

Final report

12th SESSION, 2015



International
Labour
Organization



Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel

Paris, 20–24 April 2015





INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION
UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION



CEART/12/2015/14

Final report

Twelfth Session

Joint ILO–UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel

(Paris, 20–24 April 2015)

Paris, 2015

Copyright © International Labour Organization and United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2015
First edition 2015

Publications of the International Labour Office enjoy copyright under Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. Nevertheless, short excerpts from them may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation, application should be made to ILO Publications (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. The International Labour Office welcomes such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered with reproduction rights organizations may make copies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose. Visit www.ifro.org to find the reproduction rights organization in your country.

Final report: Twelfth Session: Joint ILO–UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel, Paris, 20–24 April 2015/International Labour Office, Sectoral Policies Department/United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Geneva, ILO, 2015.
1 v. (CEART/12/2015/14)

ISBN 978-92-2-129897-7 (print)
ISBN 978-92-2-129868-4 (Web pdf)

Also available in French: *Rapport final: Douzième session: Comité conjoint OIT/UNESCO d'experts sur l'application des Recommandations concernant le personnel enseignant, 20-24 avril 2015*, ISBN 978-92-2-229897-6, Geneva, 2015; and in Spanish: *Informe final: Duodécima reunión: Comité Mixto OIT/UNESCO de expertos sobre la aplicación de las Recomendaciones relativas al personal docente, 20 a 24 de abril de 2015*, ISBN 978-92-2-329897-5, Geneva, 2015.

teaching personnel / teacher status / ILO Recommendation / UNESCO / application / educational institution
06.06.3

ILO Cataloguing in Publication Data

The designations employed in ILO publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed articles, studies and other contributions rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour Office of the opinions expressed in them.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

ILO publications and electronic products can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address, or by email: pubvente@ilo.org.

Visit our website: www.ilo.org/publns.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1
Opening session.....	2
I. Monitoring of the 1966 and the 1997 Recommendations.....	4
A. Major trends: The perspectives of international organizations	4
B. The status of teaching personnel: Trends in the application of the 1966 and 1997 Recommendations.....	5
II. Progress in promotion and use of the 1966 and the 1997 Recommendations	14
A. Allegations received since the 11th Session, 2012	14
B. Follow-up on allegations considered at the 11th Session, 2012	24
C. Promotional activities	24
D. Working methods of the Joint Committee	25
E. Draft agenda of the 13th Session of the Joint Committee	25
F. Communiqué to the World Education Forum, 2015.....	25

Appendices

I. Background sources for the 12th Session.....	27
II. Secretariat of the Joint Committee	28
III. Empowering teachers: Teaching in the post-2015 educational agenda.....	29

Introduction

This report summarizes the analysis of major issues affecting the status of teaching personnel worldwide at all levels of education by the 12th Session of the Joint ILO–UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (the Joint Committee), held in Paris on 20–24 April 2015.

Established in 1967 after the ILO and UNESCO adopted a far-reaching Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers (1966), the Joint Committee meets every three years to review major trends in education and teaching, and to make relevant recommendations. It also reviews allegations brought by teachers' unions regarding violations of the principles of the Recommendation. In 1997, when UNESCO adopted a Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel, the Joint Committee was also charged with examining key issues facing higher education staff.

Composed of independent education experts from around the world, the 12th Session of the Joint Committee examined a number of urgent issues affecting teaching personnel, including quality teaching in higher education, professionalization of early childhood education personnel, changing employment relationships in teaching, the impact of digital technologies, and social dialogue. The Joint Committee also examined a number of allegations from teacher unions regarding the application of the Recommendations.

The Joint Committee furthermore adopted a communiqué which was transmitted to the World Education Forum in Incheon, Republic of Korea in May 2015.

The report of this session contains recommendations to the Governing Body of the ILO and to the Executive Board of UNESCO, and through them to governments, employers' and workers' organizations of their member States, on how to improve the condition of the teaching profession within their respective mandates, using the two Recommendations as guidelines. The recommendations of the Joint Committee are non-binding, being intended to guide the actions of national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations and other education stakeholders.

The Joint Committee's report is submitted to the Governing Body of the ILO, with a request that it be transmitted to the Committee on the Application of Standards of the International Labour Conference, and to the Committee on Conventions and Recommendations of the Executive Board of UNESCO, for transmission to the General Conference. The report of the Joint Committee should be read together with any discussion of it at these respective bodies.

The next meeting of the Joint Committee will take place in 2018 in Geneva. In accordance with its mandate, the Joint Committee may issue an interim report on allegations received between regular sessions.

Opening session

1. The Joint ILO–UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (hereafter the Joint Committee) held its Twelfth Session in Paris at the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) headquarters, from 20 to 24 April 2015.
2. In accordance with its mandate, the meeting focused on the monitoring and promotion by the Joint Committee of both the Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers, 1966 (hereafter, the 1966 Recommendation) and the Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel, 1997 (hereafter, the 1997 Recommendation).
3. The agenda of the Joint Committee covered the following substantive items related to its work and the two Recommendations:
 - (a) review of ILO and UNESCO joint or separate activities to promote the two Recommendations;
 - (b) social dialogue in education;
 - (c) allegations submitted by teacher organizations concerning the application of the Recommendations;
 - (d) quality of teaching in the context of increasing non-public providers of higher education;
 - (e) international trends in teacher appraisal;
 - (f) professionalization of early childhood teaching;
 - (g) maintaining professionalization of teaching in higher education: from entry into the profession to lifelong professional development;
 - (h) changing employment relationships in the teaching profession;
 - (i) the impact of technological change on the teaching profession;
 - (j) teaching in the post-2015 education agenda;
 - (k) methodology and procedures of the Joint Committee.
4. Members of the Joint Committee designated by the Governing Body of the ILO and the Director-General of UNESCO were as follows:

Members appointed by the Governing Body of the ILO:

Dr (Ms) Beatrice Avalos (Chile), Associate Researcher, Centre for Advanced Research in Education, University of Chile.

Dr (Ms) Linda Chisholm (South Africa), Centre for Education Rights and Transformation, University of Johannesburg.

Professor (Mr) Maasaki Katsuno (Japan), Professor of School Development and Policy Studies, Graduate School of Education, University of Tokyo.

Professor (Ms) Denise Vaillant (Uruguay), Academic Director, Institute of Education, ORT University, Uruguay.

Professor (Ms) Frances Vavrus (United States), Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy and Development, University of Minnesota.

Members appointed by the Director-General of UNESCO:

Professor (Mr) Bernard Cornu (France), Honorary Professor, University Joseph Fourier, Grenoble, Deputy Mayor of Poitiers.

Professor (Ms) Konai Helu-Thaman (Fiji), Professor of Pacific Education and Culture and UNESCO Chair in Teacher Education, University of the South Pacific.

Dr (Ms) Nada Moghaizel-Nasr (Lebanon), Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Saint Joseph of Beirut.

Dr (Ms) Munawar S. Mirza (Pakistan), Pro Vice Chancellor, Lahore Leads University, Professor Emeritus, University of the Punjab.

Dr (Mr) Gennady Ryabov (Russian Federation), Professor, Nizhny Novgorod Linguistic University and Nizhny Novgorod National Research University.

Professor (Mr) Toussaint Yaovi Tchitchi (Benin), Former Director, National Institute for Training and Research in Education (INFRE).

5. The Joint Committee designated the following Officers:

Chairperson: **Dr Nada Moghaizel-Nasr**

Vice-Chairperson: **Mr Toussaint Tchitchi**

Reporters: **Ms Denise Vaillant**
 Ms Frances Vavrus

6. Opening remarks on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO were made by Mr Qian Tang, Assistant Director-General for Education, and on behalf of the Director-General of the ILO by Ms Alette van Leur, Director of the Sectoral Policies Department. Both speakers stressed the importance of teachers and teaching in achieving education goals and noted the opportunity for the Joint Committee to influence the proposed Sustainable Development Goal on education, and its implementation target on teachers.

7. Ms Moghaizel-Nasr made some preliminary remarks as Chairperson of the Joint Committee. She stressed that both Recommendations remained highly relevant and were critical tools in ensuring autonomy of learning institutions and participatory governance of such institutions. The 1966 Recommendation countered the view of the teacher as a simple technician who delivered content; instead it stressed the role of the teacher as a reflective practitioner who participated in the development of education policy, teaching methods and evaluation systems. The Recommendation supported the role of the teacher as a professional. The 1997 Recommendation also stressed higher education teaching as a profession, and stressed the autonomy of higher education teachers and their role in shaping policy and governing higher education institutions. The 1997 Recommendation also importantly stressed the quality goals of higher education. Both Recommendations were important guarantees to preserve basic principles and rights of teachers in a rapidly changing education world.

