



Ethical Dilemmas in Academic Staff Promotion in Nigerian Universities – Developing an Equity-Based Evaluation Model

MARY BIVWIERE ASABOR, CAROLINE ALORDIAH
University of Delta, Agbor, Nigeria

Abstract. This paper investigates the ethical challenges present in the promotion processes of academic staff at Nigerian universities, suggesting an equity-centred evaluation model as a viable solution. The report conducts a critical analysis of existing frameworks, revealing systemic weaknesses such as gender imbalances, ethnic favouritism, inconsistent evaluation methods, and opaque decision-making that compromise meritocracy and institutional legitimacy. The suggested paradigm presents four fundamental principles: openness, meritocracy, inclusion, and accountability, implemented via defined evaluation measures, bias mitigation strategies, and independent monitoring systems. A comparative comparison with global best practices yields proposals for policy reform, encompassing the standardisation of promotion criteria, compulsory bias training for evaluators, and the creation of grievance resolution channels. The research contends that the adoption of equitable promotion methods will bolster institutional reputation, promote teacher retention, and prepare Nigerian universities for global competition. The findings underscore the pressing necessity for cooperative efforts among university administrators, regulatory agencies, and faculty associations to convert promotion regimes into authentic meritocracies.

Keywords: Academic promotions, equity-based evaluation, Nigerian universities, meritocracy, ethical dilemmas, faculty advancement, higher education reform, promotion bias, institutional equity, NUC guidelines

1. Introduction

The promotion of academic personnel in Nigerian institutions is essential for career progression, institutional development, and the attainment of

academic excellence. Promotions are conventionally determined by a synthesis of pedagogical, research, community service, and administrative efforts. The procedure is complicated and often compromised by ethical concerns that diminish its legitimacy. Although promotions ought to reward merit and commitment, apprehensions of favouritism, ambiguous criteria, and institutional biases have undermined the perceived impartiality of these assessments (Sadiq et al., 2018).

Nigerian universities, akin to other institutions worldwide, depend on promotion processes to uphold academic standards and attract premier talent. However, recurrent accusations of nepotism, gender discrimination, and improper influence have cast doubt on the integrity of these procedures. Perceived inequity in promotions undermines trust, demoralises faculty, and diminishes institutional credibility. The stakes are significant—equitable assessments not only influence individual careers but also dictate the calibre of higher education in Nigeria (Alordiah et al., 2023; Igiebor, 2020; Osegbue et al., 2025a). Confronting these ethical dilemmas is crucial for cultivating a culture of transparency and meritocracy.

This study analyses the ethical challenges inherent in the promotion processes of academic personnel in Nigerian universities. Instead of providing empirical facts, it employs a conceptual framework, examining systemic deficiencies and suggesting policy-orientated remedies. The main aim is to emphasise persistent inequities—such as gender imbalances, subjective evaluations, and inconsistent policy implementation—and to promote structural improvements.

At the core of this discourse is the formulation of an equity-based evaluation model, intended to mitigate prejudices while acknowledging varied academic achievements. This paradigm emphasises equity by promoting explicit, uniform standards, impartial

review committees, and accountability frameworks. This examination intentionally concentrates on policy and procedural enhancements, avoiding statistical enquiries to engage with the philosophical and ethical aspects of academic promotions.

To navigate this complex issue, the discussion revolves around three pivotal questions:

- What are the predominant ethical issues in academic promotions in Nigeria?
- How do existing policies perpetuate or mitigate biases?
- What principles should underpin an equitable promotion framework?

This paper aims to enhance the discourse on academic equity by addressing these topics, providing a framework for Nigerian universities to realign their promotion procedures with values of justice and merit. The primary objective is to not only critique but to motivate practical reforms—guaranteeing that promotions recognise authentic scholarship instead of privilege or favouritism.

2. Ethical Foundations of Academic Promotions

2.1 Defining Ethical Dilemmas in Academia

Academic promotions ought to be fundamentally meritocratic, with academic accomplishments, teaching proficiency, and institutional contributions dictating career progression. However, Nigerian colleges frequently confront ethical challenges that undermine this objective. A prevalent dilemma is the contrast between objective meritocracy and subjective evaluations (Zinovyeva, 2015). Although formal criteria, like publication records, years of service, and student assessments, are established, informal factors including favouritism, nepotism, and political manoeuvring sometimes affect outcomes. A senior lecturer with fewer publications may be promoted over a more prolific junior colleague solely based on personal connections, thereby eroding confidence in the system (Subbaye, 2016).

Another ethical dilemma involves reconciling individual career ambitions with institutional integrity. Universities must uphold academic standards in promotions; however, inflexible or unclear policies can hinder deserving candidates (Marcotte et al., 2021). For example, an early-career academic with innovative research may be impeded by bureaucratic delays or arbitrary criteria, while a less qualified but well-connected individual progresses. This not only demoralises faculty but also undermines the institution's credibility. When promotions are viewed

as inequitable, they engender cynicism, diminish productivity, and may ultimately drive talented scholars away from academia (Osegbue et al., 2025b; Walton et al., 2012).

