

An Evaluation of the Global Labour University¹

Part A: Background

Introduction

At the Meeting of the International Steering Committee of the Global Labour University (GLU) in September 2007, the Steering Committee decided to have an evaluation process of the GLU undertaken. This evaluation would also serve as an input into the project evaluation for two ILO Projects:

- Advancing Fair Globalisation, Extension of the GLU to South Africa (2007-2008);
- Strengthening trade union capacity for social dialogue through the further development of the Global Labour University (2008-2009).

The second project is complementing and extending the scope of the first project and a joint evaluation process was seen as the most efficient option. It was agreed to request me, Mike Waghorne, to undertake this evaluation since I had experience as a trade unionist with a strong global union and union research background. As the external collaborator, I would evaluate the projects over the period from December 2007 through until mid-2009

Terms of Reference for the Project Evaluation

I was asked to evaluate the project according to the following general criteria:

| | |
|--|--|
| Relevance and strategic fit of the project | The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiary requirements, country needs, global priorities and partner and donor policies. The extent to which the approach is strategic and the ILO uses its comparative advantage. |
| Validity of project design | The extent to which the project design is logical and coherent. |
| Project progress and effectiveness | The extent to which the project's immediate objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. |
| Efficiency of resource use | A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results. |
| Effectiveness of management arrangements | The extent to which management capacities and arrangements put in place supports the achievement of results. |
| Impact orientation and sustainability of the project | The strategic orientation of the project towards making a significant contribution to broader, long-term, sustainable development changes. The likelihood that the results of the project are durable and can be maintained or even scaled up and replicated by project. |

In addition I was requested to undertake interviews with participants, teaching staff, national trade union centres, Global Unions, donors and support institutions in all four GLU programme countries: Brazil, Germany, India and South Africa. I was guided by an agreed set of questions:

- General questions:
- Questions for students
- Questions for teaching staff:
- Questions for Global Unions and national trade union centres:
- Questions for other partners (mainly the funders/ILO, etc).

The full set of questions used can be found in the Appendix to this report.

¹ This report is written by Mike Waghorne, 2 rue Duguay Trouin, Place de l'église, 29770 Esquibien, France; e-mail: mikewaghorne@orange.fr and was finalised in October 2009.

The 2008 Report

The evaluation commenced with a visit to South Africa in late 2007 and then continued with visits to Brazil and Germany in 2008. India was not included in the 2008 evaluation because the programme had not yet officially commenced. I also attended the GLU summer school in Berlin in September 2008 to obtain the views of GLU alumni. These visits and interviews were the bases for an interim report produced in late 2008: *An evaluation of the Global Labour University: a 2008 interim report*. That report is available from mikewaghorne@orange.fr and contains an overview of all site visits as well as individual reports on each campus visit. That report was discussed at the GLU Steering Committee in Berlin in September 2008 (except for the section on alumni views, which were reported orally to the Committee but not incorporated into the written report until later that year).

The 2008 phase of the project was commissioned and funded by Kassel University in Germany, one of the two German universities (along with the Berlin School of Economics) that deliver the GLU programme in Germany. At the meeting of the Steering Committee that had been held in Brazil earlier in 2008, the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES) volunteered to fund the 2009 phase of the evaluation and a contract between the FES and me was the basis of the 2009 review – this report. The main change was that there had been serious concern at the Berlin discussion in September in 2008 about the whole process of reintegration of GLU alumni into either their own previous union (where relevant) or other parts of the labour movement, since it was clear that this was not working well in too many cases. The original 2008 questions were therefore widened to look at this aspect more closely.

The 2009 Report

This report is based on repeat visits to the countries visited in 2008 (Brazil in February 2009, South Africa in March and Germany in May). I also visited India in February both to interview stakeholders involved in the GLU programme at the Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS) in Mumbai as well as to attend a GLU Curriculum Workshop and the 2009 GLU Conference. I met with available Global Labour unions in Geneva in June 2009. At the stage that the draft report was being finalised I had yet to meet with participants at the 2009 GLU summer school to be held in September in Berlin, although I had had the chance to get the views of alumni who attended the alumni workshop held in Johannesburg in March.

A draft report was prepared for discussion in Berlin at the Steering Committee in September 2009 but was then finalised in the light of alumni views obtained in September.

It was agreed with the FES that the report should focus on:

- A synthesis of observations from both 2008 and 2009, with general conclusions and recommendations;
- A set of observations from each campus/country on any significant changes or developments compared to the situation described in the 2008 report.

Part B: Synthesis Report

Evaluation overview

This section of the report takes each of the terms of reference as the skeleton on which my observations have been based. Where relevant, I have started from the position, conclusions and/or recommendations made in 2008, updated in the light of discussions held in 2009.

