

University Sustainable Development and Management of Academic Staff in Higher Institution of Learning in Central Uganda

NABAKIIBI AGNES

Muteesa I Royal University

Faculty of Education

Correspondence: email: agnesnabakiibi@yahoo.com

(Accepted: 03 December 2022 / Published: 20 December 2022)

<https://doi.org/10.58653/nche.v10i1.06>

Abstract

The study aimed at university sustainability development and the management of academic staff in Uganda. The sample comprised 80 respondents, including the teachers, heads of department and top managers in the universities. Data was analysed using one-way ANOVA by way of Excel statistical data analysis. Qualitative data was analysed using descriptions in themes deciphered in the course of the study. The majority of the academic staff lacked adequate knowledge about what was required of them in connection with university sustainability development. There was a significant relationship between university sustainability development and the management of academic staff in Uganda. It was concluded that many universities do not promote cross-campus collaborations that connect campus administration and students, which has resulted in inadequacy of funds to sufficiently train and manage staff. The study concluded that the majority of universities are still young in their sustainability effort of fully engaging the academic staff in a number of planned activities. It was also concluded that the majority of the academic staff are hesitant to get involved in university sustainability development due to lack of equity accorded to some of the staff. There is need to strengthen training of the academic staff in all areas that the universities feel are appropriate in order to greatly maintain and boost its sustainability development. There is also need to encourage a bottom-top approach for effective and sufficient communication and to provide appropriate and well-informed criteria to everyone on the mechanism used to reward the best academic staff as a way of increasing the positive impact of university sustainability development.

Keywords: *University sustainable development; Management of academic staff; Higher institution of learning; Uganda.*

Introduction

According to the Ministry of Education and Sports in Uganda (2020) and Pham (2021), university sustainability development (USD) and the management of academic staff in higher education institutions aim at identifying the level of importance given to desired competences in sustainable development among teaching staff at a number of higher education institutions. They add that all universities in Uganda aim at imparting education for sustainable development (ESD), with their major purpose being to equip learners across all disciplines with the knowledge, skills, attributes and values required to pursue sustainable visions of the future. Gamage (2022) contends that in order to sustain university development and manage academic staff, higher education institutions need to implement sustainability goals in their curricula and provide comprehensive guidance to educators, researchers and practitioners.

According to Longhurst (2022), if we, as educators in higher institutions of learning, are serious about preparing our students for the future, we must embrace university sustainable development and manage academic staff accordingly. This would ensure that every graduate has not only the knowledge and skills but also the attributes that will enable them at least to cope and ideally thrive in the face of the multiple challenges they will face in the course of their lives in the 21st century. Magdalene (2008) and Walter (2021) add that university sustainable development equips learners across all disciplines with the knowledge, skills, attributes and values required to pursue sustainable visions of the future. Using active pedagogies, learners are supported in addressing complex or 'wicked' problems and identifying how they can contribute to solutions that address environmental integrity, social justice and economic prosperity. Mthokozisi (2019) contends that in order for universities to have sustainable development and manage academic staff, it is very important to take into consideration student and academic staff activism because they have an important role to play in achieving the sustainable development goals of any university. He adds that throughout the world, academic staff and student activism has been a feature of higher education and for post-independence, African students have engaged in a second liberation struggle for social justice and democracy, he points out that in Asia, since the Second World War, students have organised protests on behalf of the academic staff, showing dissatisfaction with the way universities operate and that this has led to movements that have toppled authoritarian regimes in some countries and threatened governments that practise unfairness in the area of social justice and democracy in the universities. He adds that in Latin America, students organised and participated in the 1918 Cordoba Reform protest movement that swept across the entire continent to bring about changes in university governance. Subsequently, student inclusion in university governance in African, Asian and Latin American countries was institutionalised in public universities. Nevertheless, student activism continues to be prevalent as student activists continue to organise to defend and extend their gains with the help of their lecturers.

