

Allegation concerning the non-application of provisions of the 1966 “Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers”

All Japan Teachers and Staff Union (ZENKYO)

1. The All Japan Teachers and Staff Union is a national organization composed of teachers' unions in forty-one prefectures. Teachers' unions at prefectural level organize teachers and staff working in public kindergartens, elementary, middle, high schools and schools for the disabled. The Union was formed in March 1991 and the total membership is 150,000. The Union works for the protection and improvement of living and working conditions and rights of teachers and staff and for the realization of democratic school education.

The Union has decided to submit an allegation to the Joint Committee of Experts on the Application of the Recommendation concerning Teaching Personnel (CEART). The allegation concerns the non-application of the Recommendation on the following two points: (1) Japanese government's policy for treatment of those teachers “who are repeatedly evaluated as being unable to conduct effective teaching and class management” and (2) a new merit rating system.

2. The Constitution of Japan, enacted in 1946, stipulates that all people shall have the right to receive an equal education (Article 26). In order to realize the spirit of the Constitution in education, the Fundamental Law of Education was enacted in 1947. Both the Constitution and the Fundamental Law of Education have never been revised and remain effective to this day.

The Fundamental Law of Education states, “Education shall aim at the development of personality, striving for the rearing of the people, sound in mind and body, who shall love truth and justice, esteem individual value, respect labor and have a deep sense of responsibility, and be imbued with the independent spirit, as builders of a peaceful state and society” (Article 1).

The Law also prohibits “improper control” and stipulates that “school administration shall aim to adapt to and establish the various conditions required for the pursuit of the goal of education” (Article 10). Regarding the terms and conditions of teachers, regarded as one of the most important area for the improvement, the Law stipulates, “the status of teachers shall be respected and their fair and appropriate treatment shall be secured” (Article 6).

Since the latter half of 1950s, however, the Japanese government and the Ministry of Education have strengthened national control over teachers through legal restraint of civil rights, abuse of official instructions, mandatory transfers and other coercive means. Claiming that the National Course of Study has a legal binding force, the Ministry of Education has strengthened national control over educational contents, by carrying out strict screening of school textbooks, enforcing schools to raise the rising sun (*hinomaru*) flag and to sing the “national anthem” (*Kimigayo*) during school functions. Recently, the Ministry has gone so far as to exclude teachers from the process of textbook adoption.

Since the 1960s, the Ministry of Education has used education as an instrument to promote “policy of building up the talented ” in response to the demands of manpower policy from financial circles.

The Education Ministry has blatantly introduced the demands through its education policy in schools. As a direct result, a number of new courses and new vocational schools have been established. These schools and the courses offered are directly connected with specifically compartmentalized vocations and hardly in accord with the wishes of middle school graduates. A

great number of middle school graduates were compelled to enter schools and vocational courses for which they have little interest.

As a result of this education policy, high school entrance examinations have become increasingly competitive and practically all schools have been ranked according to student grade. Since the latter half of 1970s, it has become evident that many students have difficulties following school lessons. Cases of school violence and bullying, school phobia and dropping out have increased. In May 1998, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child noted “the highly competitive” educational system in Japan and recommended the Japanese government take appropriate steps to “prevent and combat excessive stress and school phobia”.

In an attempt to improve this situation, teachers, parents and community residents have carried on a 30 million-name signature campaign every year for the past ten years. Mentioned on the petition are the issues of smaller class size and the education budget. Teachers have also voluntarily taken part in various educational research meetings convened by non-governmental educational research organizations as well as those by teachers’ organizations. They have launched a new initiative to encourage the participation of students and parents and coordination of their efforts in school affairs.

Since the mid-1990s, the Ministry of Education (renamed the Ministry of Education and Science since 2001) has promoted educational reform at a dizzying speed. This reform is ostensibly put forward as part of the structural reform of society and the state for purposes of economic survival in a competitive age of globalization. Under these principles, educational reform is based on neo-liberal concepts and is frequently characterized using such terms as ‘competitive principle’, ‘freedom of choice’, ‘market principle’, ‘meritocracy’, ‘performance evaluation’, ‘self-responsibility’, ‘deregulation’.