These issues underscore a fundamental inquiry: should promotions be based on knowledge or connections? If the latter prevails, the entire academic endeavour risks becoming a hierarchy of privilege rather than one of intellectual rigour. Resolving these difficulties necessitates more than just administrative adjustments; it involves a philosophical reassessment of the true essence of fairness in academic career advancement.

3. Philosophical and Theoretical Perspectives

To establish an equitable promotion system, we must refer to ethical theories that offer frameworks for justice, obligation, and communal accountability. Three viewpoints are especially pertinent:

3.1 Justice Theory (Rawls) – Fairness as Impartiality

John Rawls' theory of justice underscores procedural fairness, advocating for the uniform application of rules and the minimisation of prejudices through a "veil of ignorance", wherein decision-makers remain oblivious to a candidate's background. In promotions, this entails clear criteria, impartial peer evaluations, and uniform assessments. Nigerian institutions frequently underperform due to opaque committees and variable criteria that permit personal biases to affect results. Rawls additionally champions distributive justice—guaranteeing equitable allocation of chances and rewards. If promotions disproportionately benefit senior faculty or specific fields, the system is deficient (Nielsen, 2015).

3.2 Deontological Ethics – Duty Over Consequences

A deontological approach argues that evaluations must follow moral duties (e.g., honesty, fairness) rather than outcomes (e.g., pleasing powerful stakeholders). If a promotion committee disregards a candidate's inadequate research output due to their popularity, it constitutes an ethical breach, even if the decision mitigates conflict. Conversely, consequentialist thinking could support bending laws for "greater good" instances (e.g., retaining a well-liked professor to increase department morale). Nigerian academics typically lean toward consequentialism, where political expediency outweighs principle, weakening trust in the long term (Bülbul, 2021).

3.3 Ubuntu Philosophy – Communal Fairness in African Academia

The African concept of Ubuntu ("I am because we are") offers a unique lens, emphasising communal welfare over individualism. In promotions, this could mean valuing mentorship, collaborative research, and service to the institution—not just solo achievements. Nevertheless, when improperly implemented, Ubuntu can regress into collective bias, where in-group allegiance (e.g., ethnic or institutional affiliations) supersedes merit. Achieving the appropriate equilibrium is essential: an egalitarian system must acknowledge collective efforts while maintaining rigour (Subbaye, 2015).

These theories indicate that no single strategy is perfect. A hybrid model—prioritising Rawlsian justice while integrating Ubuntu's social values—could offer a more culturally responsive approach for Nigerian universities.

3.4 Equity vs. Equality in Promotions

A major contrast in improving promotion systems lies between equality (uniform treatment for all) and equity (customised support to rectify inequities). Numerous Nigerian colleges adhere to uniformity by using standardised criteria (e.g., "10 publications for promotion"). However, this overlooks contextual impediments:

- A female academic with parenting obligations may find it challenging to equal the productivity of a male counterpart.
- Early-career academics in impoverished departments are deprived of the resources available to their counterparts in prestigious institutions.

An equity-based model acknowledges these differences, offering solutions like:

Weighted evaluations: Counting mentorship or community engagement alongside publications.

Flexible timelines: Allowing parental or medical leave extensions for promotion deadlines.

Structural support: Providing research grants to marginalised faculty to level the playing field.

Equality presupposes a level playing field; equity eliminates obstacles to ensure equitable competition. This transition is crucial for Nigerian academics; without it, institutional biases will endure, and talent will remain unrecognised (Subbaye, 2016).

The ethical basis for academic advancements necessitates more than just procedural verification; it calls for a culture transformation. By incorporating Rawlsian fairness, deontological integrity, and Ubuntu's communal principles, Nigerian institutions might develop an equity-based evaluation framework that recognises genuine merit while rectifying historical disparities. The next step is translating these principles into actionable policies—ensuring promotions uphold not just institutional goals but the very ideals of justice that academia claims to champion.

4. Ethical Dilemmas in Nigerian University Promotions

4.1 Systemic Biases and Discrimination

Academic promotions in Nigerian institutions are intended to recognise brilliance; yet, systemic biases frequently skew results, privileging specific groups while disenfranchising others. A prominent concern is gender imbalance. Although the number of women in academia is rising, they continue to be markedly under-represented in prominent positions such as professorships, deanships, and vice-chancellorships. The obstacles are complex: increased teaching responsibilities, inequitable access to research funding, and cultural norms that impose excessive caring duties on female scholars. When promotion committees underestimate these structural barriers, they sustain a system in which merit is evaluated against a male-centric standard (Magoqwana et al., 2019).

A continual challenge is the conflict between ethnic/regional favouritism and meritocracy. The "federal character" notion in Nigeria, intended to guarantee equitable representation among states, frequently conflicts with academic rigour. This may result in promotions determined by regional quotas instead of academic merit, fostering animosity among more competent individuals. Diversity in leadership is essential, but if implemented rigidly, it may jeopardise institutional excellence (Habib, 2016).

The most detrimental bias may be nepotism and cronyism, where advancements depend on personal relationships rather than academic merit. A professor with powerful mentors or familial connections may progress more rapidly than a more qualified counterpart lacking such political affiliations. This "who you know" atmosphere undermines morale, as diligent academics perceive their achievements eclipsed by favouritism. When promotions become

transactional—prioritising loyalty above competence—the entire academic institution deteriorates (Belluigi, 2019).