-
8. Consistent with its practice, the Joint Committee created working groups to analyse agenda items related to the 1966 and 1997 Recommendations. All recommendations were discussed and adopted in plenary sessions.
 9. The list of documents considered by the Joint Committee is contained in Appendix II.

I. Monitoring of the 1966 and the 1997 Recommendations

A. Major trends: The perspectives of international organizations

10. Continuing a practice from previous sessions, the Joint Committee invited a number of relevant organizations to provide additional information and views on issues arising from the two Recommendations. The following organizations addressed the Joint Committee at a special sitting: Education International, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Organization for Early Childhood Education (OMEP), the International Task Force on Teachers for Education for All, and the Global Monitoring Report. The presentations addressed the continued trend of de-professionalization of teachers, driven by austerity measures and accountability schemes. Such trends had an impact on the safety and health of teachers, in particular psychological well-being (burnout), and physical security remained a large challenge for teachers in fragile States. While there had been some progress in recognizing the role of teacher unions in education policy, in many countries freedom of association for teachers remained difficult. Teachers faced discrimination based on gender, sexuality and ethnicity, and discrimination against migrant teachers was becoming apparent as the profession increasingly crossed borders. Contract teaching, either through fixed-term employment of qualified teachers or through unqualified “community” teachers, remained a stubborn problem; in some countries the majority of teachers were on contract status with inferior working conditions, status and qualifications compared to teachers with open-ended employment relationships.
11. In the ensuing discussion, experts stressed the importance of analysing such trends beyond the usual description of problems and identifying root causes and possible solutions to the persistent problems in teaching. Such recommendations could also address education financing, which was often cited as an excuse for not improving the status of teachers. Recommendations of the Joint Committee could include addressing measures for improving the status of the teaching profession, drawn from other professions such as doctors and lawyers, and professions in the public service. It was also essential to critically analyse current narratives and discourse on education and teaching, which maintain a perspective that included rights and principles in education, and not only economic efficiency. Good practices should be identified that had led to improvement in the teaching profession, so as to inspire more positive actions by governments and other stakeholders. Finally, it was also important to analyse persistent challenges in teaching in the context of the evolving school environment, in particular changes brought about by technology.

B. The status of teaching personnel: Trends in the application of the 1966 and 1997 Recommendations

Social dialogue in education

Trends and issues

12. The global financial crisis continues to weaken social dialogue, even in countries with a long history of collective bargaining such as in Europe, where well-established social dialogue institutions have been seriously weakened and/or suspended, with a negative impact on teachers' status and working conditions.
13. Private management of publicly funded schools, which occurs in different parts of the world, such as some countries in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia and the Pacific, affects social dialogue. This is because teachers in the privately managed schools have different contractual conditions from teachers in public schools and are usually not able to engage in collective bargaining.
14. In many countries, the increasing privatization of education has also led to disparities in teaching qualification requirements and working conditions, and loss of job security, especially among contract teachers.
15. There are promising instances of civil society organizations carrying out advocacy actions to support the importance of teachers and to improve their preparation and working conditions, as exemplified by actions of this type carried out in Chile.
16. Social dialogue can be affected when trade unions lose focus on professional, employment and education interests.
17. Background material provided to the Joint Committee shows variance among European countries in the use of collective bargaining, ranging from those with a stable machinery such as in Scotland, to weakening systems as is the case in Norway, to no machinery at all, such as in England.
18. In Africa, social dialogue mechanisms vary widely in that legislation is not sufficiently implemented in practice, such as in Ghana, Senegal and Uganda.
19. Variations within countries also occur, such as in Australia, Brazil, Canada and the United States, where social dialogue mechanisms, although increasingly well established, also differ across different States.

Recommendations

20. The Joint Committee recommends that the Governing Body of the ILO and the Executive Board of UNESCO:
 - (a) encourage member States to establish and respect appropriate legal frameworks and institutional arrangements for social dialogue. They should review mechanisms with a view to securing basic principles of social dialogue and acceptable teachers' working conditions;
 - (b) encourage member States to operate mechanisms that are properly implemented and monitored, including in countries with federal government systems;

-
- (c) ask member States to work towards establishing common conditions of service for all teachers, whether in public or publicly funded private schools;
 - (d) request the ILO and UNESCO to share good practices of social dialogue, including the role of civil society in improving teachers' working conditions;
 - (e) request the ILO and UNESCO to develop guidelines on social dialogue in the education sector;
 - (f) encourage trade unions to ensure that their participation in social dialogue is not unduly influenced by partisan interests.

International trends in appraisal of teaching personnel

Trends and issues

- 21. Teacher performance evaluation has occurred through inspectorate systems and/or through head teachers' assessment with the purpose of providing teachers with feedback on their performance or noting aspects that are in need of improvement.
- 22. There are changes in the conception of teachers' appraisal resulting from increased concerns about students' learning outcomes and teaching quality. The teacher appraisal systems are changing towards the use of more standardized forms even though there are various standards used around the world.
- 23. There are tensions between the formative purposes of teacher evaluation and its summative aspects; with emphasis on the latter being linked to narrow accountability.
- 24. There are controversial policy discussions on linking teachers' performance to student learning outcomes in standardized tests. This is contested due to a number of factors, including the complexity of discerning the effect of the antecedents to learning outcomes, and of the value added statistical techniques used to do so.
- 25. Some education systems provide monetary and other professional incentives based on teacher performance evaluation.
- 26. Research indicates that teachers' performance evaluation is more effective if they participate in the elaboration of the evaluation framework, are given feedback on their teaching and have opportunities to improve through collaboration.

Recommendations

- 27. The Joint Committee recommends that the Governing Body of the ILO and the Executive Board of UNESCO encourage member States to:
 - (a) ensure that teachers and their organizations participate in framing professional standards and the process that guides the teacher evaluation system;
 - (b) ensure that teacher assessment procedures use multiple valid and reliable tools to cover different types of practices in which teachers are engaged;
 - (c) design mechanisms to ensure that performance evaluation is linked to relevant continuous professional development of teachers;
 - (d) give priority to the establishment of formative systems of teacher evaluation over those driven by narrow accountability;

-
- (e) ensure that teachers are provided appropriate feedback on their performance for ongoing improvement;
 - (f) with the participation of teachers and teacher organizations, establish mechanisms to monitor and review teacher evaluation systems.

Professionalization of early childhood education (ECE) personnel

Trends and issues

28. Considerable progress has been made since 2000 regarding the importance of ECE as a result of work towards meeting the goals/targets of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All (EFA). Globally, the gross pre-primary enrolment rate is around 50 per cent. In some regions, there have been huge increases in enrolment, especially in South and Western Asia and sub-Saharan Africa. This apparent increase in the importance and visibility of ECE globally has led to higher demand for and supply of ECE personnel.
29. Because of the importance of ECE in children's learning and development there has been an urgent need to ensure the professionalization of ECE personnel so that they are better able to deliver quality ECE programmes that are holistic, integrated, play-based, interactive, and in children's mother tongues. ECE personnel also need to experience decent work conditions in order for them to fulfil their increasingly challenging roles.
30. The provision of ECE is diverse. In some regions, it has largely been in the hands of the private sector, including non-profit and for-profit providers, while in others it has been in the public sector. Where education ministries have assumed greater responsibility for financing and managing ECE and more attention is given to improving the ECE curriculum and pedagogy, there is evidence of the increased professionalization of ECE personnel, such as in Australia and Bhutan.
31. ECE financing models are diverse. In many countries, pre-primary education is not free, and has the smallest share of the overall education budget. This can result in unequal access to ECE services, due to different factors including location, gender, ethnicity and language.
32. The increased recognition of the importance of ECE as the foundation for learning and the expanding enrolment in this sector call for more attention to be paid to the recruitment and professional development of ECE personnel. The capacity of ECE personnel can be strengthened by more emphasis in areas such as: the development of standardized competencies; better and more practicum-oriented and accredited pre-service training programmes; higher qualifications for teachers, such as diploma or degree; and more rigorous certification and licensing processes.
33. Recruitment and deployment of ECE personnel are often distorted and inequitably based on gender, socio-economic status, ethnicity/language, disability and location with greater distortion at pre-primary and primary levels although some attempts at diversifying the profession have been made in some countries such as Benin, New Zealand, Norway and Scotland.
34. In general, ECE personnel have even fewer opportunities for professional development, lower status and working conditions compared to teachers at other levels.