As a step to actualize the reform, the MES amended the relevant law in 2001 to enable local education boards to exclude so-called ‘incompetent teachers’ “who are repeatedly evaluated as being unable to conduct effective teaching and class management”. The MES plans to introduce a system under which teachers regarded as showing “excellence” will be officially commended and financially rewarded through special promotions and other means. For ‘discovering’ ‘incompetent teachers’ and ‘excellent teachers’, the MES advocates it necessary to establish a system to assessment for teachers.

The matter of incompetent teachers’ and teacher assessment system – the topic of the allegation – has now become a national issue.

3. The MES is promoting this personnel management system as a means of designating what they view as ‘incompetent teachers’ in order to exclude them from classrooms, and to transfer them into non-teaching posts.

(1) The system of transferring ‘improper teachers’ to positions outside the teaching profession was put into effect on January 11, 2002. It gives local education boards the authority to transfer any teacher deemed ‘improper’ even without their consent to a different type of jobs other than teaching profession. The two requisites are the judgement of education boards that (a) teachers “are unable to conduct effective teaching and class management” and that (b) “they have made no improvement even after appropriate measures including in-service training are taken”.

It requires little effort to see that the definition of the phrase “unable to conduct effective teaching” is ambiguous. The MES offers the following examples: (a) lack of expertise and technique on subject matters, (b) inappropriate teaching method, (c) lack of capability and interest in understanding the minds of children. Although, criteria for practical application are entrusted to the respective prefecture boards of education, there is a serious lack of coordination among these

boards. In Kochi prefecture, for example, education boards specify ninety-one different behaviors which may denote an 'improper teacher'. These include such things as 'easy-going and inclined to avoid difficulties', giving 'impression of abnormal showiness', having 'financial troubles due to an overdrawn bank account', being 'ready to comment on any and every proposed subject at staff meeting'. Many of these evaluations are clearly concerned with teachers' personalities and are simple matter of privacy. Using such loose criteria, it is unavoidable that teachers will be assessed arbitrary and subjective manner.

To make things worse, once teachers are judged as "being unable to conduct effective teaching", they are not always guaranteed jobs unless (a) they have the necessary ability and (b) it is guaranteed the number of staff will not increase. This is clearly a system designated to push teachers into retirement.

And teachers concerned are neither informed about the grounds upon which they are judged as 'incompetent' nor even whether they are being assessed at all. Thus teachers are denied the opportunities to defend themselves. Teachers are not represented on any committee which judges teachers as 'incompetent' and classifies them for special training, change of job, or dismissal. Some municipalities do not publish the names of the committee members. Upon the final decision, teachers concerned are simply given an "opportunity, if necessary, to express opinions". It is not required therefore that teachers be allowed to express their opinions. Recommendations for teachers to take in-service training are not regarded as unfavorable treatment and are exempted from items about which dissatisfaction may be expressed. There is no guarantee that the evaluation committee, as a third party, will make impartial judgement.

- (2) The duties of teachers are essentially collaborative activities decided upon through collective consultation and mutual consent. When involved in classroom activities, teachers perform their duties according to educational or teaching plans agreed at during meetings concerning subjects, grades, instructions and other such matters.

In the life stage of a teacher from employment through retirement, teaching experiences as well as open discussion with colleagues about educational research contribute greatly to the enhancement of teaching ability. This is very similar to on the job training in any commercial field. It is teachers' independent, voluntary desire to conduct educational research that is required to achieve excellence in teaching.

This is why the Special Law on Educational Public Service Workers states the following: "Public educational workers should constantly strive to do research and to build character. 2.The authorities of educational public service workers should make efforts to draft a plan for required in-service facilities and for the participation of teachers into in-service training and to implement the plan". (Article 19) In particular opportunities of in-service training for the enhancement of teaching ability should be fully guaranteed to those teachers who are regarded as "being unable to conduct effective teaching".

The system, however, does not oblige authorities to guarantee a new training opportunities for those teachers. In addition, once teachers are classified as "being unable to conduct effective teaching", they have to receive training without the guarantee of status. It is naturally difficult for them to "improve disposition and ability".