Relevance and strategic fit of the project

Criteria: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiary requirements, country needs, global priorities and partner and donor policies.

The extent to which the approach is strategic and the ILO uses its comparative advantage.

There is more than one set of beneficiaries in this programme. There are, obviously, the students who undertake the courses; but there are also the universities themselves, who need to see that their academic interests and status/reputation are enhanced by the programme. Then there are the unions from which the students come and the national trade union centres to which these unions belong and which are, in the host campus countries, official partners in the GLU. There are also the various funding/donor bodies that, presumably, hope to see their own ends met in the programme.

In the case of all stakeholders, it seems to me that the objectives of a development orientation are being well met in general. There is clear evidence that students/participants have a very positive belief that the GLU programme is contributing to their own personal development (in knowledge and skills, as well) and to the development objectives of their own union and of the relevant national centre.

In terms of unions and national centres, I think that the objectives are being met in a more complex way. Many students have raised the question of whether their own union really understands the potential of the GLU to meet the union's real needs. It can be argued that many trade unions are so poorly resourced and of such low capacity that they may not be really aware of what their long-term needs are. They may, in many cases, (think that they) know what they **want**, long/medium-term, but that is not the same as knowing what they **need**.

The dynamics between union wants/needs/expectations and student objectives/expectations need to be explored with relevant unions, since some students expressed concern that their own union may not recognise their new skills and knowledge and may not know how to optimise the learning/skills that the returning students bring. There is a need for much, much better dialogue with unions, which are sponsoring (financially or not) GLU students.

There is a specific problem for many unions in the developing world, especially those with very few full-time elected officials and/or staff. The length of GLU courses (varying from 12 to 18 months) makes it very difficult for them to release key people and/or keep their positions open for when they return. Aside from the question of the international union movement, especially the global unions, encouraging such unions to consider relevant mergers and assisting in the process, it is difficult to see any resolution to this problem. However, it does mean that the GLU objective of having alumni return to their original union is put in jeopardy in many cases.

In 2008, I said that it was clear in both South Africa and Brazil that communication between the university and the national centre needs to be improved. There is no doubt that there is political support from the latter for the GLU but in both cases, there had been problems in getting the national centres adequately involved in the objectives-setting and day-to-day running of the GLU. Some of this results from the fact that unions and national centres have many issues on their plate. Even if they are committed to the GLU concept, they are not always able to allocate resources inside the organisation to attend GLU meetings, to publicise the GLU to members/affiliates nor to developing their own policy attitudes to the requirements of a GLU. My feeling is that, in these two countries, the situation has improved: it is far from being resolved but in each country, there is an understanding of what needs to be done and active steps are being taken to address the problems.

Whilst unions (including national centres) must look for ways of being able to involve themselves in the national GLU programme, the host universities need to help them find solutions to this. This is still an uncertain issue in India: union national centres have, by and large, not involved themselves in the GLU and it remains to be seen whether some meetings planned for August 2009 go some way to clarifying the situation. [Informal feedback that I have had from two sources suggest that real progress was made in these meetings but I have no detail.]

Donor bodies seem happy with developments but are more concerned as to whether ordinary unions, as opposed to national centres, are being kept informed about the advantages of the programme. Virtually everyone seems to agree that the GLU is meeting a real need of helping unions to improve their capacity in dealing with globalisation issues, even if the full potential of the programme is yet to be realised.

Validity of project design

Criteria: The extent to which the project design is logical and coherent.

In general, I think that this criterion is being met. In each country, unique approaches tailor-made for each national situation have been established. The GLU steering committee seems to be adopting a pragmatic approach to achieving a balance between a global commonality and respecting local needs/traditions.

There is some division amongst people over the question of whether the GLU programme should be 'standardised' or flexible. There is a marked majority in favour of the latter but there are many who worry that a lack of at least a minimum of a global core/commonality will reduce the original GLU vision to a set of vaguely related programmes with just a common global exchange of an elite group of teaching staff and researchers. Some have suggested that, for the GLU to have a global identity, there must be a minimum agreement on some common themes, even if each course is unique. The curriculum workshops should be used to explore this in more depth.

There is one issue over which the GLU itself has little control but which does cause problems for students at least in terms of the desired flexibility of the programme: the institutional incompatibilities. Each university has its own academic year; each has rules (that may even come from a central university policy body at the national level) about the cross-crediting of course work pursued in other countries. It would seem that the desire of many universities to become internationally recognised might slowly erode this problem. In the meantime, the only thing that the GLU can do is to discuss amongst the various campuses ways of arranging course work such that a student who transfers from, say, Germany to Brazil, does not find that her/his second semester repeats much of what was covered in the first semester at the originating university.