Globally, the UN (2021) has mapped the road to sustainable development by providing the framework, targets and indicators. Teachers in general have a role in utilising their creative ideas, technologies and inter-connectedness to bring innovative ideas to the fore to achieve the university sustainability development, but this seems not to be followed. In Africa, the trend of university sustainability development and management of academic staff indicates that today, sustaining universities and managing academic staff is becoming a serious issue due to the fact that of late many African students have participated in strikes that show dissatisfaction with the services that are offered in the universities. For example, the Africa Students' and Youth Summit 2018 (ASYS) that

attracted thousands of students and youth to Kigali, Rwanda in 2018 had a focus on the sustainable development of universities and the African Union Agenda 2063.

In Uganda today, and mainly due to the increasing demand for university education, the number of those seeking admission to universities is increasing every year. On the other hand, the capacity of universities to provide quality education to the increasing numbers of students is not growing as fast. This has led to some universities failing to sustain their development and effectively manage the academic staff, especially in terms of providing the needed facilities (Kasozi, 2009). To put this in context and according to Enwaru (2022), university sustainable development and management of academic staff have mainly been due to the fact that managers in universities have parallel coordination in the way they manage issues. This has contributed greatly to the breakdown in cordial relationships between students, academic staff and administration, and given rise to unmet needs due to the scarcity of resources and poor conditions in the institutions, among other factors. Enwaru adds that there are major points that need not be ignored by stakeholders in universities. These include abrupt increments in tuition fees and other charges that are seemingly unfair to the students, lecturers refusing to conduct lectures as they protest delays in salary payments or as they strike over low pay, provision of poor services by universities to both students and staff. For example, some structures are dilapidated, some universities do not provide food to the lecturers despite their low pay, students are given inadequate food, failure by arrogant lecturers to provide marks in time, scrapping of some courses and merging others without consulting all stakeholders, and failure by the bursar's office to provide the right professional opinion about the financial status of the universities since some operate at a loss. This has made it very hard for the universities to sustain their development and manage academic staff. Kasozi (2009) and the United Nations (UN, 2017d), point out that the ugly face of poor salaries is made more awful by the high taxes and this leads to many universities using a big number of part-time staff, many of whom end up doing partial teaching and assessment as they crisscross the city and/or country moonlighting. Kasozi adds that many universities also do not have resources to undertake large-scale and effective staff development programmes, which has resulted in brain drain, leading to shortage of academic staff both in public and private universities. This is because the government is not funding higher education adequately and the fees that students pay fall far short of the realistic unit costs, public universities depend on government subventions and private universities on students' fees, and the availability of donor funds is very much limited and restricted. This poor funding has made it very hard for the universities to adequately sustain development and manage academic staff for competence assessment (Dodds, Donoghue, & Roesch, 2017). Sugumar (2003) contends that universities are failing to sustain their development and manage quality academic staff owing to their inability to manage their budgets, which has led to retrenchment and downsizing of the competent academic staff, which has resulted in poor performance by the universities. Mariappanadar (2003) and Pederson (2017) point out that universities' unsustainability is due to the failure to implement the plans and decisions that agreed after meetings at the different levels of management. They add that universities are failing to sustain development and manage staff due to the heavy teaching loads, undertaking of limited research, inadequate supervision of students, works and projects, listening to rumours, poor decision-making by the top managers and failure to undertake community-based activities. This has made it very hard for the universities to operate sustainably.

According to Hakki (2021), many universities have failed to sustainably manage their development and academic staff due to failure to develop curriculums and review their programmes

in line with societal needs. As a result, some of the taught programmes do not match the current and future demands of learners and, therefore, the graduates of such universities face the challenge of low demand on the job market. He adds that with the emergence of the digital age, teaching and learning has been fundamentally transformed, yet our universities lack adequate pedagogies involving teaching online and are hampered by a serious shortage of ICT equipment, facilities and capabilities such as computers, electronic resources, internet connectivity with sufficient bandwidth and ICT-compliant staff. Male (2011) contends that in Uganda today, a number of strikes have cropped up in universities owing to the inadequacy of funds to finance research development projects and support the teaching staff to upgrade, as well as failure to hold workshops as a way to sustain development and manage staff. He adds that some of the universities frequently use threats, such as that of terminating staff from jobs, and that this has, in many cases, demoralised the academic staff, negatively impacting performance, writing grant proposals, publishing and carrying out competence assessment of all the development activities. This has greatly reduced efforts by the academic staff to think and contribute to the development of universities since they are worried about job security. This research, therefore, investigated the sustainable development and management of academic staff at universities in Central Uganda.