In districts where 'incompetent teachers' are now singled out and where corrective measures are taken, they are mostly trained at out-of school facilities. Training in these facilities amounts to little else but training for clerical works for non-teaching positions and has little to do with improving teaching ability. It is difficult for teachers to return to their former posts after such training. Recent examples are not difficult to find. Five teachers from Tokyo, two from Hiroshima

and three from Kochi were compelled to retire in fiscal 2001 year. Kyoto City Education Boards established a special supervisory office in charge of district education. Inspectors from the office, in close cooperation with the personnel section in charge of teaching, have persistently assailed teachers. For example, they infringed human rights of teachers while conducting inspections, issued excessive official instructions and were usually inflexible during fact-finding tours. They even demanded that teachers concerned submit a full account of affairs as well as written apologies to account for their responsibility. Using instruction as a pretext, inspectors have put excessive pressures on teachers, so far driving thirty-six teachers into early retirement during the past five years.

- (3) Long hours and tight schedule in school have brought about increasingly serious problems. According to the “Survey on the Actual Situation of School/Class Management” published by the National Research Institute for Educational Policy, teachers spend an average 9 hours and 42 minutes working at school, 1 hour and 17 minutes for work at home and 6 hours 20 minutes for sleeping. No substantial measures have been taken to reduce teachers’ workloads and the number of teachers taking temporary leave due to illness has increased to 4,922, the largest number in the history. Forty-six percent of this total is due to mental stress – a dramatic increase over past years. (On the Situation of Disciplinary Measures for Teachers in 2000 Fiscal Year, surveyed by the Ministry of Education and Science)

Taking the above into consideration, it is easy to see that there is an urgent need to improve educational and working conditions. This includes preventive measures, coordination of busy schedules, reduction of teaching hours, medical leave system, a system for safe and sanitary workplace, mental health studies and training for management. The improvement of educational and working conditions has been neglected so far too long especially when one takes into consideration that no sincere labour – management consultations have been made.

As a means of improving this situation, our Union, ZENKYO, submitted a written request on February 21, 2001 to the MES concerning the problems of ‘incompetent teachers’. Despite this, the MES refused to meet with the union, stating that the issues would be deliberated during the immediate Diet session. In addition, almost every education board at the prefecture level refused to enter into negotiations on the grounds that the issues were ‘items concerning administrative and operational affairs’. These refusals are in direct violation of ILO Convention No. 98.

The system for excluding ‘incompetent teachers’ was introduced without attempting to obtain the understanding or consent of teachers. The most serious failure of the system is that it makes many diligent teachers uneasy, at the same time that they are being asked to cope with the changing attitudes and the unruly behaviors of children. Many earnest teachers are lost in this manner.

- (4) The policy of designating teachers as ‘incompetent’ and relocating them fails in any measures of objectivity and impartiality. It is not in accord with the “ILO and UNESCO Recommendation” which states, “(1) Where any kind of direct assessment of the teachers’ work is required, such assessment should be objective and should be made known to the teacher. (2) Teachers should have a right to appeal against assessment which they deem to be unjustified”. (item 64) Ignored in practice also are the following items which state that “The stability of employment and security of tenure in the profession are essential in the interests of education as well as in that of the teacher” (item 45), “Teachers should be adequately protected against arbitrary action affecting their professional standing or career” (item 46), and “Any system of inspection or supervision should be designed to encourage and help teachers in the performance of their professional tasks and

should be such as not to diminish the freedom, initiative and responsibility of teachers” (item 63).

4. The Japanese government and the MES have plans to implement drastic reform of the system for public service workers by introducing merit system. The MES allocated a certain amount in the 2002 national budget to entrust education boards at prefectural level with the establishment of a system for official commendation and special promotion of excellent teachers. The MES makes it public to introduce a new national merit system. A new discriminative performance-related pay level and personnel system based on teacher evaluation has been already introduced in Tokyo Metropolis. Kagawa prefecture, whose superintendent of education board is sent by the MES, has also taken an initiative in introducing a similar system. The MES is promoting the move by ‘providing pioneering systems’ to other education boards.

(1) Following is an outlines of the ‘Regulation on the Assessment of Educational Personnel’ of the Tokyo Metropolitan Education Board, now regarded as a model for a national system.

The system aims “to improve quality and capability of staff and to activate school organizations by appropriate assessment of competence and performance” and is composed of the ‘submission of self-assessment’ and ‘performance assessment’.