Project progress and effectiveness

Criteria: The extent to which the project's immediate objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

The GLU website contains the following statement, as a summary of its objectives:

Within the concept of a Global Labour University a network of trade unionists, researchers and ILO (International Labour Organisation) experts will be created to develop and deliver high-level qualification programmes including one year Masters Courses on "Trade Unions, Sustainable Development, Social Justice, International Labour Standards, Economic Policies and Global Institutions". It is a new approach to strengthen the intellectual and strategic capacity of workers organisations and to establish much stronger working relationships between trade unions, the ILO, and the scientific community. It will strengthen trade union capacity and competence to promote the values of the ILO's "Decent Work" agenda and enable workers organisations to engage more effectively in social dialogue on social and economic policy issues like employment, social protection, and the implementation of international labour standards.

The Masters programmes will support trade unions to substantially improve their intellectual profile by building a channel for the development of qualified trade union leaders as well as supporting the recruitment of younger experts. The global network will provide a unique possibility of research and policy development in a truly multicultural and multiregional environment ... Whenever possible, students

from all regions will be represented in the courses. Global workshops, conferences, publications and internet working groups, will facilitate genuine global dialogue and sustainable international networks.

A network of trade unionists, researchers and ILO experts has been created but this has gone further, to include many academics (both GLU programme teachers and others), alumni and other potentially interested universities.

So far, results from students who have completed courses show that, indeed, high-level programmes have been developed and delivered and, overwhelmingly, students have achieved the high standards to justify the GLU programmes being seen by peers in the universities concerned as worthy of the university. Perhaps, in 2009, teaching staff are being less idealistic in their assessment of this factor: more are willing to state that not all students are capable of meeting the very highest standards and that better student selection is needed in some cases.

Most students who have completed a course have returned to their original union or some other union-related organisation. It is too early to say whether these alumni have yet been able to strengthen the intellectual and strategic capacity of workers' organisations in dealing with the objectives outlined in the above website selection and to develop the links amongst all of the GLU partners. Comments below on the reintegration process qualify this statement somewhat.

Certainly, the programme is attracting potential qualified trade union leaders and developing younger experts. However, there is a question as to whether the GLU is being sufficiently advertised and promoted amongst the affiliates of national centres or regular members, to ensure that all potential applicants are being reached. There is evidence that too few students are learning about the GLU through national trade union centres or Global Union channels. Many are finding it through contacts with other students/alumni or through Internet searches. This is an area that needs more attention, although comments below elaborate more on this issue.

The whole applications process needs more discussion. The Conclusions and Recommendations at the end of this section of the report contain some specific suggestions in this regard.

It seems to be accepted that the promotion/advertising of the GLU is not working well. Several suggestions, outlined in the Conclusions and Recommendations have been made to overcome this:

All GLU partners need to be more proactive when they visit unions in taking GLU material with them. This may be a way of making people more aware of the potential of the GLU.

The profile of students suggests that the GLU is multicultural and multi-regional, with one exception. So far, few 'Northern' students (mainly OECD countries) have enrolled in the courses, especially in those programmes being run outside of Germany. Even in Germany, the number of European students has been disappointing. Some of this can be attributed to the language problem, to which I will return below. Part of the problem is that the nature of the funding donors means that they are less willing to fund students from the North. In turn, such students may not see the GLU as attractive enough to justify them having to pay for a GLU course when their own countries' universities can offer good courses covering globalisation issues at a cheaper cost, even if the union perspective may be missing from many such courses. Several students and some faculty have asked whether it is time for the GLU to revisit the question of scholarships for (at least some) Northern students.

In connection with this problem, it should be noted that in both Germany and South Africa, there has been active discussion as to whether a resolution of the issue is to be found in:

- Expanding 'downwards', by creating a certificate programme (a Kassel solution); or
- Looking to other academic departments that can offer some kind of bridging course that enables potential students to qualify for entry into a master's course (the PDM course mentioned in the South African section of this report).

The GLU steering Committee may want to discuss this in more detail.

As far as 'global workshops, conferences, publications and internet working groups' are concerned, the GLU obviously works closely with the Global Union Research Network (GURN) and encourages and promotes publications from GLU participants within the GURN structures. There have now been four GLU global conferences see below. These have all been well attended, with a good mixture of

faculty from all GLU campuses, ILO staff, donor/funding bodies, students (usually from the local campus), alumni and other academics interested in or associated with the GLU. There have, however, been few unionists at these conferences.

In fact, some people suggested that it would be good, perhaps at future curriculum workshops, to discuss the desired relationship amongst the GLU academic programme, the GLU conferences, the curriculum workshops themselves and the Summer School research projects.