-
35. There is also evidence that ECE personnel are insufficiently organized collectively to make them serious partners in any social dialogue or collective bargaining, let alone in the governance of ECE. Existing teacher associations are dominated by teachers from higher levels and teacher unions have traditionally not organized this sector.

Recommendations

36. The Joint Committee recommends that the Governing Body of the ILO and the Executive Board of UNESCO:
- (a) encourage member States to promote ECE policies, strategies and action plans and increase budget allocations for ECE to ensure that quality ECE services are accessible to all and, as far as possible, free;
 - (b) encourage member States to devise clear policies, strategies and action plans for the professionalization of ECE personnel by enhancing and monitoring the professional development, status and working conditions of such workers;
 - (c) encourage member States to work towards developing a holistic, integrated and play-based ECE curriculum and pedagogy which provides smooth transition to early grades of primary education. Member States should also be supported to ensure appropriate training for ECE and early grades teachers, including on child psychology and development, diversity, and early literacy and numeracy, and to promote the use of mother tongue as the language of instruction;
 - (d) request member States to promote diversity in the recruitment and development of ECE and early primary grades personnel, free from discrimination;
 - (e) encourage unions and organizations to be more proactive and inclusive in their efforts to organize and represent ECE personnel;
 - (f) promote coordination, collaboration and dialogue between government, private ECE providers, unions, communities, and other stakeholders.

Changing employment relationships in the teaching profession

Trends and issues

37. The number of teachers on short-term, temporary contracts, rather than on open-ended, tenured contracts, is significant and increasing in many countries and regions, particularly low-income ones in Africa and Asia. As the Joint Committee has repeatedly warned in its previous reports, this instability of employment relationships is linked to serious concerns, such as:
- (a) worsening of teachers' working conditions, including more precarious forms of employment;
 - (b) increased turnover of teachers;
 - (c) inequality in working conditions depending on the category of teaching (early childhood, primary and secondary);
 - (d) over-representation of women in informal, involuntary part-time work and low-paid categories of teaching;

-
- (e) declining opportunities for the professional development of teachers;
 - (f) decisions on employment status and career advancement linked to some contested forms of teacher evaluation, such as performance measured by students' standardized scores;
 - (g) weakening of teachers' collective representation through trade unions in collective bargaining and social dialogue.
- 38.** The instability in employment relationships of teachers also raises serious concerns about the quality of education and equity in the educational system, which, in some cases, include the following:
- (a) insufficient training and qualifications of contract and part-time teachers;
 - (b) lack of time for planning and reflection, and for collaboration with colleagues;
 - (c) limited opportunities to provide sufficient support to students and to interact with parents;
 - (d) necessity of taking on additional jobs due to low salaries and benefits.
- 39.** A number of policy-related factors have been identified as contributing to the increased instability in employment relationships in the teaching profession. These include:
- (a) policies to increase enrolment that have led to teacher shortages in some countries;
 - (b) the reduction of public education budgets that has resulted in more fixed-term and part-time employment;
 - (c) the influence of for-profit educational providers on public policies that has accelerated the de-professionalization of teachers;
 - (d) the policy advice of international financial institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, favouring the promotion of contract teaching based on the assumption that greater flexibility in employment relationships would enhance the effectiveness of teachers and consequently student learning outcomes. However, evidence to support this assumption is lacking.

Recommendations

- 40.** The Joint Committee recommends to the Governing Body of the ILO and the Executive Board of UNESCO to:
- (a) encourage member States to review and revise, as appropriate, their policies and practices regarding employment relationships of teachers, taking into account:
 - (i) the 1966 Recommendation, specifically its paragraphs 45 (stability of employment and security of tenure), 59 (reasons for part-time service) and 60 (conditions of part-time employment);
 - (ii) research documenting the effects of temporary and part-time employment of teachers on the quality of education, equity and equality in the educational system and the collective voice of teachers;

-
- (b) encourage member States to engage more consistently in social dialogue with teachers' organizations so as to address the growing precariousness of teachers' employment status and working conditions;
 - (c) consider requesting the ILO and UNESCO to facilitate further research on how to reduce the inequality in working conditions within and across different levels of teaching (early childhood, primary, and secondary) and how to create more stable employment in each category.

The impact of information and communication technologies on the teaching profession

Trends and issues

ICT, society and educational institutions

- 41. Information and communication technologies (ICTs) have developed and progressed very rapidly over recent years. They have had a considerable impact on many facets of societies. Nevertheless, educational institutions still struggle to keep up with these rapid changes and have not strategically integrated ICTs into their pedagogical plans. As a result, there is an increasing disconnection between society and educational institutions in terms of incorporating and using ICTs.
- 42. ICTs lead to new relationships with information and knowledge, with time and space, as well as supporting new collaborative ways of teaching and learning.
- 43. Educational institutions are no longer the only place where knowledge is accessible. In the digital age, jobs and competencies are changing. As a result, schools and teachers have to re-identify their main missions, even though schools and teaching personnel are key mediators and facilitators of the learning process.

Technology and pedagogy

- 44. A reason for the increasing gap between rapid society changes and educational institutions is that ICTs are being prioritized as an independent subject of study in isolation from the variety of pedagogical practices that could integrate them. Too often educational policies address technological aspects more than pedagogical ones. More research is needed on the impact of information and communication technologies on pedagogy.

Digital divide

- 45. The digital divide is increasing around the world. This divide is not only a question of access to mobile communications, equipment and broadband internet but it is also about the serious risk of increasing inequality in the opportunities that learners have to develop their knowledge, skills and competencies via new technologies.
- 46. The teaching profession requires profound changes in view of the impact of ICTs. New competencies are now necessary for teachers. With digital technologies and resources, the teaching profession could become more collaborative and networked. New roles are emerging in the teaching profession, such as pedagogical engineers, digital pedagogical designer, etc., which may lead to future new teaching professions.

-
47. ICTs have connected teaching personnel more closely to learners, parents, and communities. If strategically managed and deployed, ICTs are poised to assist teaching personnel in their duties, but if badly managed or understood, they can lead to increased workload and stress for teachers.

Recommendations

48. The Joint Committee recommends to the Governing Body of the ILO and the Executive Board of UNESCO to encourage member States to:
- (a) develop and implement ICT-enriched pedagogies that integrate the new relationships with time and space, mobility, social networks, and collective intelligence, as well as personalized and individualized pedagogies;
 - (b) integrate ICT competencies as a core component of the teaching profession, for all teachers at all levels;
 - (c) support teachers to actively integrate ICTs in all the dimensions of their professional activity (teaching, research, planning activities, administration, relationships with pupils, colleagues, with the school management, with parents, and with other partners);
 - (d) integrate ICT throughout the curriculum, and not only as an additional subject;
 - (e) implement ICT-enriched pedagogies across teacher-education programmes and institutions at both pre-service and in-service professional development levels;
 - (f) ensure that teachers have access to ICT tools and resources, and to professional networks;
 - (g) pursue ICT policies in education which are in line with educational objectives and sound public procurement policies;
 - (h) disseminate to relevant institutions and bodies the UNESCO ICT *Competency Framework for Teachers* and other appropriate UNESCO publications.

Quality of teaching in the context of increasing non-public providers of higher education

Trends and issues

49. Higher education is undergoing transition and rapid change, including such facets as:
- (a) massification;
 - (b) market-oriented delivery;
 - (c) a knowledge economy that is driving the development of new skills;
 - (d) increased privatization and competition among higher education institutions;
 - (e) internationalization of higher education and greater mobility of students and higher education teaching personnel;
 - (f) changes in employment relationships, including the use of part-time and/or temporary appointments with reduced opportunities for entering into regular employment.

-
50. All these changes call for improved quality of education at the level of programmes, teachers' qualifications and learning environments.
 51. The quality of higher education, and of its teaching personnel, is often understood in terms of international rankings. The concept of quality education is complex and involves several dimensions, which cannot be reduced to such rankings.
 52. The concept of higher education quality needs to be refined in relation to the 1997 Recommendation that considers quality for all.
 53. Despite the worldwide recognition of the rapid development of quality assurance systems, little is known of their actual impact on learning outcomes, and there is insufficient information on higher education quality across different institutions.