- (a) Regarding the self-assessment, the regulation requires that “each staff set up his/her own official goals ...and conduct self-assessment of their achievement”. However, the goal should be strictly set up “on the basis of the school management policy laid down by principal”. There are no guarantees that school management policy will be worked out based on the consultation with and consent of teachers. Each staff should submit a self-assessment to the principal three times a year and the final one should include the assessment of achievements.
- (b) The assessment of achievements is made on the following three factors, ‘quality of instruction’, ‘pastoral guidance’ and ‘career guidance’. On each factor, ‘competence’, ‘motivation’ and ‘achievements’ are assessed. Regular assessment is made once a year (March 31). There are two kinds of assessment; “absolute” assessment (criterion-referenced assessment) by deputy principal and principal and “relative” assessment (non-referenced assessment) from a superintendent. On receipt of the primary assessment by deputy principal, principal makes secondary absolute assessment with reference to the teacher’s self-assessment and “without delay shall submit his/her report to the superintendent by applying the distribution rate indicated by the superintendent”. In the end, superintendent makes relative assessment on the achievements of individual teachers.

The regulation stipulates that “result of the assessment will be reflected in salary, promotion and other personnel management”. The aim is to make this a basic piece of data in determining pay, treatment, ‘incompetent’ teachers, and selection for managerial posts.

(2) It is imperative that principals, deputy principals and teachers freely discuss a variety of issues at staff meetings and divisional committees at the beginning of each new school year taking account of the attainment of the last year. It is also important that educational goals and management policy of each year group and school as a whole are adopted as a result of the discussion and that each teacher has his/her own general and specific educational goals.

As is mentioned earlier, however, the “Regulation of the Assessment of Educational Personnel” of the Tokyo Metropolis Education Board states that school management policy shall be laid down by principal. The regulation stipulates, “individual staff members establish their own

official goals...and make self-assessments of their achievement on the basis of the school management policy laid down by principal". It is feared that this provision will restrict the originality and freedom of teachers.

Principal and deputy principal are expected to "provide appropriate instruction and advise" concerning the self-assessment of each teacher. In a number of schools, teachers have been forced to redo their self-assessments when, according to the management, failed to meet the requirements for 'special wage increase'. A number of complaints have been reported by union members regarding this. One mentioned the fact "When interviewed by principal, I was requested to report personal bad relationship among colleagues, if any". Another member commented "My young colleague was advised on affairs which are simply too private, for example, how to dress well, who to drink with and who not to".

It has been noted that there are two types of teacher assessment: one is an 'assessment of the development of abilities' (a formative assessment) which aims to improve teachers' abilities. The second is an 'assessment of achievement' (managerial assessment) which has to do with pay and personnel affairs. Our union is not strictly opposed to the former since we regard it as an appropriate assessment tool. Descriptive assessments that do not necessarily rank teachers, and assessment done by colleagues through collective discussion could be categorized as "formative" assessment.

According to the system in Tokyo, however, teachers are assessed in two ways. Absolute assessment is made for the "instruction and supervision of staff" and relative assessment of the achievement of teachers is made "for the purpose of appropriately linking the result to pay, promotion and other personnel affairs".

As seen in Appendix I, assessment shall be made on three factors, "competence", "motivation (enthusiasm and attitude)" and "achievement". The definition of each factor and correlation among three factors is not clear-cut. The three factors are assessed based on the following four categories: (a) quality of instruction, (b) guidance, (c) school management and (d) extra-curricular activities and others. On the basis of these twelve items in total, individual teachers are given one of the following five rankings: [S] particularly excellent, [A] excellent, [B] ordinary, [C] slightly inferior and [D] inferior. Once again, the criteria for assessment are obscure and far from objective.

For example, the difference among [A], [B] and [C] is expressed by such terms as "fully", "has defect", "with foresight", "imminent", "appropriate" and "effective". It is an extremely difficult task to make objective and impartial assessment using these criteria. Although the Regulation states that those who are superior to [A] should be ranked as [S] and those who are inferior to [C] should be ranked as [D], there are no criteria at all to regarding how to judge superior or inferior.

Education that aims at "the development of personality" is being promoted through collective efforts of teachers in close cooperation with parents and community residents. Educational knowledge concerning this goal has gradually accumulated and been applied over the years producing some excellent results. Results such as these cannot be attributed to individual teachers. At the same time, all children are individuals with unique personalities and diverse lifestyles. Education is in many ways a spiritual and cultural endeavour, and as such it is extremely difficult to assess the direct achievement of teachers in a short span of time.