I was also asked to make some comments on the GLU conferences and the curriculum workshops in this report. The GLU conferences have been held annually, one each in each of the countries involved in the GLU programme, as follows: Germany (2006), South Africa (2007), Brazil (2008), and India (2009). These latter three conferences were held just as the first course was beginning. In my own view, this may have been a very good way of incorporating the new country into the GLU 'family' but was quite a stress on coordinators and others who were already struggling to get the logistics of the new programme sorted out. If another country were to be added to the GLU programme, I would suggest that no conference be held there until after a full year of the programme has been completed.

In the section of the report on conferences and workshops, I make a number of observations that I do not want to repeat here on the format and content of GLU conferences. However, it is important to have a formal GLU Steering Committee discussion on how to tackle the gender imbalance problem identified in those comments.

The 2007 Summer School in Germany also instituted three research projects involving GLU faculty and alumni:

- One on representation issues in micro/small enterprises;
- One on the question of decent work and labour standards in the lead-up to and hosting of major international sporting events such as the 2010 Soccer World Cup and the 2012 London Olympics; and
- One on the ways in which unions/labour are involved in national policy-making around global issues such as trade.

There seems to be a consensus that these (and potential additional projects) may well be a good selling point for the GLU, since they are aimed at producing papers/products that unions can use in global and national organising/campaigning. Students interviewed in 2009 expressed an interest in being able to join these projects and/or initiating fresh projects, as a way of building and sustaining a global alumni network.

Efficiency of resource use

Criteria: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.

I saw no evidence and heard no complaints from anyone interviewed about any inefficiency in resource use. There are some grounds for saying that some resources are not being used as effectively as they could be, although, in the main, this is simply a matter of not having sufficient resources to do what is required. These include:

- *Internships:* The coordination of internship arrangements for students is very resource-intensive and, in most cases, is being done by post-graduate students who are also working on their own PhDs.

The 2008 report noted the particular problems/features of the internship programmes at the three existing national programmes. It is clear that logistical and academic year constraints are forcing each campus to come up with its own solution to internships. This was discussed at the 2008 Berlin steering committee but more discussion is needed on the purpose and nature of internships.

It is clear that logistical arrangements remain one of the key bugbears of students. They often feel that arrangements are made too late, that they are not always consulted on which internship they will be on, that their host institution does not understand the expectations on

both sides. The problems are more acute in non-German programmes, where the number and range of potential hosts is much more restricted.

- *Coordination resources:* Some of the problems of finding sufficient resources for course coordinators have been mentioned. However, it is clear that in all cases, there is tremendous pressure on the coordinators just before and after the students arrive on site. The latter are often new to the country and culture, may not speak the local language and are not familiar with local requirements about renting, opening bank accounts, getting a mobile phone, etc. They are, therefore very reliant on the coordinators who are, as noted, often busy with their own course work.

In South Africa and Brazil, the same coordinators are responsible for general coordination and the logistics of arranging internships. This has resulted in some students having to spend much more of their own time in stumbling through many of the bureaucratic requirements of settling into a new country and a new university at the very time when they are trying to unravel the complexity of understanding their GLU course requirements. In some cases, this has led to understandable complaints that 'the organisation of all these things is not good', even if students all say that they think very highly of the coordinators.

Kassel people had suggested in 2008 that the GLU needed a more permanent global coordinator. See the Conclusions and Recommendations below for some specific suggestions on this.

The steering committee needs to consider finding more adequate coordination resources.

- *Selection of candidates:* Whilst, in 2008, most faculty were very happy with the quality of most students, 2009 discussions have been more nuanced. It is clear that, in a few cases, people need much more preparation before they arrived at the campus, usually because of their language difficulties, because they have very minimal understanding of economic issues, because they have weak research skills and may need considerable help in approaching academic writing skills. Although the application process enables some limited ability to assess such skills, it is mainly limited to a judgement about their written English, gleaned from application forms.

Two distinct suggestions on issues arising from the selection process problems are below in the Conclusions and Recommendations.

- *Access to relevant literature:* There were concerns expressed by some students in 2008 about access to relevant (English) resource material. In 2009, it became clear that this was mainly a question of students not knowing where to locate the ample material available in the university library. However, there is a student concern that much of this material is European/North American in orientation and very little originates from or is about the developing world. I am not competent to judge whether this is simply a reflection of current publication realities or whether it is a question of each campus having to build a corpus of relevant, modern global literature.

One idea that emerged from the two curriculum workshops held so far was that it would be useful for all campuses to contribute to a database of literature that they are using, so that all GLU faculty are aware of material not currently in their telescope. However, it was stressed that this should not be seen as a GLU-required reading list.