Recommendations

54. The Joint Committee recommends that the Governing Body of the ILO and the Executive Board of UNESCO encourage the ILO, UNESCO, member States, higher education institutions, and other relevant organizations to:
 - (a) organize activities and joint regional workshops, seminars and symposia that result in a common understanding and sharing of good practices in line with the 1997 Recommendation, in order to update the concept of higher education quality in the context of recent changes in social and economic conditions;
 - (b) institutionalize quality assurance processes, in consultation with higher education institutions and organizations of higher education personnel, as well as to build their capacities to do so;
 - (c) regulate and assure the quality of higher education as provided by both public and non-public institutions, including their online programmes;
 - (d) engage in developing common processes for quality assurance and accreditation across the world (or regions of the world);
 - (e) ensure both the research and teaching capacity development of all higher education personnel.

Maintaining professionalization of teaching in higher education: From entry into the profession to lifelong professional development

Trends and issues

55. The professionalization of higher education teaching personnel has been marked by the following trends:
 - (a) increasing demands by students and other stakeholders to improve the quality of teaching in higher education institutions (HEIs) and to incorporate teaching into quality frameworks;
 - (b) growing emphasis on the use of learner-centred methods and the centrality of the learner activity in higher education classrooms along with reward systems that value research;

-
- (c) greater attention to student learning outcomes and subject performance indicators at the post-secondary level;
 - (d) increasing use of learning technologies in HEIs that require higher education teaching personnel to develop new pedagogical skills, especially for online courses, without necessarily being provided the time or incentives to do so;
 - (e) expansion of enrolment at HEIs without concomitant increases in funding to support the hiring of more full-time/permanent higher education teaching personnel, in some countries leading to the hiring of higher education teaching personnel without proper qualifications;
 - (f) emphasis on the need for the improved mentoring of junior higher education teaching personnel in the areas of teaching and research and provision of incentives and adequate working conditions to retain junior personnel, especially in countries experiencing “brain drain”;
 - (g) growing calls for the restructuring of incentive structures to promote the status of teaching despite the ongoing practice of hiring higher-education teaching personnel primarily on the basis of their research.

Recommendations

56. The Joint Committee recommends that the Governing Body of the ILO and Executive Board of UNESCO:

- (a) encourage member States to promote a culture of quality teaching at HEIs through the following:
 - (i) development of pedagogical skills through courses, workshops, and teaching/learning centres for higher education teaching personnel and students preparing for a higher-education teaching career;
 - (ii) creation of platforms through which to share best teaching practices;
 - (iii) co-teaching opportunities, especially between junior and senior higher education teaching personnel
 - (iv) creation of mechanisms to retain excellent teaching staff in the classroom;
 - (v) review of evaluation and promotion criteria to ensure that teaching excellence is valued and rewarded;
- (b) request the ILO and UNESCO to advocate for changes in national, regional and international systems for the evaluation and assessment of HEIs, which take into account academic criteria of competence in research and teaching, as well as other academic or professional duties as interpreted by peers. These systems should take into account the difficulty inherent in assessing HEIs and higher-education personnel;
- (c) request UNESCO to expand their work in the development of processes to ensure quality for HEIs and the creation and dissemination of materials for higher-education teaching personnel development that take into consideration the needs of different world regions;

-
- (d) request the ILO and UNESCO to engage in further research into one or more of the following areas and/or expand the knowledge base regarding the professionalization of teaching in higher education:
 - (i) the current state of pedagogical content knowledge among higher-education teaching personnel in select member States;
 - (ii) a review of best practices at HEIs aimed at improving the pedagogical skills of higher-education teaching personnel; and
 - (iii) the impact of improved pedagogical knowledge and skills on student learning outcomes.

II. Progress in the promotion and use of the 1966 and the 1997 Recommendations

A. Allegations received since the 11th Session, 2012

Allegation received by the Tokyo-to-Gakko Union of Japan

Background

57. The ILO received an allegation from the Tokyo-to-Gakko union concerning non-respect of the 1966 Recommendation on the Status of Teachers on 2 June 2012. The initial allegation was discussed at the 11th Session of the Joint Committee in October 2012, and found to meet the criteria of receivability. As per the Joint Committee's procedures, the allegation was sent to the Government of Japan, which provided observations on the allegation on 19 July 2013. Further comments were received from the union on 16 September 2013, to which the Government responded on 10 December 2013.
58. The allegation was presented in the Joint Committee's interim report to the ILO's Governing Body at its 322nd Session in November 2014, with a recommendation to follow up with a number of factual questions concerning the case. The Government supplied responses to these questions on 10 April 2015.

Substance of the allegation

59. The allegation centres on the treatment of Miyako Masuda, a junior high school social studies teacher in Tokyo. Ms Masuda was hired as a teacher by the Tokyo Metropolitan Government in 1973. In 1997, she was transferred to the Daijuroku Junior High School in Tokyo's Adachi Ward. The same year, a new history textbook produced by the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform was introduced into Tokyo schools. Reacting to what Ms Masuda considered "a forgery of history" in the textbook (in particular concerning Japan's role during World War II), Ms Masuda began criticizing the textbook in her classes and offering alternative teaching materials to her students.
60. According to the union, following a complaint in 1997 by a parent that Ms Masuda's teaching materials were biased, the school promised the parent disciplinary action against the teacher, without informing Ms Masuda.
61. In July 1997, Ms Masuda published a "True Modern History for Junior High School Students", a publication which recorded discussions and writings she had undertaken with

students in her previously assigned school, where she taught from 1987 until 1997. According to the union, in 1998 the *Sankei Shimbun* newspaper and an assembly member of the Tokyo Metropolitan Government began a public campaign against her. In March 1999, Ms Masuda sent a letter to parents of her school to repudiate the claims made by *Sankei Shimbun*. As punishment, her salary was reduced 10 per cent for the month of July. In September 1999, Ms Masuda was removed from teaching and ordered to attend a series of extended trainings at the Tokyo Education Research Centre, apparently in order to improve her instruction method and quality as an educational civil servant. On 1 April 2000, the Adachi Ward Board of Education ordered her to undergo further long-term training until 31 March 2001, at the same centre and with the same content. On 1 April 2001, the Adachi Ward Board of Education ordered her to undergo further long-term training at the Tokyo Teacher and Staff Training Centre.

62. In April 2002, following two years and seven months of training, Ms Masuda was transferred to Kudan Junior High School in Tokyo's Chiyoda Ward. In 2004, she published a pamphlet "Who destroys education?" which outlined her disciplinary treatment at Daijuroku Junior High School. She also drafted a letter to President Roh Moo-Hyun of the Republic of Korea, expressing disappointment with the teaching of history in Japan, which in her view did not deal accurately with Japanese actions during World War II. In the letter, she also criticized by name a member of the Tokyo Assembly. After a parent sent this material to the Tokyo Board of Education in 2005 as part of a complaint, an article appeared in the *Sankei Shimbun* newspaper criticizing her teaching materials.
63. According to the union, on 30 August 2005, the Tokyo Board of Education issued a warning to Ms Masuda that her actions were damaging the trust of public workers. The warning was issued as a press release without her knowledge.
64. On 1 September 2005, Ms Masuda was again removed from teaching and ordered to attend extended training. According to the union, the training involved solitary training which included time during which she had to sit and face a wall under surveillance, and she was required to ask permission to use the toilet. The training required Ms Masuda to indicate "reflection and regret" for her actions.
65. In March 2006, the Tokyo Board of Education dismissed Ms Masuda, claiming that, despite her training, she had not reflected upon and regretted her actions. The union claims that neither she nor her principal were informed of the decision or were able to present their views.
66. The union further alleges the Government had not disseminated awareness of the 1966 ILO-UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Teachers.
67. In further arguments, the union notes that the revised junior high school history textbook published by the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform had not been adopted by the Board of Education through a process involving teachers. The union points out that the textbook had received international criticism, including by the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, and that the Japanese Government in the past had reiterated its commitment to present Japanese history with respect to the suffering of its neighbouring countries. The union claims that Ms Masuda's actions as a teacher only upheld the stated principles of the Government of Japan, which were being undermined by the Tokyo Metropolitan Government.
68. In its response to the allegation, the Government of Japan restated its commitment to the spirit of the 1966 Recommendation. The Government noted that teachers have a moral responsibility, and if teachers failed under that responsibility, they would face disciplinary actions as set out by the Local Public Service Act, as well as government guidance on professional responsibility of teachers. Under the Local Public Service Act, any

disciplinary action against teachers must be carried out in fairness with possibilities of appeal.