4.2 Flawed Evaluation Criteria

Despite efforts to mitigate biases, the criteria employed to evaluate candidates sometimes lack sophistication, favouring surface standards over substantive influence. A significant deficiency is the excessive focus on the quantity of publications—prioritising the number of articles over an assessment of their quality, originality, or societal significance. The "publish or perish" imperative results in submissions to predatory journals, the recycling of research, and a disregard for more profound scholarship. Simultaneously, innovative research in specialised areas may be disregarded if it does not conform to traditional output standards (Azman et al., 2016).

The efficacy of teaching is another victim of inadequate evaluations. Student feedback forms, sometimes swayed by popularity rather than instructional proficiency, serve as inadequate indicators of teaching ability. A lecturer who imposes demanding assignments may obtain lower evaluations than one who enhances grades to gain approval. In the absence of classroom observations or peer evaluations, teaching contributions are inadequately recognised (Booi et al., 2017).

Likewise, community service—a cornerstone of academic accountability—is often evaluated subjectively. Does organising a conference carry the same significance as mentoring junior colleagues? Is policy advocacy regarded with equal importance as administrative responsibilities? In the absence of explicit criteria, these contributions transform into leverage for those with committee power (Belluigi, 2020).

The most concerning issue is the absence of transparency in promotion discussions. Decisions frequently occur in private, providing minimal feedback to unsuccessful candidates. When a lecturer is denied promotion without justification, suspicions of bias proliferate. Secrecy engenders cynicism, rendering the process seemingly arbitrary rather than meritocratic (Ssentongo, 2020).

4.3 Consequences of Unethical Promotions

When promotions are compromised by bias or inadequate criteria, the consequences reach well beyond personal complaints. The most immediate victim is confidence in academic leadership. Faculty

who view the system as biased withdraw, refraining from fully committing to institutional objectives. Why pursue excellence if success is contingent upon politics rather than merit? (Chipunza, 2017).

This disappointment drives brain drain, as discontented scholars pursue more equitable regimes outside. Nigeria forfeits its most talented individuals to universities where meritocracy prevails and biases are minimised. The remaining personnel, disheartened by stalled career progression, may engage in inadequate effort, further undermining academic standards.

Unethical promotions worldwide undermine university rankings and research integrity. When senior positions are occupied based on affiliations rather than qualifications, the institution's reputation deteriorates. Peer reviewers identify deficient scholarship; funding organisations scrutinise research integrity; international collaborators exhibit reluctance to participate. The reputation of a university depends on the quality of its faculty; if promotions compromise that quality, the institution deteriorates (Mkhize, 2022).

The ethical concerns surrounding promotions in Nigerian universities are manageable; however, they require immediate action. Mitigating systemic prejudices necessitates the implementation of policies that proactively combat discrimination, including gender-neutral review panels, anonymised application procedures, and stringent anti-nepotism regulations. Amending rating criteria to emphasise quality over number, teaching effectiveness over popularity, and transparent discussions over secretive committees will reinstate confidence in the system.

Universities must acknowledge that promotions are not merely administrative functions; they are moral declarations regarding the institution's values. When conducted ethically, they promote quality, encourage diversity, and enhance Nigeria's global academic reputation. Poor execution entrenches inequality, suppresses potential, and undermines the fundamental aim of higher education. The decision is unequivocal.

5. Existing Promotion Frameworks: A Critical Review

The academic promotion procedure in Nigerian universities functions under defined parameters designed to standardise career advancement while ensuring quality. Nevertheless, a thorough analysis uncovers substantial discrepancies between policy objectives and actual execution, along with

considerable deficiencies relative to global best practices. This section evaluates the existing promotion schemes, emphasising their structural bases and deficiencies.

5.1 Current Policies in Nigerian Universities

At the national level, the National Universities Commission (NUC) establishes comprehensive rules for academic promotions, delineating fundamental criteria for each position, from assistant lecturer to professor. These often highlight a synthesis of pedagogical experience, scholarly contributions, and community engagement. The NUC's framework functions solely as a baseline standard, permitting individual universities to establish supplementary requirements. This freedom has resulted in contradictions, especially when contrasting federal, state, and private entities (Steinþórsd, 2018).

Federal universities, due to their established nature, frequently implement more stringent and bureaucratic promotion procedures, occasionally hindered by administrative delays. Conversely, state institutions may encounter political meddling when nominations and promotions are swayed by local governmental interests. Private institutions, although typically more efficient, sometimes prioritise financial factors or institutional allegiance over academic merit. The absence of uniformity among these systems results in an inequitable environment, where the trajectory to promotion is influenced equally by the type of university and the candidate's qualifications (Shaik 2021).

Furthermore, although the NUC stipulates specific benchmarks, including a minimum publication requirement, it provides minimal regulation for the assessment of these benchmarks. Consequently, several colleges concentrate exclusively on quantity, neglecting the quality and significance of research. Some experience uneven enforcement, wherein privileged candidates enjoy leniency while outsiders endure excessive scrutiny. In the absence of robust central monitoring, these discrepancies sustain imbalances in professional progression (Barnes et al., 2022).