It had been noted in the 2008 Kassel report that it would be a good idea to put lecture texts or even videotaped lectures on-line for students to be able to go back over these at their leisure. This is certainly now happening at Kassel and it was noted, during the 2009 Curriculum Workshop in Mumbai in February 2009, that Christoph Scherrer is routinely doing this now. It was further suggested in Mumbai that it would be useful to make such on-line material available to other GLU campuses and to consider on-line discussions via video-link between any two or more campuses, which may help with some of the language or specialty problems raised elsewhere in this report.

- *The bureaucracy involved at the ILO and universities, as opposed to the flexibility possible with the new GLU Association:* The nature of the ILO and universities sensibly requires that the kinds of money amounts being transferred and expended through/to the GLU must be very carefully accounted for. There is no suggestion that this accountability should in any way be reduced.

However, these are large institutions whose administrative staff do not always recognise the vulnerability of sponsored students or of the need to transfer money for essential running costs (including travel and accommodation) of people from other countries. There have been delays in transferring money or in getting approvals for some matters.

The GLU has now become an incorporated non-governmental organisation (NGO) in Germany. It is possible that this GLU Association could be used as a conduit for many of these administrative/financial transactions that could operate more speedily but no less accountably than the current arrangements allow. What needs to be explored is whether this is a potential reality and whether this German-based NGO could serve the entire GLU network or whether separate national GLU associations will be required in each country.

Overall, it is clear that some additional resources would be required to address all of these matters in an optimal manner. Until that can be achieved, it may be that one simply has to accept the reality of resource gaps and do the best that can be done within those constraints.

Effectiveness of management arrangements

Criteria: The extent to which management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of results.

The management of the GLU is highly dispersed. The GLU's global Council/Steering Committee meets twice annually, usually at the time of the global GLU conference and during the annual Berlin Summer School, and has representatives from all of the partner interests. The Council/Steering Committee operates on a relatively informal basis. Composed of representatives from participating universities, global unions, national trade union centres and the funding bodies (that is, mainly the sponsoring donor bodies), it is charged with distributing the ongoing coordination, networking and work of the GLU amongst its members on a consensus basis. In each country, there is a national steering committee that is responsible for communication amongst the partners in the country concerned, although the nature and working method of each of these is left up to each country to decide.

However, the reality in a globally dispersed organisation is that many day-to-day decisions are taken by e-mail consensus. Almost all of the people involved, with the exception of the students, know each other reasonably well and there is a considerable amount of mutual trust amongst the key actors. The bureaucratic and physical demands of face-to-face meetings have a cost. For financial reasons, these meetings need to be associated with other GLU events like the annual conference or the Berlin GLU Summer School. This means that there are times when the official representative of one of the partners is replaced by a substitute who needs to be briefed on the business at hand. This has generally not proved problematic since, as noted, most of the key players know each other and there have been few controversial discussions where such lack of continuity would have made for difficulties.

Not that this results in any laxity: partners have had clear reasons for supporting the GLU and are quite clear about their objectives and interests. I have certainly seen various partners questioning issues on which they have a strong view and insisting that basic GLU principles are adhered to.

Steering committee meetings have been serious about discussing GLU objectives and in determining a course of action that they want followed up. For example, there is clearly a wish to expand the GLU to other countries, yet meetings have been quite strict in refusing to accept new partners until they are quite sure that the new partners will be able to adhere to and advance the GLU's objectives.

Dan Cunniah of the ILO makes the point that what is perhaps lacking is direct input at the global Steering Committee from national centres: the GUFs are at these meetings but perhaps we need brief written reports from national centres or national steering committees for each global Steering Committee meeting.

Impact orientation and sustainability of the project

Criteria: The strategic orientation of the project towards making a significant contribution to broader, long-term, sustainable development changes; the likelihood that the results of the project are durable and can be maintained or even scaled up and replicated by project.

The *raison d'être* of the programme is to work for 'long-term sustainable development' and all students and faculty seem to be passionate about achieving this objective from the point of view of alumni and trade unions. See the Conclusions and Recommendations below regarding a proposed survey of alumni in the next year or so.

The initial class sizes at both Wits and Campinas have been small. There seems to be agreement that these classes should be expanded up to an optimal size of around 20 students. In theory, this is achievable, although every effort must be made to ensure that regional, national and gender balances are all built into this expansion. As noted in the Brazil section of this report, this is now being accompanied by a concerted effort to expand the number of Latin American students, especially in Brazil.

Attempts are also being made to increase the number of students from OECD countries, especially in Germany. In Germany, a lower level Certificate course has now been approved at Kassel, which may attract more such students and other campuses have discussed whether some lower level 'bridging' course might help to prepare more trade union people to qualify for entry into a masters level programme. See the Conclusions and Recommendations below for some suggestions on sponsorships for some students from OECD countries and those with dependent families.