Methodology

Design

This study used a descriptive cross-section survey design that employed both qualitative and quantitative approaches. As suggested by Amin et al. (2005), these approaches were preferred because they combine the benefits deriving from the diversity of the multiple realities one finds in more complex field situations while also taking into consideration representative sampling.

The population size

The main target respondents were higher education teachers. The universities that were considered were four, i.e. two government universities and two private universities located in four districts in Central Uganda. The target population for the teachers was 80. Both the universities and central districts were randomly selected and a representative sample was obtained using Krejcie and Morgan's sample table (1970).

Sampling

Purposive sampling was used to select a sample of four universities, each located in a separate district, with two being private and two public, because the country has a big number of universities, i.e. forty-three. Convenience sampling was used to select the urban and rural districts within Central Uganda where the four universities were situated. This sample was considered appropriate, in line with Gay's, (1996, p. 126) recommendations, which stated that the sample saves time and enables the researcher to carry out his or her work without waiting for those who are not around at the time of the study. The answers from such sub-groups proved to be more motivating or more interested in the study, thus generalizing the target population with caution (Amin 2005, pg., 242).

A simple random sampling procedure was used to select a sample of 20 academic staff from each of the four universities.

Purposive sampling was used to select academic staff, heads of department and some top managers from each university to provide reliable and valid information.

Procedure

Data collection and analysis involved a synthesis of all ideas obtained from both primary and secondary sources. The study specifically involved the use of survey, focus group discussion (FGD) and interviewing methods, purposively to select the respondents. These laid the ground for a reflection on university sustainable development and staff management in Central Uganda. A total of 80 questionnaires for the academic staff were returned, a response rate of 100%. These methods were selected because they are time-saving, records can be kept for future use, and so that the purposively and randomly selected respondents could be interviewed.

Results and Discussion

Data on university sustainable development and management of academic staff in connection with assessing the competencies present at universities was based on reaching out to the respective respondents in the respective universities in order to assess their competencies.

Ways institution consider to ensure an environmentally conscious staff workplace

The study investigated the ways institutions consider to ensure an environmentally conscious workplace for staff in a higher institution of learning.

In this study, ensuring an environmentally conscious staff workplace was understood to mean having policies and programmes in place that encourage green behaviour (behaviour that minimises harm to the environment as much as possible, or even benefits it) amongst the academic staff so that they can act for the sake of nature and can put others ahead of themselves. This goes beyond just having in place policies and programmes but putting into practice all that is agreed upon by the institutional managers through the institution of eco-friendly policies that help to contribute to helping the universities to develop sustainably and enable them to manage their academic staff.

With regard to ensuring an environmentally conscious staff workplace, the teachers in higher education institutions were asked to tick appropriately in the questionnaire ways which the universities had created to manage their employment in the workplace. Their responses are summarised in the table below.

Table 1: Teachers' opinions of the areas in which higher institutions of learning have ensured the environmentally conscious workplace. (Tick appropriately)

Items	Teacher's perception of the level of disagreement	Freq.	Percent
Formulate eco-friendly policies that do motivate the academic staff in the workplace	Strongly agree	38	48.0%
	Disagree	42	52.0%%
Institutions always measure the performance of academic staff regularly	Strongly agree	51	64.0%%
		29	36.0%%
Universities always arrange regular meetings with all academic staff on matters concerning the university operations	Strongly agree	28	35.0%
	Disagree	52	65.0%
The set goals are clearly followed	Strongly agree	42	52.0%%
	Disagree	38	48.0%%
Reward hard work by paying emoluments in time as agreed in staff appointment	Strongly agree	38	48.0%
	Disagree	42	52.0%