5.2 Comparative Analysis with Global Models

Nigeria's promotion processes, when compared to those in more academically competitive regions like South Africa, the U.S., and Europe, have significant deficiencies that necessitate enhancement. Numerous prestigious international colleges utilise blind peer review systems, wherein evaluators judge research

without knowledge of the author's name, hence reducing unconscious bias. Nigerian promotions frequently depend on internal committees, wherein personal relationships affect decision-making (Rooy, 2015).

A notable distinction is the employment of external evaluators. Institutions in South Africa and Europe sometimes necessitate independent assessments from scholars external to the candidate's university to guarantee impartiality. Nigerian academia, however, often prioritises internal evaluations, which may result in conflicts of interest, particularly at smaller institutions where faculty members frequently assess their peers. Implementing compulsory external evaluations would enhance credibility and align Nigeria with international standards (Archer, 2017). Furthermore, prestigious universities prioritise balanced metrics, assessing teaching, research, and service in proportion rather than solely focusing on publications. For example, U.S. institutions frequently utilise teaching portfolios, student evaluations, and peer assessments to appraise educators, while European universities progressively emphasise interdisciplinary and societal impact in research. Nigeria's excessive dependence on publication counts, devoid of consideration for innovation or practical significance, constrains the acknowledgement of varied academic contributions (Nkosingphile, 2019).

5.3 Gaps and Limitations in Current Systems

Notwithstanding the presence of formal policies, Nigeria's promotion frameworks are hindered by inadequate enforcement of anti-bias measures. Gender and ethnic imbalances endure due to the infrequent implementation of accountability mechanisms to support anti-discrimination standards. Many colleges assert their commitment to meritocracy; nevertheless, few provide mechanisms to scrutinise promotion outcomes for biased tendencies or to publicly address complaints (Mbukanma, 2022).

A significant deficiency is the absence of accountability among promotion committees. Decisions are frequently rendered without comprehensive reasoning, resulting in rejected candidates lacking a definitive path of action. In certain instances, committee members may lack the qualifications to assess specific disciplines, resulting in conflicting standards. The absence of compulsory training for evaluators and public disclosure of promotion information renders the process unclear and vulnerable to manipulation (Subbaye, 2017).

The primary systemic restriction is the lack of long-term career monitoring. In contrast to colleges in Europe or North America, which frequently assess post-promotion performance to guarantee sustained output, Nigerian institutions hardly reevaluate promotion decisions. This establishes a situation in which, once achieving a rank, there is less motivation for continued brilliance, leading to academic stagnation (Schreiber, 2016).

5.4 Toward a More Robust Promotion System

The deficiencies in Nigeria's existing frameworks underscore the necessity for systemic improvements. Implementing blind reviews, external evaluations, and multidimensional assessment standards would conform the system to international best practices. Augmenting enforcement mechanisms—such as bias audits, committee training, and transparent reporting—would improve equity.

A promotion system should incentivise not just the attainment of rank but also continuous contributions to knowledge and education. Nigerian universities may develop frameworks that reward merit, promote equity, and enhance the nation's academic reputation globally by borrowing from more sophisticated models while tackling local difficulties.

5.5 Toward an Equity-Based Evaluation Model

The enduring ethical quandaries and structural deficiencies in Nigeria's academic promotion systems necessitate more than minor modifications; they call for a comprehensive rethinking of the evaluation and reward mechanisms for faculty accomplishments. This section introduces a thorough equity-focused evaluation methodology aimed at rectifying the deficiencies of existing frameworks while conforming to international best practices in academic career advancement. This proposed paradigm aims to convert promotions from a bureaucratic obstacle into a true meritocratic process that acknowledges many forms of brilliance while actively eradicating systemic prejudices.

6. Core Principles of the Proposed Model

This equity-based methodology is founded on four interconnected concepts designed to re-establish trust and fairness in academic promotions. The primary concept is transparency, necessitating that all criteria, processes, and decisions regarding promotions be publicly accessible and properly articulated. This model would require comprehensive rubrics that delineate the criteria for evaluating and weighting

teaching, research, and service activities, in contrast to existing systems where faculty frequently find it difficult to comprehend the rationale behind their promotion or denial. Departments must provide annual workshops to elucidate these criteria, and individual candidates will receive targeted feedback regarding their promotion cases.

The second concept, meritocracy, transcends the superficial usage of the term prevalent in several Nigerian universities today. An authentic meritocratic system must establish advanced methodologies to objectively assess the entirety of academic labour. This signifies the acknowledgement that innovative research, impactful teaching, and significant institutional service are distinct yet equally valuable kinds of scholarly contributions. The model advocates a balanced scorecard methodology wherein superiority in one domain can offset a deficiency in another, contingent upon the fulfilment of minimal standards across all categories.

Inclusivity constitutes the third pillar, tackling the systematic obstacles encountered by women, early-career researchers, and professors from marginalised groups. This transcends passive non-discrimination to encompass proactive initiatives, including consideration of career interruptions due to childcare, modification of productivity expectations for teachers at under-resourced schools, and assurance of diverse representation on evaluation panels. The concept includes provisional special measures to expedite the progress of historically marginalised groups until equitable representation is attained.