The question of potential expansion of the GLU programme to other countries has been extensively discussed. It must be recognised that the extension to a new country is potentially very stressful both to the GLU partners in that country and to the GLU governance structures. Whilst many people have suggested various countries that the GLU could expand to (the UK, North America, Eastern Europe and the Pacific have all been mentioned), there seems to be an agreement that the short-term priority is to consolidate and grow the existing programmes. The Mumbai Steering Committee meeting changed the Constitution of the GLU to make provision for associate membership for institutions that wish to cooperate with the GLU, as well as providing for GLU fellows, so that, even if expansion itself does not occur, opportunity to widen the GLU circle can be taken.

Crystal Dicks of COSATU raises an interesting question about unionists and unions' needs and capacities to supply qualified candidates for the GLU programme: she wonders whether universities could cope with collective learning potentials, as opposed to systems based on individualistic criteria.

Conclusions and recommendations

Unions and universities: An issue that has arisen in more than one country is the question: just what labour wants from universities – not just from the GLU programme. National union centres have all subscribed to and supported the GLU, apart from the case of India, where attempts to resolve that question have continued throughout 2009. Yet, for some national centres, if not all, the actual involvement in the day-to-day GLU business is less than that of other partners. Some of this is obviously a question of competing priorities fighting for very finite resources, not just money but staff time and access to the main communication channels of the union movement.

Whilst unions (including national centres) must look for ways of being able to involve themselves in the national GLU programme, the host universities need to help them find solutions to this.

Dan Cunniah of the ILO makes the point that what is perhaps lacking is direct input at the global Steering Committee from national centres: the GUFs are at these meetings but he suggests that perhaps the GLU needs brief written reports from national centres or national steering committees for each global Steering Committee meeting.

The GLU needs to consider mounting a serious debate globally and in each country over just what unions want from universities. Some students say that they detect a kind of reverse elitism in unions – a feeling that people who undertake university studies, even a labour-oriented course such as the GLU, can't be 'real unionists'. Many senior unionists have come up through the ranks; in the past, it was true that they could be effective union leaders through highly skilled demagoguery and fluent

rhetoric. More and more union leaders are now aware that the top layer of the union has to encompass a whole range of professional knowledge and expertise that can withstand withering media exposure and television face-to-face debates with leading politicians and policy makers who have teams of spin doctors and experts at their disposal.

So, many unions are conflicted about universities. They see governments effectively 'subsidising' capital through business studies, management and other courses but are not sure whether they have a right or a need to ensure that public education funds are also serving the needs of workers and their unions and whether universities can deliver in this area.

There is some division amongst people over the question of whether the GLU programme should be 'standardised' or flexible. There is a marked majority in favour of the latter but there are many who worry that a lack of at least a minimum of a global core/commonality will reduce the original GLU vision to a set of vaguely related programmes with just a common global exchange of an elite group of teaching staff and researchers. Some have suggested that, for the GLU to have a global identity, there must be a minimum agreement on some common themes, even if each course is unique. The curriculum workshops should be used to explore this in more depth.

Internships: in one form or another, internships have emerged as an issue in all four countries visited. In many cases, this is simply a question of logistics, as the discussion on coordination above has already covered. But there have been questions about three issues: the length and weighting of the internship; the nature and purpose of the internship; and student and host organisation expectations about the internship. These were all extensively canvassed in the 2008 report and I will not repeat those observations here.

However, none of those issues has really changed since then. Whilst the global Steering Committee may well want to discuss these issues in greater depth, it seems that national/institutional constraints/needs will determine how internships are treated in each place. There seems to be agreement in each country that the question of logistical arrangements, especially the timely discussion on the expectations of all parties about the internship, need to be improved.

A specific recommendation from UNI was that it might be useful to have a GLU document that provides some guidelines on what is expected of the internships.

Student selection: As noted earlier, there is a feeling amongst some teaching staff that the quality of students, although acceptable at present, could be improved if there was better information at the application stage of the kind of research expertise and other academic experience/knowledge of potential students.

The whole applications process needs more discussion:

- The content and kind of contacts with sponsoring unions before decisions on accepting a student into the programme;
- Union expectations about what the course will offer and whether the union intends to keep the student's position on her/his return;
- The English language facility of prospective students, especially those from countries where English is not the native language;
- The computer awareness of students;
- The economics background and recent research skills of students;
- The potential for FES to help in student selection.

Crystal Dicks' question of whether universities could cope with collective learning potentials, as opposed to systems based on individualistic criteria, may well be worth discussing.

