service provided by qualified part-time higher-education teaching personnel should be recognized. Higher-education teaching personnel employed regularly on a part-time basis should:
- a. receive proportionately the same remuneration as higher-education teaching personnel employed on a full-time basis and enjoy equivalent basic conditions of employment;
 - b. benefit from conditions equivalent to those of higher-education teaching personnel employed on a full-time basis as regards holidays with pay, sick leave and maternity leave; the relevant pecuniary entitlements should be determined in proportion to hours of work or earnings;

- c. be entitled to adequate and appropriate social security protection, including, where applicable, coverage under employers' pension schemes.

X. Utilization and implementation

73. Member States and higher education institutions should take all feasible steps to extend and complement their own action in respect of the status of higher-education teaching personnel by encouraging co-operation with and among all national and international governmental and non-governmental organizations whose activities fall within the scope and objectives of this Recommendation.
74. Member States and higher education institutions should take all feasible steps to apply the provisions spelled out above to give effect, within their respective territories, to the principles set forth in this Recommendation.
75. The Director-General will prepare a comprehensive report on the world situation with regard to academic freedom and to respect for the human rights of higher-education teaching personnel on the basis of the information supplied by Member States and of any other information supported by reliable evidence which he/she may have gathered by such methods as he/she may deem appropriate.
76. In the case of a higher education institution in the territory of a state not under the direct or indirect authority of that state but under separate and independent authorities, the relevant authorities should transmit the text of this Recommendation to institutions, so that such institutions can put its provisions into practice.

XI. Final provision

77. Where higher-education teaching personnel enjoy a status which is, in certain respects, more favourable than that provided for in this Recommendation, the terms of this Recommendation should not be invoked to diminish the status already recognized.

Appendix

United Nations

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948;
- Declaration concerning the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples, 1965;
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 1965;
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1966;
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Protocol thereto, 1966;
- Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subject to Torture and Other Cruel and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 1975;
- Declaration on the Rights of Disabled Persons, 1975;
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 1979;
- Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, 1981;
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 1984.

United Nations Educational, and Cultural Organization

- Convention against Discrimination in Education, 1960, and Protocol thereto, 1962;
- Recommendation against Discrimination in Education, 1960;
- Recommendation on Education for International Understanding and Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, 1974;
- Recommendation on the Status of Scientific Researchers, 1974;

- Revised Recommendation concerning Technical and Vocational Education, 1974;
- Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice, 1978;
- Convention on Technical/Vocational Education, 1989;
- Recommendation on the Recognition of Studies and Qualifications in Higher Education, 1993.

International Labour Organization

- Convention No. 87: Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948;
- Convention No. 95: Protection of Wages Convention, 1949;
- Convention No. 98: Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1949;
- Convention No. 100: Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951;
- Convention No. 102: Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952;
- Convention No. 103: Maternity Protection Convention (Revised), 1952;
- Recommendation No. 95: Maternity Protection Recommendation, 1952;
- Convention No. 111: Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958;
- Convention No. 118: Equality of Treatment (Social Security) Convention, 1962;
- Convention No. 121: Employment Injury Benefits Convention, 1964 [Schedule I amended in 1980];
- Convention No. 128: Invalidity, Old-Age and Survivors Benefit Convention, 1967;
- Recommendation No. 131: Invalidity, Old-Age and Survivors Benefit Recommendation, 1967;
- Convention No. 130: Medical Care and Sickness Benefit Convention, 1969;

- Convention No. 132: Holidays with Pay Convention (Revised), 1970;
- Convention No. 135: Workers' Representatives Convention, 1971;
- Recommendation No. 143: Workers' Representatives Recommendation, 1971;
- Convention No. 140: Paid Educational Leave Convention, 1974;
- Recommendation No. 148: Paid Educational Leave Recommendation, 1974;
- Convention No. 151: Labour Relations (Public Service Convention), 1978;
- Recommendation No. 159: Labour Relations (Public Service) Recommendation, 1978;
- Recommendation No. 162: Older Workers Recommendation, 1980;
- Convention No. 154: Collective Bargaining Convention, 1981;
- Recommendation No. 163: Collective Bargaining Recommendation, 1981;
- Convention No. 156: Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981;
- Recommendation No. 165: Workers with Family Responsibilities Recommendation, 1981;
- Convention No. 158: Termination of Employment Convention, 1982;
- Convention No. 159: Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983;
- Recommendation No. 168: Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Recommendation, 1983.

Other

- Recommendation Teachers adopted by the Special Inter-governmental Conference on the Status of Teachers (convened by UNESCO in co-operation with ILO), Paris, 5 October 1966;

- UNESCO, Universal Copyright Convention, 1952, revised 1971;
- World Intellectual Property Organization, Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Paris Act, 1971, amended in 1979.

UNESCO Bangkok Office

Mom Luang Pin Malakul Centenary Building

920 Sukhumvit Road, Prakanong, Klongtoei

Bangkok 10110, Thailand

Email: eisd.bgk@unesco.org

Website: www.unesco.org/bangkok

Tel: +66-2-3910577 Fax: +66-2-3910866