Items	Teacher's perception of the level of disagreement	Freq.	Percent
Ensure that employees enjoy working by providing them with teaching and assessment materials during the teaching and learning process	Strongly agree	48	60.0%
	Disagree	32	40.0%
Encourage communication through teamwork	Strongly agree	42	52.0%
	Disagree	38	48.0%
The university communicates directly and transparently	Strongly agree	36	45.0%
	Disagree	44	55.0%
Provide constructive feedback and recognition	Strongly agree	23	29.0%
	Disagree	57	71.0%
Assign tasks to academic staff based on skill, experience and competency	Strongly agree	32	40.0%
	Disagree	48	60.0%
All academic staff have overcome the challenges of online teaching and assessment of the learners	Strongly agree	56	70.0%
	Disagree	24	30.0%
Provide healthier food and breakfast to staff	Strongly agree	38	48.0%
	Disagree	26	32.0%
Facilitate community service opportunities	Strongly agree	29	36.0%
	Disagree	51	64.0%
Exposed to research training and publications	Strongly agree	18	23.0%
	Disagree	62	77.0%

Source: Field study

The results in Table 1 above indicate that the majority of the academic staff in higher institutions of learning ensured that there was an environmentally conscious workplace in a number of areas. The staff at the institutions concerned affirmed that the institutions always measured the performance of academic staff regularly by strongly agreeing, at 64.0%; 52.0% of the staff in some of the institutions strongly agreed that the set goals were closely followed; 60.0% agreed that the institutions did not provide the necessary teaching and learning materials, which would make the academic staff enjoy teaching and assessing the learners; 52.0% agreed that communication was encouraged through teams and, finally, 70.0% of the academic staff attested that they had overcome the challenge of teaching and assessment using online platforms. From the findings, it can be noted that the majority of the universities in Uganda still have challenges in areas like facilitating community outreach activities, have academic staff with inadequate exposure to research training and publications, have staff some of whom are deployed when they have inadequate skills due to lack of workshops, reward their workers inadequately, and rarely provide constructive feedback and recognition. All these are evidenced by the low percentages, which indicate some limitations that prohibit the universities from developing sustainably and managing their academic staff as per the required standards.

During oral interviews, the teachers revealed that there were still difficulties around ensuring an environmentally conscious workplace because some universities still faced inadequate instructional materials, inadequate training of teachers to handle environmental education-related topics in their subject areas and over-reliance on the lecture method of teaching, among others.

One lecturer responded that “many university managers believe that one to teach, he or she must be in the lecture room always to ensure that there is teaching and learning of the students, which exposes them to rote learning” (interview, August 2022).

It was also revealed through FDGs that some universities, instead of making attempts to improve the situation when academic staff complained of failure to pay their salaries in time, instead resorted to using intimidating language connected to termination of service, which leads to some staff looking for greener pastures elsewhere. They also reported that some universities had programmes that did not help the communities, which made it impossible for those programmes provide enough funds for development. This meant that the academic staff were facing some problems at the workplace which, in turn, constrained the universities’ ability to sustainably develop and be effectively supported by their staff. When the data was tested that relates to the academic staff and ensuring an environmentally conscious workplace for staff, the two were found to be positively significant.

Table 2: ANOVA results on teachers’ opinions of the areas in which higher institutions of learning have ensured the environmentally conscious workplace

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Strongly Agree	14	519	37.07143	112.2253
disagree	14	585	41.78571	132.7967

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	155.5714	1	155.5714	1.269857	0.270087	4.225201
Within Groups	3185.286	26	122.511			
Total	3340.857	27				

When the above was subjected to one-way ANOVA, it was found that there was no significant difference ($P > 0.05$) between the academic staff and the environmentally conscious workplace provided by universities. This meant that the academic staff in universities have a significant positive influence at their workplaces.

Academic staff involvement in sustainability development for competence assessment

The study investigated the involvement of academic staff in sustainability development and management for competence assessment.

In this study, academic staff sustainability development means the related approach chosen to calculate positive sustainability development contributions, for example designating champions and creating a green team, inviting suggestions and observations, holding consistent meetings, participating in local initiatives, communicating results and general news, including a section in the employee handbook, among others. This, in the end, helps to unite academic staff in any institution to create a better work culture and work-life balance that boost competence assessment without compromising the ability of future generations. Therefore, when university managers put into practice all the above, it can greatly help to contribute to helping the academic staff get fully involved in universities’ sustainability development for competence assessment.