69. With regard to the specific case, the Government confirmed the basic timeline presented by the union. With regard to particular incidents, the Government added information as set out below.
70. Regarding the complaint by a parent about Ms Masuda's teaching materials in 1997, the Government pointed out that the principal promised the parent a response following an investigation of the events. The Government did not indicate if Ms Masuda was notified about the complaint.
71. When Ms Masuda's salary was first reduced for a month in 1998, she was informed as to reasons for the disciplinary action by letter. The same letter also informed her of her right to appeal. The same occurred during the second reduction of salary in 1999.
72. In May 1999, the Adachi Ward Board of Education submitted a report concerning the events leading to disciplinary action, and the Board held three hearings with Ms Masuda. It was based on these procedures that the claimant was removed from teaching and placed into training.
73. The Government acknowledges the long period of training which ensued. It points to the legitimacy of this measure by the fact that several lawsuits and appeals to overturn the order to train were filed by the claimant, but these were all dismissed. The Government contends that the training did not affect Ms Masuda's standing as a teacher.
74. With regard to the press release issued by the Board of Education following her renewed order for training in 2005, the Government states that Ms Masuda did not attend a hearing on the matter. The Tokyo Board of Education regularly publicizes disciplinary action against teachers, providing information on the name of the teacher, age, gender, school and job type and reasons for disciplinary action.
75. The Government denies that the training Ms Masuda was ordered to attend from September 2005 through March 2006 violated her human rights. According to the government submission, the Tokyo Board of Education asked the teacher to train in the following areas:
 - (a) understanding the official course of study and curriculum for middle school, understanding content and method of instruction based on the course of study;
 - (b) improving quality as a public servant;
 - (c) education and understanding the local community;
 - (d) privacy and protection of students.
76. In the Government's view, Ms Masuda failed to cooperate with the training, demonstrated through such actions as writing protest letters, making audio recordings of the training, and ignoring instructions. The Government also points out that the claimant had participated in a rally held at the Toshima Ward Labour and Welfare Centre on 7 November 2005, which was during the period of the training she was ordered to undertake. At this rally, she distributed a document addressed from the principal of Chiyoda Ward Kudan Middle School to the Ward's Board of Education which contained information about a parent at the school.

-
77. As a result, the Board of Education decided to dismiss Ms Masuda. Hearings on the dismissal of Ms Masuda were held from 2 to 24 March 2006. Ms Masuda was invited but refused to attend. The claimant went on to sue over the disciplinary action of 2005 and 2006, but the courts dismissed the cases.
78. The Government further adds that the textbook which Ms Masuda criticized was adopted through the Textbook Authorization Research Council, and in accordance with the Act on the Organization and Operation of Local Educational Administration and the Act on Free Distribution of Textbooks for Compulsory Education Schools. The Government was taking steps to address the recommendations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child.
79. The Government also notes that it had disseminated knowledge about the 1966 Recommendation through its public relations magazine and to each prefecture school board.
80. In further information submitted to the Joint Committee, the union indicates that Ms Masuda did not attend the hearing regarding her dismissal because she was not allowed to invite a third party to join her.
81. In its responses to questions posed by the Joint Committee in its interim report of November 2014, the Government set out the following:
- (a) the Government is unable to determine if Ms Masuda was informed in writing of the allegations against her. Records indicate, however, that she was informed by the principal about complaints from parents;
 - (b) in the two cases of disciplinary action against her, Ms Masuda was provided an opportunity to explain her side of the story;
 - (c) disciplinary procedures by the Board of Education are conducted based on article 29, paragraph 4, of the Local Public Service Act. The procedure is carried out through an investigation by the Personnel Division of the Tokyo Office of education, which determines if disciplinary action is warranted and, if so, the severity of the measure. The Review Committee for Disciplinary Action and Change in the Status of Teachers reviews the disciplinary action. Peer teachers are not part of these procedures. Under the procedures, the accused are able to defend themselves, and can challenge disciplinary actions in court;
 - (d) professional standards for teachers are set out in the Local Public Service Act and the Special Act for Education Personnel.
82. With regard to academic freedom in a secondary school setting, the Government notes that a 1976 Supreme Court ruling held that teachers did not have complete academic freedom, since secondary students did not have the capacity to criticize teaching content; teachers exercised a strong influence over students; students did not have a choice of teachers and courses; and there was a recognized principle of consistency in nationwide education. Moreover, curriculum was mandated through regulation, and schools bore the responsibility of delivering curriculum content. The ruling, however, acknowledged some academic freedom in relation to specific teaching content and methods of teaching. Academic freedom was allowed in devising creative and flexible approaches to teaching mandatory content.
83. With regard to selection of textbooks, the Government indicates that current teachers are part of the Textbook Authorization Research Council. For the Tokyo metropolitan area, textbooks were selected based on the advice of the Tokyo Textbook Selection Council,

which was comprised of “school officials, officials from the Tokyo Board of Education, and academic experts”.

Findings

- 84.** The union’s submission to the Joint Committee alleges that the above series of events violated numerous principles set out in the 1966 Recommendation. In essence, these principles relate to academic freedom (paragraphs 61, 67 and 79), participation of teachers in development of courses and textbooks (paragraph 62), and fairness in disciplinary proceedings against teachers (paragraphs 45–52, 67–68).

Academic freedom

- 85.** The Joint Committee notes that the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, at its 54th Session in June 2010, expressed concern “at information that Japanese history textbooks do not enhance the mutual understanding of children from different countries in the region as they represent a Japanese interpretation of historical events only” and that it recommended that Japan “ensure that officially reviewed textbooks present a balanced view of historical events in the Asia–Pacific region”.¹ The Joint Committee further notes paragraph 14 of the UNESCO Recommendation concerning education for international understanding, cooperation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms (1974), which states:

Education should include critical analysis of the historical and contemporary factors of an economic and political nature underlying the contradictions and tensions between countries, together with study of ways of overcoming these contradictions, which are real impediments to understanding true international cooperation and the development of world peace.

- 86.** In its paragraph 61, the 1966 Recommendation provides that:

The teaching profession should enjoy academic freedom in the discharge of professional duties. Since teachers are particularly qualified to judge teaching aids and methods most suitable for their pupils, they should be given the essential role in the choice and adaptation of teaching material, the selection of textbooks and the application of teaching methods, within the framework of approved programmes, and with the assistance of educational authorities.

- 87.** In view of the above, the Joint Committee notes that in the field of social studies, the very nature of social science methodology implies that a teacher must present material with a view to encouraging a critical approach to representations of history. It would be contrary to the commonly accepted scientific methods of history to present any single account of history as the “truth”; instead, historical methodology holds that any historical account should be the basis for continued critical dialogue aiming at deeper understanding of the topic. It should therefore be fully within a teacher’s right and indeed in the interest of educational authorities to present curriculum materials in a critical manner.

- 88.** In the case of Ms Masuda, however, the teacher appears to have gone beyond a critical approach to curriculum materials and to have presented the curriculum as “forgery”. In her submission, she purports to present the “truth” to students and criticizes the teaching materials and its publishers as “forgers of history”. The Joint Committee understands that Ms Masuda’s critical view of the teaching materials have a foundation. She would have been within her right to present such materials in a critical light and to encourage students

¹ Committee on the Rights of the Child, 54th Session, 25 May–11 June 2010, document CRC/C/JPN/CO/3, paras 74–75.

to engage with the material not as the “truth”, but a representation of such. However, it is not within the right of teachers to present curriculum as patently false and to present an alternate “truth” to learners; this would in fact be contrary to the principle of critical engagement. Such an understanding of the principle of academic freedom in a secondary school context could indeed undermine the very purpose of historical inquiry.

- 89.** The Joint Committee underscores that teachers should enjoy the right of participation in social and public life, and be free to exercise all civic rights generally enjoyed by citizens, as set out in paragraphs 79 and 80 of the Recommendation.