Guidance on multicultural behaviour: It was clear in the 2008 report that there had been some internal dynamics/problems inside the student groups at Kassel and Campinas around cultural and gender differences – personal and logistical - and this had caused some tension. Whilst it is important for the GLU to monitor developments in this area, it seems that both of those campuses have now instituted serious, early interventions into the course programme to enable students to avoid and/or handle such issues better.

Language and visiting faculty: Nobody has suggested that the GLU should abandon the use of English as the GLU language of instruction. However, this does create problems in both Germany and Brazil, where there is often a lack of national union centre or local union leaders who can intervene in the GLU course, contribute to the teaching or discussions or help with internships. Certainly, students would like to see more trade union people and trade union issues built into the courses and the GLU needs to find a way of overcoming this barrier.

It is very clear that the CUT and the FES in Brazil have started to make real efforts to overcome this problem in both Brazil and throughout Latin America through either English language programmes and/or better identification of students who have sufficient English capacity. For the CUT, this is not just a GLU matter: their ability to play a full role in the international union movement is hampered by the same limitation. However, the global Steering Committee needs to continue to monitor these developments in Brazil.

Brazil and Germany are not the only places where English is a problem. All campuses have 'foreign' students. Some consideration needs to be given to the question of English competence for those who do not have English as their native language. It may be a matter of checking more thoroughly on the language capacities of such students before a final selection of students is made or of finding money that allows for a longer period of teaching English as a second language for such people.

This language issue is, in some ways, linked to the fact that some students feel that trade union issues, officials and material are not well integrated into the programme or well planned. The global union representative on the global Steering Committee may need to discuss this with other global unions to see whether their affiliates can identify relevant people for national programmes. However, it must be recognised that it is not just a question of getting union faces in front of a class: the union people must respect the demands of the course and not use these opportunities to push their own personal or union agenda, a complaint made especially in India but also elsewhere.

Almost everyone seems to agree that it is necessary to programme better the interventions made by visiting lecturers. Everyone accepts that having visiting faculty from other countries enriches the courses but these interventions need to be better integrated into the teaching programme and, wherever possible, allow such teaching staff to develop relationships with students and to be part of the assessment process. Students need to know how and when these visitors fit into the programme and they need to have advance reading lists so that they can prepare for these interventions as well as they do for others. It was also suggested by many people that, where possible, such visitors should stay long enough at the host institution for them to play a meaningful role in student assessments. In agreeing with all of this, Dan Cunniah suggest that visiting teaching staff be asked to offer students the opportunity to have follow-up discussions, etc. by e-mail.

Specifically, in Brazil and Germany, ways need to be found to enable more dialogue between GLU students and Brazilian/German unionists who speak only Portuguese/German.

Union expectations: There is a need to get better information from sponsoring unions as to what expectations they have of the students once they have finished the course. Ideally, it would be good if the host university or the FES could have a real conversation with the relevant unions over why they are sending students to the programme. However, that may be logistically difficult. At the least, it could be that any covering letter from a sponsoring union should be required to have some information on how the union intends to use the student on her/his return. It might also be the case – although the students need to initiate this as much as anyone else – that unions need to be alerted to just what kinds of skills the students have acquired during the course so that unions can think more strategically about how they can exploit these skills when the student returns.

On this latter issue, one thing that has emerged in interviews with students in 2009 is that students are keeping in touch with their unions much more than was the case earlier. Many have discussed the possible content of their research topic with their union and many more have had more serious discussions with the union on how they are going to be used when they get home.

This is not to deny that, still, there are too many alumni who report that they have either not been able to regain their former (or any) union position on their return and/or have faced either hostility from union leaders or colleagues.

The Steering Committee cannot intervene in these matters directly but it might be useful for it to discuss whether better and more prolonged selection procedures might obviate them occurring in the first place.

Resource material: The 2008 report noted that several students felt that it was difficult to get English resource material at their campus. This has turned out not to be the case. It may simply be a matter of making sure that students are made aware very early in their course of what material the university library holds, how students can suggest/request specific material and whether there are (or could be made available) university computers in student facilities that have English software that they can use.

However, it remains a complaint from both students and some teaching staff both that much of the course material is very Northern in content and perspective and that it is difficult to get modern material on the countries from which students come. In this regard, it might be worth exploring the idea that has emerged from the two curriculum workshops held so far that an attempt be made to create a database of reading material that all campuses are using.

Coordinators: The need for more resources for coordinators at each campus has been made earlier in this main report. These coordinators play a crucial role in making the programmes a success but they play this role at considerable cost in terms of stress and their own academic work. More resources should be found to make this coordination less exploitative of such people.