On ensuring academic staff involvement in sustainability development for competence assessment in areas like preparing self-assessment reports, putting staff in real-life situations, giving the team tasks to play, among others, the teachers in higher education institutions were asked in

the questionnaire to tick appropriately the ways in which the universities had involved them in contributing towards sustainability development for competence assessment. Their responses are summarised in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Academic staff's opinions on the areas that they have been involved in the universities for sustainable development for competence assessment. (Tick appropriately)

Items	Teacher's perception of the level of disagreement	Freq.	Percent
Take a top-down approach always	Strongly agree	38	36.0%
	Disagree	42	64.0%
Create a sustainability committee	Strongly agree	34	39.0%
	Disagree	46	61.0%
Offer green-commuting incentives	Strongly agree	28	21.0%
	Disagree	52	79.0%
Always encourage feedback to staff	Strongly agree	42	43.0%
	Disagree	38	57.0%
Promote sustainability initiatives	Strongly agree	23	29.0%
	Disagree	57	71.0%
Emphasise environmental protection	Strongly agree	38	35.0%
	Disagree	42	65.0%
Staff training workshops on writing papers for publication	Strongly agree	48	30.0%
	Disagree	32	80.0%
Staff training workshop on new methods	Strongly agree	42	46.0%
	Disagree	38	54.0%
Manage conflict and create win-win situations for academic staff through organised retreats	Strongly agree	36	21.0%
	Disagree	44	79.0%
Effective communication between managers and academic staff	Strongly agree	44	79.0%
	Disagree	36	21.0%
Strongly involved in teamwork activities	Strongly agree	48	60.0%
	Disagree	32	40.0%
Opportunity to exchange ideas with other staff in other universities	Strongly agree	46	58.0%
	Disagree	34	43.0%
Delegation top to bottom staff	Strongly agree	38	47.0%
	Disagree	42	53.0%
Developing and writing programmes in the university	Strongly agree	39	49.0%
	Disagree	41	51.0%

Source: Field study

Data in the Table 3 reveals that the majority of academic staff (79.0%) got effective communication between managers and staff, 60.0% of the academic staff were strongly involved in teamwork activities, and that 58.0% enjoyed the opportunity to exchange ideas with other staff in other universities. However, developing and writing programmes (49.0%), delegation by top staff to

bottom staff (47.0%), managing conflicts between staff (21.0%), staff training workshops on new methods (46.0%), involvement in writing papers for publication (48.0%), emphasising environmental protection (38.0%), offering green community incentives (28.0%), using a bottom-top approach (38.0%) and creating a sustainability committee at all levels (34.0%) were still problematic.

The revelations were supplemented by the results of the interviews and FGDs, where the majority of the teachers reported that they still faced a major problem of competing priorities among managers who had to juggle the need for profit and growth, the environment and human capital, poverty and exclusion, underpayment of salaries, building strong institutions and supporting the rule of law, and limited land to develop sustainable activities. Some of the academic staff interviewed reported that they did not know the criteria the managers in universities used to recognise some of their colleagues for performing beyond the supervisor's expectations in sustainability activities. They also added that sometimes universities were reluctant to increase awareness, and that they rarely developed sustainability development programmes with community participation. Furthermore, some responded that there was lack of coordination between staff, inadequate incentive-based practices and inadequate resources. Others responded that some academic staff at the bottom had good ideas pertaining to developing programmes but were never involved in the meetings. And yet others also reported that they lacked knowledge of writing grant proposals and how to publish.

This revelation was corroborated by FGDs of academic staff where it was attested:

The management of universities set rules without consulting the academic staff which has led to resistance, lack of commitment, pessimism and negativity to perform tasks at hand. (Interview, August 2022)

This also supports the above response from the FGDs where the reason the reason for their sometimes not getting involved in the university sustainability development was reported:

Some managers in universities always focus at pinning academic staff with complaints than focusing on solutions and always tend to assume that they do have all the answers to all solutions, which has failed to build a strong team for development. (Interview, August 2022)

When the data was tested using one-way ANOVA, between academic staff and their involvement in the universities for sustainable development for competence assessment, the two were found to be positively significant (see Table 4).