Adoption of teaching materials

- 90.** A second question is whether the teaching materials adopted were done so in respect of the principles laid out in the 1966 Recommendation, which provides that: “Since teachers are particularly qualified to judge the teaching aids and methods most suitable for their pupils, they should be given the essential role in the choice and the adaptation of teaching material, the selection of textbooks and the application of teaching methods, within the framework of approved programmes, and with the assistance of the educational authorities” (paragraph 61). The Recommendation further sets out that: “teachers and their organizations should participate in the development of new courses, textbooks and teaching aids” (paragraph 62).
- 91.** In its submission to the Joint Committee, the Government of Japan states that teaching materials are authorized by the Textbook Authorization Research Council, and under standards set out under the Basic Act on Education. According to the Government, the Textbook Authorization Research Council included teachers, but no representatives of teachers’ organizations. The Tokyo Board of Education can only adopt textbooks which were approved through this process. The Government also indicates that in the case of the Tokyo metropolitan area, textbooks are recommended by the Tokyo Textbook Selection Council, which does not appear to include teachers.

Disciplinary measures against teachers

- 92.** A third issue raised in this case is the disciplinary measures taken against Ms Masuda. Paragraph 68 of the Recommendation sets out that:
- (1) Parents having a complaint against a school or a teacher should be given the opportunity of discussing it in the first instance with the school principal and the teacher concerned. Any complaint subsequently addressed to higher authority should be put in writing and a copy should be supplied to the teacher.
 - (2) Investigations of complaints should be so conducted that the teachers are given a fair opportunity to defend themselves and that no publicity is given to the proceedings.
- 93.** The Recommendation further provides, in its paragraph 47, that: “Disciplinary measures applicable to teachers guilty of breaches of professional conduct should be clearly defined. The proceedings and any resulting action should only be made public if the teacher so requests, except where prohibition from teaching is involved or the protection or well-being of the pupils so requires.”
- 94.** The Recommendation further suggests that: “Professional standards relating to teacher performance should be defined and maintained with the participation of the teachers’ organizations” (paragraph 71). Furthermore, “Authorities should recognize that effectiveness of disciplinary safeguards as well as discipline itself would be greatly enhanced if the teachers were judged with the participation of peers.” (paragraph 51).

-
- 95.** From the submissions, it appears that initial parent complaints were communicated to Ms Masuda, but it remains unclear if they were done so in writing. The submissions differ as to whether Ms Masuda was notified of the reasons for the two occasions when her salary was reduced, and whether there had been an opportunity for Ms Masuda to respond to the allegations against her.
- 96.** The Government acknowledges that Ms Masuda was ordered to attend more than two-and-a-half years of training from 2000 to 2002, and another six months of training before her dismissal in 2006. While the Joint Committee holds that training and support are the best remedial practices for teachers who fail to meet professional standards, removal from teaching and training for such long periods of time appears to be more of a means of isolation and punishment than professional development. Moreover, it is unclear if Ms Masuda had an opportunity to discuss the training objectives.
- 97.** Furthermore, the professional standards she was accused of violating appear to have been those set out in the Local Public Service Act, rather than ones set out specifically for the teaching profession.
- 98.** Finally, the Joint Committee notes with concern that Ms Masuda's order for training and her ultimate dismissal were made the subject of public announcements, even though her actions did not represent an immediate threat to the protection or well-being of her students.

Dissemination of the Recommendation

- 99.** The submission by the union also alleges that the Government failed to disseminate awareness of the 1966 Recommendation. The Joint Committee recalls that after the Recommendation's adoption in 1966 by the Special Intergovernmental Conference on the Status of Teachers, the ILO's Governing Body considered that article 19 of the ILO Constitution did not apply to it. The Governing Body nonetheless invited member States to report periodically on the action taken upon the Recommendation and to communicate the Recommendation and all reports relative thereto to the organizations concerned.²

Recommendations

- 100.** The Joint Committee notes that some of the events described above occurred more than 18 years ago, and that Ms Masuda had access to internal appeal mechanisms, including courts, which upheld the actions taken by the authorities. Moreover, the Joint Committee finds that while Ms Masuda did not act in a professional manner, the disciplinary actions taken against her were not in line with paragraphs 51, 63 and 68 of the Recommendation of 1966.
- 101.** The case raises a number of wider policy concerns in relation to the Recommendation, which are important with regard to other situations in which teachers may disagree with curriculum and educational policy.
- 102.** In this respect, the Joint Committee recommends that the Governing Body of the ILO and the Executive Board of UNESCO invite the Government of Japan and the Tokyo Metropolitan Government to consider the following measures:
- (a) ensure that the principle contained in paragraph 3 of the Recommendation that "utmost importance should be attached to the contribution to be made by education to

² ILO, *Official Bulletin*, Volume L, No. 1, Jan. 1967, pp. 28–29.

peace and to understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and among racial and religious groups” is reflected in teaching materials;

- (b) review policy and practice on how teachers are included in the selection of teaching materials and textbooks. Such policy and practice should allow both teachers and representatives of teachers’ organizations to participate. Selection criteria and practices for involving teachers should be fair and transparent to ensure a diversity of views in the development of teaching materials;
- (c) review and change policy and practices on disciplinary actions against teachers, including dismissal, to ensure that teachers who are the subject of complaints by parents are given an opportunity to discuss with the principal, the parents, and other concerned parties, and are given opportunities to defend themselves, in line with paragraph 68(1) and (2) of the Recommendation. Teachers should have access to full evidence in the case against them, and can be defended by a representative of their choice, as provided for by paragraph 50 of the Recommendation;
- (d) consider involving peer teachers in disciplinary review bodies;
- (e) review and revise policy and practices so as to prevent public announcements of disciplinary actions against teachers, in line with paragraphs 47 and 68 of the Recommendation, except where prohibition from teaching is involved or the protection or well-being of the pupils so requires;
- (f) review and change policy and practice on teacher training to ensure that its aim remains the professional development of teachers, and is not used as an instrument of discipline or punishment;
- (g) develop policies and standards, in collaboration with teachers’ organizations, on defining teacher autonomy within prescribed curricula and policies so as to strike a balance between educational consistency and academic freedom, as set out in paragraph 61 of the Recommendation;
- (h) undertake renewed efforts to disseminate the Recommendation to authorities concerned, including local boards of education, to ensure the policies and practices can be guided by the Recommendation;
- (i) keep the Joint Committee informed of efforts on the above recommendations.

***Allegation received through Education International
from the Cambodia Independent Teachers
Association (CITA)***

Background

103. The ILO received an allegation from the Cambodian Independent Teachers’ Association (CITA) on 5 October 2012, transmitted through Education International, regarding non-respect of principles in the 1966 ILO–UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Teachers. The initial allegation was discussed at the 11th Session of the Joint Committee in October 2012, and found to meet the criteria of receivability. As per the Joint Committee’s procedures, the allegation was sent to the Government of Cambodia on 16 November 2012 for its observations. As no response was received, a reminder was sent to the Government on 18 April 2013. A further reminder was sent on 12 August 2013, indicating that the Joint Committee, as per its usual practice, would have to proceed to examine the case in its interim report. No response by the Government has been received to date.

-
- 104.** The allegation was presented in the CEART's interim report to the ILO's Governing Body (CEART/INT/2014/1), with a recommendation to strongly encourage the Government to respond to the allegation. To date, no response has been received by the Government.