The notion of accountability puts essential checks and balances into the promotion process. This entails the implementation of formal grievance procedures for applicants who perceive unfair evaluations, regular audits of promotion results to identify bias trends, and repercussions for committee members who breach evaluation norms. Importantly, accountability procedures would encompass post-promotion oversight to guarantee that promoted academics consistently uphold the norms of their position (see Table 1).

6.1 Key Components of the Model

The implementation of these principles transpires through three interrelated components that together provide a comprehensive evaluation environment. The initial component encompasses organised evaluation indicators that transcend mere quantitative assessments of publications or tenure. The concept advocates a multidimensional approach to teaching

assessment, integrating peer classroom observations, analysed student feedback (with measures to prevent popularity contests), and records of educational advances. Research evaluation should prioritise quality over quantity by utilising metrics such as journal impact factors, citation indexes, and assessments of real-world impact, which is especially pertinent in the Nigerian setting where scholarship must tackle local concerns. Service contributions would be appropriately evaluated and may encompass departmental leadership, effective mentorship of junior faculty, and community involvement initiatives that further the university's public mission.

The second essential element comprises bias-mitigation measures aimed at addressing both conscious and unconscious biases in assessment. This entails reorganising promotion committees to guarantee variety in subjects, career stages, and demographic attributes, augmented by obligatory external reviewers from different institutions. The concept implements anonymous review procedures for research portfolios and teaching evaluations, eliminating identifying details that could provoke prejudices associated with gender, ethnicity, or institutional affiliation. Specialised training would assist committee members in identifying and mitigating prevalent evaluation biases, such as overestimating theoretical contributions from prestigious institutions while underappreciating practical research with local significance.

The model's third component implements appeals and monitoring mechanisms to rectify the existing deficiency in promotion decision recourse. An autonomous ombudsman office would be established at each university to address promotion issues, possessing the authority to examine cases for procedural anomalies or manifest prejudice. The Ombudsman may suggest reassessment by a different committee when appropriate. The National Universities Commission will perform annual audits of promotion outcomes across institutions, producing reports that identify inequalities and suggest corrective measures. These oversight systems establish numerous checkpoints to guarantee the system's integrity while preserving suitable respect for academic judgement (see Table 1).

6.2 Implementation Challenges and Solutions

The shift to this equity-based approach encounters substantial implementation obstacles that require careful consideration. The most significant barrier arises from established interests within the academic hierarchy—senior teachers and administrators who have profited from the existing system may oppose reforms that diminish their discretionary authority or necessitate more stringent explanations for promotion choices. The concept advocates for a staged implementation strategy, commencing with pilot initiatives at participating institutions and progressively expanding as evidence of efficacy is gathered. Early adopters may obtain preferred accreditation or research money from the NUC as an incentive for their involvement.

A significant difficulty pertains to evaluator ability, as numerous present committee members are inadequately trained in contemporary assessment methodologies or the identification of unconscious bias. The model mandates a certification programme for all promotion committee members, addressing rubric-based assessment, identification of various academic impacts, and strategies to mitigate prevalent evaluation biases. This training will be produced in collaboration with foreign specialists and tailored to the Nigerian situation, with mandatory refresher courses every three years.

The effective implementation of these reforms relies significantly on the collaborative engagement of essential stakeholders. The National Universities Commission should advance from merely establishing basic standards to actively endorsing best practices via updated accreditation criteria and specific financing incentives. Academic unions such as ASUU play a vital role in safeguarding faculty rights and promoting systemic equity; their support can be garnered by highlighting how the model safeguards against capricious administrative actions. University governing councils must, crucially, offer continuous leadership and resources to effectively implement these reforms, rejecting the inclination to retreat to established yet erroneous practices in the face of adversity.

Table 1: Equity-Based Academic Promotion Model

Core Principles	Implementation Components	Implementation Strategy
1. Transparency	A. Structured Evaluation Metrics	Phase 1: Preparation (Year 1)
- Public promotion criteria	1. Teaching Assessment:	- Stakeholder consultations
- Detailed rubrics	- Peer classroom observations	- Policy drafting
- Candidate feedback	- Analyzed student feedback	- Evaluator training programs
	- Pedagogical documentation	
2. Meritocracy	2. Research Evaluation:	Phase 2: Pilot Testing (Year 2)
- Balanced assessment	- Journal impact factors	- Voluntary institutional adoption
- Minimum thresholds	- Citation analysis	- Process documentation
- Compensatory scoring	- Real-world impact	- Mid-term adjustments
3. Inclusivity	3. Service Valuation:	Phase 3: National Rollout
- Career interruption	- Departmental leadership	(Years 3-5)
accommodations	- Mentorship documentation	- Phased mandatory adoption
- Adjusted expectations	- Community engagement	- Continuous monitoring
- Diverse committees		- Framework updates
4. Accountability	B. Bias Mitigation Strategies	Support Structures
- Grievance mechanisms	1. Committee Composition:	1. Capacity Building:
- Promotion audits	- Cross-disciplinary	- Evaluator certification
- Post-promotion tracking	- Demographic diversity	- Annual refresher courses
	- External reviewers	- International exchanges
	2. Evaluation Protocols:	2. Incentive Systems:
	- Anonymous reviews	- Accreditation advantages
	- Standardized rubrics	- Targeted funding
	- Blind assessments	- Recognition awards
	C. Oversight Mechanisms	3. Stakeholder Roles:
	1. Institutional:	- NUC: Standard-setting
	- Independent ombudsman	- ASUU: Faculty advocacy
	- Alternative review option	- Councils: Resource allocation
	2. National:	
	- NUC outcome audits	
	- Disparity reporting	
	- Corrective protocols	