Table 4: ANOVA results on academic staff involvement in universities sustainability development for competence assessment

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
38	13	488	37.53846	60.26923
42	13	532	40.92308	92.57692
	0	0	DIV/0!	DIV/0!

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	74.46154	2	37.23077	0.466868	0.632775	3.422132
Within Groups	1834.154	23	79.74582			
Total	1908.615	25				

From the study findings, it was concluded that the majority of the academic staff still suffered low self-esteem so were not prepared to get involved in universities' sustainable development for competence assessment. In that respect, Table 4 indicates that there was no significant difference ($P>0.05$) among the academic staff. This means that academic staff involvement in universities has a significant positive influence on boosting the university sustainable development.

Impact of academic staff on sustainability development and management of universities growth

The study investigated the impact of academic staff sustainability development and management of university growth.

In this study, the impact of academic staff sustainability for development and management of university growth was understood to mean the current and future ability of workers to remain in the workforce, and this is determined by a healthy organisation culture that supports and values academic staff. Management of university growth, on the other hand, means the effort needed to encourage development for conducting, monitoring and analysing the complex activities of the university such as centralised admission, centralised examination and much more.

Regarding ensuring the impact of academic staff sustainability for development and management of university growth, the lecturers in higher education institutions were asked in the questionnaire to tick appropriately. The responses are summarised in Table 4 below.

Table 5: Academic staff's opinions and their impact on sustainability development and management on universities growth. (Tick appropriately)

Items	Teacher's perception of the level of disagreement	Freq.	Percent
Increased competence assessment due Job security	Strongly Agree	39	49.0%
	Disagree	41	51.0%
Inclusion (professional growth and development is actively taken into consideration)	Strongly Agree	34	33.0%
	Disagree	46	67.0%
Been able to write grant proposals to boost the sustainability development	Strongly Agree	39	21.0%
	Disagree	41	79.0%
Prudence through research symposium	Strongly Agree	42	19.0%
	Disagree	38	81.0%
Equity in decision-making for all employees	Strongly Agree	35	44.0%
	Disagree	45	56.0%
Participate in sustainability report as a whole	Strongly Agree	48	20.0%
	Disagree	32	80.0%
Undertaking innovative initiatives in a knowledge-based society	Strongly Agree	36	45.0%
	Disagree	44	55.0%
Often participate in socio-economic development	Strongly Agree	39	59.0%
	Disagree	47	41.0%
Participated in maintenance of the environment	Strongly Agree	45	56.0%
	Disagree	35	44.0%
Get time to research and publish every semester	Strongly Agree	34	43.0%
	Disagree	46	57.0%

Items	Teacher's perception of the level of disagreement	Freq.	Percent
Actively participate in community-based activities	Strongly Agree	46	57.0%
	Disagree	34	43.0%
Been able to deliver skills as expected in the university	Strongly Agree	38	48.0%
	Disagree	42	52.0%
Been able to teach learners online without hardships, both physical and online	Strongly Agree	39	49.0%
	Disagree	41	51.0%
Competent in conducting research supervision for learners	Strongly Agree	36	45.0%
	Disagree	44	55.0%

Source: Field study

The results in Table 5 indicate that regarding the impact of academic involvement on sustainability development and management of universities' growth, the majority of the academic staff had often participated in socio-economic development, 59.0% had actively participated in community-based activities, 53.0% had developed prudence through research symposiums and half of the workers had enhanced their competence assessment due to job security. However, the percentages for the rest of the items were below the half-way mark. These include the provision of competent knowledge in research supervision for learners (45.0%), ability to effectively teach online (49.0%), participation in delivering the skills obtained through training at the university (48.0%), finding time to do research and publish every semester (43.0%), undertaking innovative initiatives (45.0%), participating in decision-making equally (44.0%), being interested in professional growth (33.0%) and being able to write proposals for grants to supplement the university's income (21.0%). This showed that there is need to motivate the academic staff towards university sustainability development and growth.