Forced into competitive assessment systems themselves, teachers may in turn begin to pervert the goals of the educational system by forcing children to cram ever-increasing loads of information. In fact, some members have just such apprehension about losing sight of the true objectives of education. These worries are largely due to their being compelled to assess only visible and tangible matters.

It is irresponsible for a superintendent with no direct knowledge of either teachers or educational practices to make relative assessments and final ranking. As the percentage of each rank is strictly decided beforehand, those assessed are categorized willy-nilly – far from impartial and objective.

Based on the realities of children, the personnel assessment system related to pay and promotion is hardly be said to be free and candid assessment. It does not lead to the development and enhancement of the competence of teachers. Even when teachers cooperate with each other for the best interests of children, a certain percent will inevitably be ranked in the lowest level using the assessment system. Because of this, the system will sometimes encourage teachers to sacrifice their pupils/students best interests in order to obtain a high (i.e. by making those students with a high fever attend school or by simply giving them the correct answers for tests in advance). Other teachers might expect some colleagues to fail.

It has recently been pointed out that in private sector, performance-related pay systems have led to such practices as colleagues concealing vital knowledge from each other and attempting to their mistakes. These practices clearly have harmful influences upon management as a whole. At schools, customs such as these necessarily hinder collaborative collegiality among teachers. If teachers are continuously assessed lower than expected, they may lose their enthusiasm for education and lower their goals. It is not too much to say that the proposed system could easily result in a morally hazardous situation.

Teachers are naturally suspicious about whether a management having no direct contact with children can make impartial assessments. Teachers of middle schools, high schools and schools for the disabled, who are assigned according to certificates of specific subjects entertain particular doubts how management can assess subjects for which they are not qualified. The superintendent of Tokyo Metropolitan Education Board must assess 15,000 teachers from both high schools and schools for the disabled. It is physically impossible for a person to make objective and impartial assessment of such a large number of teachers.

(3) Only limited and partial disclosure is admitted in the regulation of the Tokyo Metropolitan Education Board. It states, “If a teacher demands to see assessment results, the superintendent can disclose to him/her that part of the record which the superintendent considers to be of no harm to the accomplishment of personnel management”. It was once recognized that if the disclosure is denied, this “might have the possibility to cause distrust for the transparency of assessment”. Even the limited disclosure on demand prescribed in the regulations has been suspended its implementation by a subsidiary law on the grounds that educational personnel do not fully understood the policy’s objectives and that disclosure might, instead, invoke confusion in the system as a whole. Furthermore, a system of appeals against assessment (means for grievance) has been examined but not been yet instituted.

The assessment system used by the Education Board of Kagawa Prefecture is similar to that of Tokyo Metropolitan Board of Education. According to the general plan for implementation, officials are not allowed to disclose merit ratings, observation records for the ratings or instruction records. Under this system, therefore, it is impossible for teachers to reflect on their teaching or to improve the quality of teaching in this way. The disclosure policy completely disregards the stated goals of the system - “enhancement of teaching quality”, “fostering of talents and development of ability”.

(4) No education system can be successful unless teachers actively participate in an atmosphere of understanding and trust. The “Recommendation on the Status of Teachers” stipulates that

“Teachers’ 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” (item 9). It also states clearly that “ No merit rating system for purposes of salary determination should be introduced or applied without prior consultation with and acceptance by the teachers’ organizations concerned”(item 124).

Despite these items, the Tokyo Metropolitan Board of Education has adopted an adverse position. It reiterates its position that the Japanese government only agreed to adopt the “Recommendation” with the expectation that it would improve the status of teachers as a whole and that the Ministry of Education views the “Recommendation” as not binding over national laws. The Board has refused industrial consultation with teachers unions on the grounds that the system falls under the category of matters for management. Tokyo Metropolitan Teachers Union and Tokyo Metropolitan Teachers Union of Schools for the Disabled were allowed only short twenty-five minute ‘petitions’ respectively and their opinions were not fully listened to. Kagawa Prefecture Teachers Union and Kagawa Prefecture High School Teachers Union petitioned the Board of Education but again were refused on the grounds that the system is a management matter that requires no consultation. The Recommendation’s request for “prior consultation and acceptance by the teachers’ organizations” appeared not to apply in these cases.