Substance of the allegation

- 105.** The submission by CITA in essence alleges that there was a lack of a consultative framework for teachers and teachers' organizations to participate in the development of education policies. While the Education Law of 2007 provided for the participation of education stakeholders in the development of policies, in practice no independent teachers' organizations were recognized by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport for the purpose of formal discussions regarding education policy. According to the union, teachers' representatives were not included in such bodies as the Education Sector Working Group, the Joint Technical Working Group, and the Education Congress. This lack of participation of teachers in policy setting failed to implement the principles set out in paragraph 9 of the Recommendation.
- 106.** The allegation further states that there was a severe lack of opportunities for in-service training for teachers. While in-service training existed, it was often provided by non-governmental organizations or development partners. The union called for more regular provision of in-service training by the Government, along with standards developed together with teachers' associations to govern access to, and the quality of, such training, in line with paragraphs 32–37 of the Recommendation.
- 107.** CITA also alleges that professional standards and policies on the recruitment of teachers were developed in the absence of consultation with teachers' organizations, and that such standards were poorly disseminated. This situation was not in conformity with the principles set out in paragraphs 38–39 of the Recommendation.
- 108.** The allegation also states that there was no policy governing the promotion of teachers, and notes that promotions were often linked to affiliation with the ruling political party, a practice that was not in line with the principles set out in paragraphs 40–44 of the Recommendation.
- 109.** According to the union, there were no guidelines or regulations governing disciplinary measures against teachers, other than provisions concerning the civil service in general. In some cases, teachers were only informed of sanctions against them, and not of complaints or evidence against them, and not offered an opportunity to defend themselves. The union states that such practices were not in line with the principles set out in paragraphs 45–52 of the Recommendation. Moreover, a code of ethics was drawn up by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport, but not in consultation with teachers, as called for in paragraphs 70–73 of the Recommendation.
- 110.** The union alleges that there was no consultation on selection of teaching aids, and that teachers were hesitant to use or develop teaching materials that were not sanctioned by the Ministry. Such practices were not in line with paragraphs 61–62 of the Recommendation.
- 111.** According to the allegation, contact hours were above regional averages, and teachers were not consulted on determining hours of work, as is encouraged in paragraphs 89–93 of the Recommendation.
- 112.** Similarly, teachers' salaries were below the World Bank estimate of the income needed to support a typical Cambodian family. The union calls for an increase in salaries to attract and maintain people with the desired qualifications, as set out in paragraphs 114–124 of the Recommendation.

-
- 113.** The allegation further states that teachers were denied the right to form unions or to bargain collectively under the Common Statute of Civil Servants, and that provisions for teachers' participation in the development of educational policies stipulated in the Education Law were not implemented. The allegation cites several instances where local authorities had interfered with CITA events. These problems impaired the implementation of the principles set out in paragraphs 82–84 of the Recommendation.

Findings

- 114.** The Joint Committee notes with regret that the Government has not responded to this allegation.
- 115.** The Joint Committee recognizes the economic challenges faced by Cambodia and notes its steady progress in achieving education goals over the past decade. Nonetheless, the situation described in the allegation appears to present several problems with respect to implementing the principles of the Recommendation. Overall, there appears to be a complete absence of a consultative framework with teachers and their organizations in the development of education policy, the selection of teaching materials, and the setting of salaries and hours of work. Disciplinary procedures appear to lack the appropriate safeguards to provide the necessary autonomy for teachers to be effective. In this respect, the Joint Committee recalls the important principle that “[t]eachers’ organizations should be recognized as a force which can contribute greatly to educational advance and which therefore should be associated with the determination of educational policy” (paragraph 9 of the Recommendation).
- 116.** The Joint Committee also notes the allegations that teachers’ salaries remain below levels commensurate with the principles set out in paragraph 115 of the Recommendation. In this respect, the Joint Committee recalls the general principle, set out in paragraph 8 of the Recommendation, that “[w]orking conditions for teachers should be such as will best promote effective learning and enable teachers to concentrate on their professional tasks”.
- 117.** The Joint Committee also notes with concern allegations of interference in the activities of teachers’ organizations. While matters of freedom of association are not within the mandate of the Committee, the Joint Committee notes that interference with the activities of teachers’ organizations is not in line with the principles set out in paragraph 9 of the Recommendation. The Joint Committee further notes that similar concerns were the subject of a discussion and conclusions by the Committee on the Application of Standards at the 102nd Session of the International Labour Conference in 2013.

Recommendation

- 118.** Given the seriousness of the situation described, the Joint Committee regrets that the Government has not used this opportunity to engage in dialogue with CITA and with the Joint Committee.
- 119.** The Joint Committee recommends that the Governing Body of the ILO and the Executive Board of UNESCO urge Cambodia, as a member State of ILO and UNESCO, to:
- (a) respond to the allegations by CITA;
 - (b) enter into dialogue with CITA;
 - (c) respond by December 2015 at the latest to ensure that such information can be considered in the Joint Committee’s next interim report.

B. Follow-up on allegations considered at the 11th Session, 2012

Cases previously examined by the Joint Committee

Allegation received from the Dansk Magisterforening (DM) of Denmark

120. The Joint Committee considered an allegation made by the Dansk Magisterforening (DM) at its Tenth Session in 2009. At its 11th Session, it noted that the DM still considered that current practices at Danish universities undermined principles of academic freedom. The Joint Committee recommended that the Government of Denmark discuss the issues raised in this case with the relevant parties.

121. At its interim report in 2014, the Joint Committee noted that no further information had been received and invited both parties to provide further information for the 12th Session. As no further information was received, the Joint Committee therefore considers this case closed.

Allegation received from the All Japan Teachers' and Staff Union (ZENKYO)

122. At its 11th Session and in its interim report, the Joint Committee requested further updates from both parties. Because no further information was provided from either party, the Joint Committee recommends that this case be closed.

Allegation received from the National Teachers' Federation (FENPROF) of Portugal

123. At its 11th Session, the Joint Committee considered an allegation submitted by the National Teachers' Federation (FENPROF) concerning the Portuguese Government's alleged disregard for collective bargaining, the absence of negotiation in relation to the reduction of teachers' salaries, the suspension of teachers' career progression and the absence of negotiation with regard to legislative measures aimed at introducing changes in the curriculum. In its recommendation, the Joint Committee urged both parties to seek a resolution to these matters in line with the principles of the Recommendation.

Recommendation

124. In view of the continuing challenges faced by educational authorities in light of economic austerity, the Joint Committee recommends that the Governing Body of the ILO and the Executive Board of UNESCO request both parties to keep it apprised of developments.

C. Promotional activities

125. The Joint Committee noted a wide range of activities undertaken by UNESCO and the ILO to promote greater knowledge and use of the two Recommendations, including those undertaken by CEART members. It specifically noted the participation of Joint Committee experts in World Teachers Day events, the joint UNESCO–Education International (EI) project on “Improving teacher support and participation in local education groups”, and the publication of the *ILO policy guidelines on the promotion of decent work for early childhood education personnel*. In the ensuing discussion, the Joint Committee called for more involvement in the promotion of the Recommendations. It was suggested to formally introduce experts to UNESCO and ILO offices in their regions and respective UNESCO

National Commissions. Joint Committee members could also use conclusions of their sessions to organize events such as panels at the meetings of relevant professional associations, and draft opinion pieces in media to disseminate the work of the Joint Committee. Better involvement of the experts in promoting the Recommendations would require a strategic plan to be implemented by the secretariat.

D. Working methods of the Joint Committee

126. The Joint Committee considered the current working methods of the regular sessions sound and decided to continue them in the next session. Between regular sessions, the Joint Committee stressed that experts could do more to promote the Recommendations and the report of the Joint Committee, with support from ILO and UNESCO. Professional networks and ICTs could play an important role in these activities. Preparatory work on the topics of discussion should move up earlier in the calendar, and experts should be involved in the preparation of background materials in advance of the meeting. For the next meeting, a survey of the application of the Recommendations could be envisaged, in relation to available resources.

E. Draft agenda of the 13th Session of the Joint Committee

127. The Joint Committee proposed the following topics for consideration on the agenda of its 13th Session in 2018:

- (a) teaching in upper-secondary and tertiary TVET institutions;
- (b) the participation of teachers in policy dialogue;
- (c) assessment and evaluation of higher education personnel;
- (d) changes in the teaching profession in relation to the 1966 and 1997 Recommendations

F. Communiqué to the World Education Forum, 2015

128. Recognizing that the 12th session of CEART was being held at a critical time when the global community was adopting the post-2015 sustainable development agenda, the Joint Committee took the opportunity to review the proposed education goal and its targets for 2030 proposed by the UN Open Working Group. It subsequently adopted a communiqué addressed to participants of the World Education Forum held in the Republic of Korea, 19–22 May 2015 (see Appendix III).