During the FGD, the academic staff revealed that the most demotivating factor in the universities was failure to pay their salaries in time. They also revealed that universities did not want to facilitate people who might want to upgrade. They revealed that some universities resource-constrained, which limited opportunities for research in some instances. They also reported that some trainers of academic staff seemed to have inadequate knowledge of what they trained the staff about, so that in the end there was still a shortfall in achieving sustainable development in the university.

The structured interviews revealed that the academic staff is frightened by the lack of job security, which hampered them from doing their best to contribute to sustainable development for university growth. They also reported that they were overloaded with course units, which made it hard to have more ambitious plans for the university, especially in terms of developing programmes, publishing and undertaking innovative research.

One lecturer reported that "universities are failing to sustainably develop for their growth due to very small salaries that have made many lecturers to part [moonlight] from one university to another. This has made it very hard for the people to settle and plan well in their mother universities' (interview, August 2022).

When the data was subjected to one-way ANOVA, it was found that there was no significant difference ($P > 0.05$) among the academic staff in the universities under study regarding their sustainability development and growth.

This meant that the academic staff in the different universities had a similar impact on university development and growth (See Table 6 below).

Table 6: ANOVA results on academic staff and their impact on university sustainability development and growth

Groups	Sum	Average	Variance
Strongly Agree	550	39.28571	19.91209
disagree	576	41.14286	22.74725

ANOVA

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	1	24.14286	1.131891	0.297154	4.225201
Within Groups	26	21.32967			
Total	27				

There is a strong positive relationship between academic staff and university sustainability development regarding their growth because the ($P > 0.05$), hence there is a statistically significant between the two, i.e. the impact of academic staff on university sustainability development and growth.

Conclusions

From the study findings, it was concluded that the majority of the academic staff seemed not to fully engage in activities that boost sustainable development in the universities as far as providing the sustainability reports to the staff was concerned. Some universities did not facilitate participation in community-based activities, or provide money to encourage the staff to upgrade. Some used trainers who lacked the appropriate knowledge to train the academic staff adequately. Also, some universities failed to pay the agreed emoluments as per the appointment letters. Furthermore, some academic staff tended to be overloaded with course units, which led to failure by academic staff to perform adequately and plan for university sustainability as far as carrying out research is concerned. All these made it very hard to adequately manage the academic staff owing to failure to boost equity in all areas, and this has caused imbalances in both economic and social stability. University sustainability development and management of academic staff have a significant positive influence on the universities' existence and create a balance in both the social and economic wellbeing of the employees for competence assessment.

Recommendations

Following the discussion of the results and conclusions reached, the researchers wish to make the following recommendations.

There is need for the universities to consistently equip the academic staff with the right knowledge, specifically knowledge related to both why an action is important and how to do it. There is need for universities to help the academic staff absorb ideas and make decisions in specific ways; for example, the staff are moved more by positive messages than messages of gloom and doom. There is also need for the universities to make actions easy to undertake and enjoyable by emphasising the provision of practical support to academic staff. There is need for NCHE to encourage workshops that train managers in higher institutions of learning about the need to foster sustainable development

and manage their academic staff. This can help to keep the benchmarked policies on track. There is also need for NCHE to get involved in the process of developing the proposed programmes by the technical people in the universities as a way to ensure that the programmes suit the communities' needs. In this way, the universities will gain access to resources that will ensure that they operate effectively and manage the academic staff competently. There is need for university managers to provide effective and consistent rewards to staff as these tend to retain staff, ensure sustainability development and foster competence assessment.

Limitations of the Study

Since the position of the research study was mainly quantitative in nature, it was very expensive and time-consuming since it involved reviews during certain periods to collect the data.

Future Research Recommendations

The study recommends that a further study should be carried out in the following area:

Thoughts on good managerial skills and its effectiveness in university sustainable development.

Acknowledgements

To all those men and women who have contributed to the successful writing of this research paper, especially Dr. Dorothy Ssebowa: You are the most fantastic experience of my academic life. Also to Mr. Peter Ssemuusi, who has done a lot in data collection and supported me morally and financially up to the completion of this paper and to all my research respondents in this study.