This system, introduced without prior consultation with teachers’ organizations, lacks the support of a majority of teachers. According to the surveys made by various teachers unions, overwhelming majorities of teachers have expressed negative views regarding the system. Prof. Toyokazu Urano, Graduate School of Education at the University of Tokyo, conducted an opinion survey of teachers in Tokyo in January 2002. When asked whether their daily efforts have been rewarded and their morale enhanced by the introduction of the assessment system, only 13.8% of elementary school and 14.5% of middle school teachers answered in affirmative (the number of respondents: elementary - 834 and middle - 343).

(5) The “ILO/UNESCO Recommendation” stipulates that “Where any kind of direct assessment of the teacher’s work is required, such assessment should be objective and should be made known to the teacher” [64.(1)] and “Teachers should have a right to appeal against assessments which they deem to be unjustified” [64.(2)]. An ‘objective’ assessment system is understood to be impartial and transparent, one based on the facts. As noted above, however, the system in Japan is remarkably subjective and arbitrary. By not guaranteeing disclosure of information on demand or a right to appeal, the system simply fails to apply the Recommendation.

The “Recommendation” further stipulates that “Salary differentials should be based on objective criteria such as levels of qualification, years of experience or degrees of responsibility but the relationship between the lowest and the highest salary should be of a reasonable order”. (119) The assessment system is closely related with pay and promotion and it is a system to introduce salary differentials based on subjective and arbitrary assessment among teachers.

5. With mounting seriousness, Japanese schools now experience problems of juvenile delinquency, bullying, school phobia and class disruptions. Faced with these unprecedented difficulties, parents and citizens are puzzled and embarrassed, and teachers are struggling. The most effective way to break through these difficulties would be not to enforce ‘control and competition’ but to coordinate efforts by parents, citizens, all educational staff, and educational authorities to create a type of education which listens to the voices and wishes of children.

There is an urgent need to examine the purposes, the personal responsibilities and the means by which assessments are made rather than to discuss on the propriety of assessment in general. The

assessment should aim to encourage teachers from the standpoint of helping schools better serve children. A thousand evils and little good is produced in using assessment as a tool for the promotion of particular education policy or as a strategy to bring about discrimination and division among teachers. People have the right to education. Therefore, the hostile controversies between teachers unions and educational authorities as well as between teachers and the management do not solve the problems of teacher assessment. The simplest solution will be found through open and frank discussions about education with the participation of children, parents, local residents and teachers in their respective communities.

6. Dialogue among people with different positions and views is always meaningful for society. As long as there is a common belief that education should be improved for the benefits of children, anyone can engage in serious discussion concerning education. However, the MES and education boards at municipal levels are inclined to refuse consultation with teachers' organizations that have any different views at all.

The ILO/UNESCO Recommendation states in the preamble that "Recognizing the essential role of teachers in educational advancement and the importance of their contribution to the development of man and modern society", (the Special Intergovernmental Conference) ... "ensures that teachers enjoy the status commensurate with this role". The item nine go on to say that "Teachers' 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".

With the ongoing globalization of economies, the storm of 'market principles' and 'deregulation' based on neo-liberalism howls menacingly through education. As education becomes increasingly regarded as a commodity and a profit-making business, central and local governments have come to evade their responsibilities, reducing educational budgets and bringing about a serious decline in public education.

The focus is ever more on 'meritocracy and performance-related pay and personnel policy' with professional matters of teaching treated lightly. The decline of the social status of teachers due to unstable employment and deterioration of pay and working conditions continues not only in Japan but all over the world. Pay and personnel policies are increasingly based not on educational considerations but on competitive principles even while the ILO/UNESCO Recommendation continues to emphasize the professional aspects of teaching profession.

The forty-fifth session of the International Conference on Education convened in October 1996 adopted a recommendation, "Strengthening of the role of teachers in a changing world". Taking into account thirty years after the adoption of the "Recommendation", the Conference recommendations refer to the role for future teachers. They attach particular importance to the functions of educational coordinators. Among these are listed favorable attitudes towards teamwork, a sense of solidarity, the ability to communicate (1.2, and 2.3.3). In connection with these, consultation, co-ordination and dialogue with teachers and their organizations in defining educational objectives and the directions of reforms are encouraged (4.2.1). As a step to further develop the internationally agreed upon role of teachers in Japan, we present herewith our allegation concerning the non-application of the "ILO/UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Status of Teachers".