6.3 A Path Forward for Nigerian Academia

This equity-based evaluation methodology signifies more than a mere technical solution for promotion procedures; it presents a framework for restoring confidence and performance in Nigerian universities. By ensuring transparency in expectations, and rigour in evaluations while maintaining fairness, and accountability among decision-makers, the system may transition from its present atmosphere of scepticism and discontent to one that authentically incentivises and fosters academic success. The implementation obstacles are significant yet manageable, especially if improvements are pursued methodically with sufficient stakeholder involvement.

In the context of Nigerian universities contending against a progressively globalised academic environment, the capacity to recognise, cultivate, and retain exceptional talent via equitable promotion procedures would be increasingly vital. This model offers a framework for converting promotions from a source of scepticism into a catalyst for institutional enhancement, acknowledging the comprehensive spectrum of faculty contributions while maintaining the utmost norms of meritocratic equity. The consequence would yield not just fairer results for

individual scholars but also an improved reputation and performance for Nigeria's whole university system.

6.4 Implications for Tertiary Institution Administrators

The suggested equity-based promotion paradigm entails significant consequences for university administrators in Nigeria, necessitating both strategic leadership and practical modifications for effective implementation.

6.5 Policy Reform & Standardization

Administrators must spearhead the change of institutional promotion policies to conform to the equity-based paradigm, establishing explicit, quantifiable criteria for teaching, research, and service.

Collaboration with the NUC is crucial for standardising practices among universities while permitting discipline-specific adaptability.

6.6 Capacity Building

Investing in compulsory training programs for promotion committee members is essential. Workshops ought to encompass:

- Implicit bias recognition
- Rubric-based evaluation techniques
- Best practices in peer review and mentorship
- Collaborations with global institutions may enhance the exchange of knowledge regarding equitable promotion schemes.

6.7 Transparency Infrastructure

- Development of digital platforms to track and publish promotion metrics (application rates, success rates by gender/department).
- Standardised formats for candidate portfolios and committee evaluations to guarantee uniformity.

6.8 Accountability Mechanisms

- Creation of autonomous ombudsman offices to address complaints, with direct reporting to university councils.
- Conducting regular audits to evaluate adherence to equity principles and pinpoint systemic obstacles.

6.9 Cultural Change Management

- Active involvement with uncooperative stakeholders via town halls, policy briefings, and pilot programs showcasing the model's advantages.
- Incentivization of equitable practices (e.g., linking departmental funding to promotion fairness metrics).

6.10 Resource Allocation

Budgetary provisions for:

- External assessors
- Promotion process digitization
- Faculty development programs to help candidates meet revised standards

6.11 Data-Driven Decision Making

Institutional research units should analyze promotion outcomes annually, tracking:

- Time-to-promotion by gender/rank
- Research impact vs. quantity trade-offs
- Correlation between evaluation methods and post-promotion performance

6.12 Strategic Priorities for Immediate Action

- Establish a cross-functional task team comprising academics, HR, and legal experts to adapt the equity model to specific institutional circumstances.
- Implement the framework in 2-3 departments, recording issues and solutions before a university-wide deployment.
- Engage ASUU and other unions early to co-create solutions and prevent implementation roadblocks.
- Administrators that adopt this move will establish their institutions as pioneers in academic equity, yielding quantifiable advantages in staff morale, retention, and international reputation. The operational obstacles are considerable yet manageable through gradual, evidence-based execution.

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

The issues of academic staff promotion in Nigerian universities expose systemic deficiencies that necessitate immediate adjustment. Our investigation has shown ethical issues—gender inequities, racial bias, inconsistent assessment standards, and ambiguous decision-making processes—that cumulatively erode meritocracy and institutional integrity. These concerns are not simply administrative hindrances; they are essential obstacles to Nigeria's academic advancement and global competitiveness.

This study presents an equity-based evaluation approach founded on four fundamental pillars: transparency, meritocracy, inclusivity, and accountability. Nigerian universities can convert their promotion procedures from causes of dissatisfaction to catalysts for academic performance by employing standardised assessment measures, bias mitigation strategies, and rigorous oversight mechanisms. This paradigm acknowledges that genuine excellence encompasses not only publishing metrics but also pedagogical innovation, research influence, and contributions to institutional service—all assessed using equitable, standardised procedures.

Three essential reforms must be prioritised. The standardisation of promotion criteria across all schools via revised NUC guidelines would eradicate existing discrepancies among federal, state, and private universities. These guidelines must prioritise quality over quantity, with explicit measures for evaluating instructional efficacy, research significance, and community involvement.

Secondly, compulsory bias training for members of promotion committees is essential. Regular training must tackle both conscious and unconscious biases, integrating case studies from Nigerian academics. The training should focus on practical methods for fair evaluation, such as blind review processes and rubric-based assessments.

Third, the creation of independent review bodies at both institutional and national levels would reinstate confidence in the system. Every university ought to establish an ombudsman office to address promotion issues, whereas a national academic appeals panel might resolve intricate situations. These entities must possess sufficient authority to propose corrective measures upon the identification of biases.