References

- Alston, M. (2014). Gender mainstreaming and climate change. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 47(B), 287–294.
- Appel, S., & Barragán, D. (2017). Universities, NGOs, and civil society sustainability: *Preliminary lessons from Ecuador. Development in Practice*, 27(4), 472–486.
- Blasco, M. (2012). Aligning the hidden curriculum of management education with PRME: An inquiry-based framework. *Journal of Management Education*, 36, 364–88.
- Byrch, C. (2007). Sustainable “what”? A cognitive approach to understanding sustainable development. *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management*, 4(April), 26–52.
- Cavalcanti, B, et al. (2011). Provision of education for sustainability development and sustainability literacy in business programs in three higher education institutions in Brazil, Colombia and Peru. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 22(5) 1055–1086.
- De Haan, G. (2010). The development of ESD-related competencies in supportive institutional frameworks. *International Review of Education*, 56, 315–28.
- Dodds, F., Donoghue, D., & Roesch, J. (2017). *Negotiating the Sustainable Development Goals*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Douglass, J. A., Judson, K.C., & Feller, I. (2009). *Globalization's muse: Universities and higher education systems in a changing world*. California: Berkeley Public Policy Press.
- European Union. (2010). *Europe 2020: A European strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*. Brussels: European Union.
- Gamage, K., et al. (2022). *The Wiley handbook of sustainability in higher education learning and teaching. Wiley handbooks in education*. Indianapolis: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Hakki, A. (2021). Teachers' competences and their effectiveness in the teaching process. Unpublished article.
- Holdsworth, S. (2021). *Competencies or capabilities in the Australian higher education landscape and its implications for the development and delivery of sustainability education*. Philadelphia: Routledge.
- Holdsworth, S. (2016). *A sustainability education academic development framework (SEAD)*. Philadelphia: Routledge.
- Mariappanadar, S. (2003). Sustainable human resource strategy: The sustainable and unsustainable dilemmas of retrenchment. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(8), 906–923. <https://doi.org/10.1108/org/10.1108>
- Mthokozisi, E.N. (2019). *Student activism and its role in achieving the SDGs*. University World News.
- Nolet, V. (2009). Preparing sustainability literate teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 111(2), 409–442.
- Pederson, K. (2017). Wheels of change in higher education: A collaborative, multi-stakeholder project as a vehicle for sustainability education. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 18(2), 171–184, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-10-2015-0172>.
- Pham, D., (2021). The professional development of academic staff in higher education institutions. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*, 23(1), 115–131, Jun.
- Pribisev, B., et al. (2022). *The importance of the OMEP ESD rating scale for building future preschool teachers' professional competencies in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. New York: Springer.
- Ramos, T., Caeiro, S., Moreno Pires, S., & Videira, N. (2018). How are new sustainable Development approaches responding to societal challenges? *Sustainable Development*, 26(2), 117–121.
- Redman, E., & Arnim, R.A. (2018). *Continuing professional development in sustainability education for K-12 teachers: Principles, programme, applications, outlook*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Salovaara, J., et al (2021). Educated professionals of sustainability and the dimensions of practices. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 22(8), 69–87.
- Sandri, O., & Holdsworth, S. (2022). Pedagogies for sustainability: Insights from a foundational sustainability course in the built environment. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 23(3), 666–685.
- Serna, J., et al. (2021). Driving transformational sustainability in a university through structural and academic innovation: A case study of a public university in Spain. *Advances in Engineering Education*, 10(1).
- Sobel, D. (2013). *Place-based education: Connecting classrooms and communities*. Great Barrington, MA: Orion.
- UN. (2017d). *Sustainable Development Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable*. Retrieved from UN Knowledge Platform: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg11>
- UNESCO. (2010). *Teaching and learning for a sustainable future: A multimedia teacher education programme*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2005). *Globalisation and education for sustainable development. Sustaining the future*. Nagoya, Japan. United Nations University.
- Walter, L.F. (2021). *University teaching staff and sustainable development: An assessment of competences*. Springer.
- Zomer, A., & Benneworth, P. (2011). The rise of the university's third mission. In J. Enders, H. de Boer, & D. Westerheijden (Eds.), *Reform of higher education in Europe* (pp. 81-101). Sense Publishers.