Appendix I

Background sources for the 12th Session ¹

- Connell, J. *Maintaining the professionalization of teaching in higher education: from entry into the profession to lifelong professional development*, background paper for the 12th Session of CEART (CEART/12/2015/4), UNESCO, 2015.
- Education International. *Report to the Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teachers (CEART)*, Brussels, EI, 2015.
- Mominó, J. *The implications of technological change on the teaching profession*, background paper for the 12th Session of CEART (CEART/12/2015/6), UNESCO, 2015.
- Kinser, K. *Quality of teaching in the context of increasing non-public providers of higher education*, background paper for the 12th Session of CEART (CEART/12/2015/5), UNESCO, 2015.
- Looney, J. *International trends in teacher appraisal*, background paper for the 12th session of CEART (CEART/12/2015/8), UNESCO, 2015.
- Ratteree, B. *Changing employment relationships in the teaching profession*, background paper for the 12th Session of CEART (CEART/12/2015/7), ILO, 2015.
- Shaeffer, S. *The promotion of decent work for early childhood education personnel: The professionalization of a neglected profession*, background paper for the 12th Session of CEART (CEART/12/2015/3), ILO, 2015.
- Wintour, N. *Social dialogue in the education sector – The continuing challenge*, background paper for the 12th Session of CEART (CEART/12/2015/9), ILO, 2015.

¹ Background documents of the 12th Session of the Joint Committee can be found at: http://www.ilo.org/sector/activities/sectoral-meetings/WCMS_364828/lang--en/index.htm.

Appendix II

Secretariat of the Joint Committee

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

Mr Qian Tang
Assistant Director-General for Education
Education Sector

Ms Maki Hayashikawa (Katsuno)
Chief, Section of Learning and Teachers
Division for Teaching, Learning and Content

Ms Carolina Belalcazar
Programme Specialist
Section of Learning and Teachers

Ms Yoshie Kaga
Programme Specialist
Section of Learning and Teachers

Ms Florence Migeon
Programme Specialist
Section of Learning and Teachers

Ms Hassmik Tortian
Programme Specialist
Section of Higher Education
Division of Policies and Lifelong Learning Systems

Ms Mariana Kitsiona
Associate Project Officer
Section of Learning and Teachers

Ms Delphine Santini
Consultant
Section of Education Policy
Division of Policies and Lifelong Learning Systems

International Labour Organization (ILO)

Ms Alette van Leur
Director
Sectoral Policies Department

Mr Oliver Liang
Sectoral Specialist: Education, Culture, Media, Graphics
Sectoral Policies Department

Ms Angelika Muller
Labour Law Officer
Industrial and Employment Relations Department

Appendix III

Empowering teachers: Teaching in the post-2015 education agenda

Communiqué by the 12th Session of the ILO–UNESCO Joint Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel to the World Education Forum 2015

The ILO–UNESCO Joint Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel (hereafter the Joint Committee), having met at its 12th Regular Session in Paris on 20–24 April 2015,¹

Recognizing the importance of international deliberations on the Sustainable Development Goals and in particular Goal 4 on education and its target on teachers,

Concerned that, while much is expected of teachers in the post-2015 agenda, the status of teachers around the world is severely challenged,

Considering that the ILO–UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers (1966) and the UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel (1997) are as relevant as ever in guiding policies aimed at strengthening the status of teaching personnel,

Adopts the following communiqué:²

1. The Joint Committee appreciates the major progress made worldwide in steadily increasing the number of teaching staff, especially at the secondary education level, during the last two decades. It notes with satisfaction that quality teachers are increasingly recognized as the single most important factor in providing effective learning, and that a wide evidence base supports this view.
2. The Joint Committee is nonetheless deeply concerned by persisting challenges brought about by teacher shortages and by the low status of teachers at all levels of education, as reported by the Global Monitoring Report 2015, as well as by teacher organizations and NGO/CSOs.

¹ The Joint ILO–UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel was established in 1967 after the ILO and UNESCO adopted a far-reaching Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers (1966). Since 1997, the Joint Committee is also charged with examining key issues facing higher education staff following the adoption of the Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel by UNESCO. Composed of independent education experts from around the world, the Joint Committee meets every three years to review major trends in education and teaching, and to make relevant recommendations. It also reviews allegations brought by teachers' unions regarding violations of the principles of the Recommendation. The recommendations of the Joint Committee are non-binding, being intended to guide the actions of national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations and other education stakeholders.

² This communiqué represent the views of the Joint ILO–UNESCO Committee. As it was not possible for the Governing Body of the ILO and the Executive Board of UNESCO to discuss the communiqué in time for the World Education Forum, the views expressed in the communiqué are those of the Joint Committee only, and its publication does not represent an endorsement by the ILO or UNESCO.

-
3. In particular, the Joint Committee has noted that the latest trends show:
 - (a) a continued lack of recognition of teachers as professionals at all levels (de-professionalization), driven by austerity measures and poorly designed accountability schemes. Such trends have had an impact on the safety and health of teachers, in particular on their psychological well-being (burnout) and physical security;
 - (b) weakening social dialogue in education;
 - (c) lack of participation of teachers and their organizations in education policy reforms;
 - (d) decline in teachers' status and working conditions;
 - (e) increasing disparities in teaching qualification requirements at all education levels;
 - (f) increasing for-profit privatization of education and a related impact on quality of education;
 - (g) violence targeted specifically at schools and teachers.
 4. Moreover, early childhood education teaching personnel enjoy the least recognition, appreciation and investment in their professional development, despite the increasing recognition of the importance of ECE in laying the foundation for learning throughout life.
 5. With reference to the proposed 2030 education goal and its set of targets, the Joint Committee notes with concern the narrow focus given to the issue of teaching personnel, with its main emphasis being on ensuring the adequate supply of teachers. The Joint Committee has noted that the target related to teachers is referred to as the "Means of Implementation", implying that teachers/teaching personnel are merely seen as an "input" into the education system.
 6. The Joint Committee is of the firm view that teachers are not only a means of implementing education goals; they are the very key to sustainability and national capacity in achieving learning outcomes and creating societies based on knowledge, values and ethics. For this reason, the professional status of teachers must be addressed as a critical element of education goals.
 7. The Joint Committee firmly believes that the key condition to attaining quality education at all levels is to ensure that every learner is taught by a qualified, motivated and professionally-supported teacher who is able to participate in education decision-making.
 8. In view of the above, the Joint Committee calls on governments, teacher organizations and unions, international development partners, and other stakeholders in education to take urgent actions, in line with the provisions of the Recommendations of 1966 and 1997, so as to:
 - (a) ensure that the central role of teachers in the full achievement of all the 2030 education-related targets is explicitly recognized and included as one of the core targets of Sustainable Development Goal 4 on Education;
 - (b) ensure that the status of teaching as a profession is publicly recognized and respected;
 - (c) ensure that practising teachers are properly qualified through formal teacher education processes in line with each country's requirements;
 - (d) devise strategies for the provision of appropriate incentives, including competitive remuneration, clear career paths and continuous professional development opportunities to attract and retain good candidates to become teachers;
 - (e) establish and respect appropriate legal frameworks and institutional mechanisms that secure social dialogue and acceptable working conditions for teachers;
 - (f) ensure that teachers and their organizations participate prominently and play a constructive role in policy discussions and reform efforts in education;
 - (g) identify and agree on a comprehensive set of key indicators that would allow systematic monitoring of progress on the status and quality of the teaching profession at global, regional and national levels;
 - (h) identify good practices that lead to improvement in the teaching profession, so as to inspire more positive actions by government and other stakeholders;
 - (i) analyse and address new challenges in teaching in various contexts such as the evolving school environment, new forms of technology and for-profit privatization;

-
- (j) establish policies and strategies to protect teachers from violence within the framework of violence-free schools, and, in areas of armed conflict, adhere to international principles which prohibit the targeting of schools or use of schools for military purposes.

Paris, 24 April 2015

CEART/12/2015/14

This report summarizes the analysis of major issues affecting the status of teaching personnel worldwide at all levels of education by the 12th Session of the Joint ILO/UNESCO Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendations concerning Teaching Personnel, held in Paris on 20–24 April 2015.

Established in 1967 after the ILO and UNESCO adopted a far-reaching Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers (1966), the Joint Committee meets every three years to review major trends in education and teaching, and to make relevant recommendations. It also reviews allegations brought by teachers' unions regarding violations of the principles of the Recommendation. In 1997, when UNESCO adopted a Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel, the Joint Committee was also charged with examining key issues facing higher education staff.

Composed of independent education experts from around the world, the Joint Committee examined during its 12th Session a number of urgent issues affecting teaching personnel, including quality teaching in higher education, professionalization of early childhood education personnel, changing employment relationships in teaching, the impact of digital technologies, and social dialogue. It also reviewed a number of allegations from teacher unions regarding the application of the Recommendations.

The Joint Committee furthermore adopted a communiqué which was transmitted to the World Education Forum in Incheon, Republic of Korea, in May 2015.

For more information:

www.ilo.org/education