The execution of these measures will encounter opposition from established interests that profit from the existing conditions. Surmounting this opposition necessitates audacious leadership from university administrators, persistent advocacy from faculty unions, and stringent oversight from regulatory authorities. A phased implementation strategy—initiating with pilot programs at designated institutions—could validate the model's efficacy before nationwide adoption.

The enduring advantages warrant the exertion. Fair promotion processes improve institutional prestige, rendering Nigerian universities more appealing to both domestic and international academics. They enhance employee retention by establishing transparent, meritocratic career trajectories. Primarily, they cultivate an academic environment in which achievement is acknowledged and rewarded, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, or personal affiliations.

Actualising this goal necessitates engagement from all parties. University governing boards must commit funding for training and system enhancements. The NUC ought to integrate equality standards into accreditation criteria. Faculty members must engage in the reform of evaluation systems and ensure accountability among decision-makers.

Nigerian academia is at a pivotal juncture. The decision lies in preserving a dysfunctional system that repels talent or adopting reforms that enhance universities' worldwide significance. By implementing equitable promotion procedures, Nigeria may cultivate an academic environment that prioritises excellence, values each scholar's contributions, and enables universities to achieve their role as catalysts for knowledge and social advancement. The moment for action is now. The issues of academic staff promotion

in Nigerian universities expose systemic deficiencies that necessitate immediate adjustment. Our investigation has shown ethical issues—gender inequities, racial bias, inconsistent assessment standards, and ambiguous decision-making processes—that cumulatively erode meritocracy and institutional integrity. These concerns are not simply administrative hindrances; they are essential obstacles to Nigeria's academic advancement and global competitiveness.

This study presents an equity-based evaluation approach founded on four fundamental pillars: transparency, meritocracy, inclusivity, and accountability. Nigerian universities can convert their promotion procedures from causes of dissatisfaction to catalysts for academic performance by employing standardised assessment measures, bias mitigation strategies, and rigorous oversight mechanisms. This paradigm acknowledges that genuine excellence encompasses not only publishing metrics but also pedagogical innovation, research influence, and contributions to institutional service—all assessed using equitable, standardised procedures.

Three essential reforms must be prioritised. The standardisation of promotion criteria across all schools via revised NUC guidelines would eradicate existing discrepancies among federal, state, and private universities. These guidelines must prioritise quality over quantity, with explicit measures for evaluating instructional efficacy, research significance, and community involvement.

Secondly, compulsory bias training for members of promotion committees is essential. Regular training must tackle both conscious and unconscious biases, integrating case studies from Nigerian academics. The training should focus on practical methods for fair evaluation, such as blind review processes and rubric-based assessments.

Third, the creation of independent review bodies at both institutional and national levels would reinstate confidence in the system. Every university ought to establish an ombudsman office to address promotion issues, whereas a national academic appeals panel might resolve intricate situations. These entities must possess sufficient authority to propose corrective measures upon the identification of biases.

The execution of these measures will encounter opposition from established interests that profit from the existing conditions. Surmounting this opposition necessitates audacious leadership from university administrators, persistent advocacy from faculty

unions, and stringent oversight from regulatory authorities. A phased implementation strategy—initiating with pilot programs at designated institutions—could validate the model's efficacy before nationwide adoption.

The enduring advantages warrant the exertion. Fair promotion processes improve institutional prestige, rendering Nigerian universities more appealing to both domestic and international academics. They enhance employee retention by establishing transparent, meritocratic career trajectories. Primarily, they cultivate an academic environment in which achievement is acknowledged and rewarded, irrespective of gender, ethnicity, or personal affiliations.

Actualising this goal necessitates engagement from all parties. University governing boards must commit funding for training and system enhancements. The NUC ought to integrate equality standards into accreditation criteria. Faculty members must engage in the reform of evaluation systems and ensure accountability among decision-makers.

Nigerian academia is at a pivotal juncture. The decision lies in preserving a dysfunctional system that repels talent or adopting reforms that enhance universities' worldwide significance. By implementing equitable promotion procedures, Nigeria may cultivate an academic environment that prioritises excellence, values each scholar's contributions, and enables universities to achieve their role as catalysts for knowledge and social advancement. The moment for action is now.

References

- Alordiah, C. O., Omumu, F. C., & Kaizar V. O. (2023). Investigating why students in Nigeria perceive education as a scam. (2023, May 23). *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching (JALT)*, 6(1).
<https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.31>
- Archer, S. (2017). function of a university in South Africa: Part 1. *South African Journal of Science*, 113(5/6), 6–6.
<https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2017/a0190>
- Azman, N., Omar, I. C., Yunus, A. S. Md., & Zain, A. N. M. (2016). Academic promotion in Malaysian public universities: A critical look at issues and challenges. *Oxford Review of Education*, 42(1), 71–88.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2015.1135114>
- Barnes, N., du Plessis, M., & Frantz, J. (2022). Career Competencies for Academic Career Progression: Experiences of Academics at a South African University. *Frontiers in Education*, 7.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.814842>
- Belluigi, D. Z., & Thondhlana, G. (2020). ‘Your skin has to be elastic’: the politics of belonging as a selected black academic at a ‘transforming’ South African university. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 35(2), 141–162.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2020.1783469>
- Belluigi, D. Z., & Thondhlana, G. (2019). ‘Why mouth all the pieties?’ Black and women academics’ revelations about discourses of ‘transformation’ at an historically white South African university. *Higher Education*, 78(6), 947–963.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00380-w>
- Booi, M., Vincent, L., & Liccardo, S. (2017). Counting on demographic equity to transform institutional cultures at historically white South African universities? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(3), 498–510.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1289155>
- Breetzke, G. D., & Hedding, D. W. (2016). The changing racial profile of academic staff at South African Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), 2005–2013. *Africa Education Review*, 13(2), 147–164.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2016.1224114>
- Bülbül, S. (2021). Glass ceiling in academia revisited: evidence from the higher education system of Turkey. *International Journal of Sociology*, 51(2), 87–104.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00207659.2021.1881872>
- Chipunza, C., & Malo, B. (2017). Organizational culture and job satisfaction among academic professionals at a South African University of Technology. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 15(2), 148–161.
[https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.15\(2\).2017.14](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.15(2).2017.14)
- Habib, A. (2016). Transcending the Past and Reimagining the Future of the South African University. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 42(1), 35–48.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070.2016.1121716>
- Hlatshwayo, M. N., & Fomunyan, K. G. (2019). Views from the margins: Theorising the experiences of black working-class students in academic development in a historically white South African university. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern*

- Africa*, 15(1).
<https://doi.org/10.4102/td.v15i1.591>
- Igiebor, O. (2020). Women, academic leadership and the ‘constricting’ gender equity policies in Nigerian universities: an integrated feminist approach. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 43(4), 338–352.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080x.2020.1836569>
- Magoqwana, B., Maqabuka, Q., & Tshoedi, M. (2019). “Forced to Care” at the Neoliberal University: Invisible Labour as Academic Labour Performed by Black Women Academics in the South African University. *South African Review of Sociology*, 50(3–4), 6–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21528586.2020.1730947>
- Marcotte, L. M., Arora, V. M., & Ganguli, I. (2021). Toward Gender Equity in Academic Promotions. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 181(9), 1155–1155.
<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2021.3471>
- Mbukanma, I., & Strydom, K. (2022). Challenges to and Enablers of Women’s Advancement in Academic Careers at a Selected South African University. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 21(12), 44–64.
<https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.21.12.3>
- Mkhize, Z. V. (2022). Is it transformation or reform? The lived experiences of African women doctoral students in STEM disciplines in South African universities. *Higher Education*, 86(3), 637–659.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00918-5>
- Osegbue, G., Ohamobi, I., Ekwe, N., & Alordiah, C. (2025a). AI-Enhanced crisis management in schools. *Nigerian Journal of Social Psychology*, 8(1). Retrieved from <https://www.nigerianjsp.com/index.php/NJS/P/article/view/198>
- Osegbue, G. C., Ohamobi, I. N., & Alordiah, C. O. (2025b). Enhancing School Safety and Security: Developing and Implementing Effective Protocols for a Secured Learning Environment. *African Journal of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 15(2).
- Sadiq, H., Barnes, K. I., Price, M., Gumedze, F., & Morrell, R. (2018). Academic promotions at a South African university: questions of bias, politics and transformation. *Higher Education*, 78(3), 423–442.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0350-2>
- Ssentongo, J. S. (2020). ‘Which journal is that?’ Politics of academic promotion in Uganda and the predicament of African publication outlets. *Critical African Studies*, 12(3), 283–301.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21681392.2020.1788400>
- Shaik, A., & Kahn, P. (2021). Understanding the challenges entailed in decolonising a Higher Education institution: An organisational case study of a research-intensive South African university. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 26(7–8), 969–985.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1928064>
- Schreiber, B., & Yu, D. (2016). Exploring student engagement practises at a South African university: Student engagement as reliable predictor of academic performance. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 30(5).
<https://doi.org/10.20853/30-5-593>
- Steinþórsdóttir, F. S., Smidt, T. B., Pétursdóttir, G. M., Einarsdóttir, Þ., & Feuvre, N. L. (2018). New managerialism in the academy: Gender bias and precarity. *Gender Work and Organization*, 26(2), 124–139.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12286>
- Subbaye, R. (2017). The shrinking professoriate: Academic promotion and university teaching. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 31(3).
<https://doi.org/10.20853/31-3-831>
- Subbaye, R., & Vithal, R. (2015). Teaching criteria that matter in university academic promotions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(1), 37–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1082533>
- Subbaye, R., & Vithal, R. (2016). Gender, teaching and academic promotions in higher education. *Gender and Education*, 29(7), 926–951.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016.1184237>
- van Rooy, B., & Rooy, S. C. (2015). The language issue and academic performance at a South African University. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 33(1), 31–46.
<https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2015.1012691>
- Walton, G. M., Spencer, S. J., & Erman, S. (2013). Affirmative Meritocracy. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 7(1), 1–35.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2012.01041.x>
- Zinovyeva, N., & Bagues, M. (2015). The Role of Connections in Academic Promotions. *American Economic Journal Applied Economics*, 7(2), 264–292.
<https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20120337>