As more experience is gained, some of the coordination problems will be solved. If more student classes can be encouraged to compile a dossier of the kinds of problems they have faced, it should be possible to prepare more useful and problem-avoiding material to send to students before they arrive on site. Many students complain of the often expensive 'surprises' that greet them on arrival.

The contribution of the programme to sustainable national development: The *raison d'être* of the programme is to work for 'long-term sustainable development' and all students, unions and teaching staff seem to be passionate about achieving this objective. However, some kind of survey of national centres and unions should be undertaken over the next year or so, when there is a broad enough group of alumni to make for a useful sample size. This should assess whether trade unions feel that the returning graduates are, in fact, contributing to the long-term, sustainable development of individual trade unions, national trade union centres and the national development.

The potential to scale up the programme: The initial class sizes at both Wits and Campinas were small. There seems to be agreement that these classes should be expanded up to an optimal size of around 20 students. In theory, this is achievable, although every effort must be made to ensure that regional, national and gender balances are all built into this expansion. As already noted, this needs to be accompanied by a concerted effort to expand the number of Latin American students, especially in Brazil, and the number of students from OECD countries, especially in Germany. It is recognised that this may entail a revisiting of the question of whether sponsorships for at least some selected students from such countries can be provided.

Associated with that question is that of whether some specific GLU funding can be set aside to help with the problems faced by those students with families in cases where the student is on leave without pay but where the family obviously has ongoing costs in their home country. Of course, this has serious resource implications that would demand considerable extra funding.

As one teaching staff member at Wits put it, the best way to **scale up** the programme may be to **expand down** – by building better bridging programmes that enable more unionists to qualify for entry into a master's programme.

It seems to be agreed that expansion of the GLU to other countries should not be a medium-term objective but that better promotion of the GLU and attention to some of the logistical problems on each campus should be directed to getting sustainable class sizes in each country.

Meeting union needs: I have already commented above on the reintegration process and recommended some possible solutions. There seems to be some consensus amongst students and unions that a circular relationship may exist on the question of whether union needs are being met.

Unions have some idea of what they expect when they sponsor a student but, when students return home at the end of their course, the students' new skills and knowledge may help to educate the union into recognising that it needs to extend its bargaining or organising agendas to include issues on globalisation that it has not absorbed before. In turn, this can lead to the union revising its expectations of what the GLU can deliver. This needs to be explored with relevant unions, since some students expressed concern that their own union may not recognise their new skills and knowledge and may not know how to optimise the learning/skills that the returning students bring.

It might be useful for the Steering Committee to discuss the problem raised above about the difficulty small unions have in releasing key people for a GLU programme and/or keeping their position open for them.

One GUF suggestion was that it might help to have a panel of potential GUF speakers and a listing of the subjects that they can handle so that the universities could more easily see where to fit them into the programmes.

GLU promotion and advertising: There seems to be agreement that the GLU is not being sufficiently advertised and promoted amongst regular members, to ensure that all potential applicants are being reached. There is evidence that too few students are learning about the GLU through national trade union centres or global union channels. Many are finding it through contacts with other students/alumni or through Internet searches.

The Steering Committee should discuss with alumni the ways in which they can be used to promote the GLU and whether they need specific materials to help them to do this. It would help to have a small coterie of GLU contact enthusiasts in each country who could be asked to pass on GLU information and to look out for potential students. It has been suggested that a regular (not necessarily frequent) GLU newsletter with items from each campus might arouse more interest. Many respondents also believe that the GLU should publicise the research projects coming out of the Summer Schools, since these can be shown to be of real use to unions and can build an ongoing community of GLU researchers who can be missionaries for the programme.

I was also asked to make some comments on the GLU conferences and the curriculum workshops in this report. The GLU conferences held in South Africa, Brazil and India were held just as the first course was beginning. In my view, this may have been a very good way of incorporating the new country into the GLU 'family' but was quite a stress on coordinators and others who were already struggling to get the logistics of the new programme sorted out. If another country were to be added to the GLU programme, I would suggest that no conference be held there until after a full year of the programme has been completed.

In the section of the report on conferences and workshops, I make a number of observations on the format and content of GLU conferences, including the need:

- To have a formal GLU Steering Committee discussion on how to tackle the gender imbalance problem identified in those comments;
- To try to generate more papers/presentations from union people;
- To minimise, diplomatically, the number/length of 'protocol' speeches at conferences;
- To generate more alumni presentations;
- To increase the number of parallel sessions, rather than 'crowding' existing sessions; and
- To consider the use of non-paper presentations.

Some people suggested that it would be good, perhaps at future curriculum workshops, to discuss the desired relationship amongst the GLU academic programme, the GLU conferences, the curriculum workshops themselves and the Summer School research projects.

It seems to be accepted that the promotion/advertising of the GLU is not working well. Several suggestions have been made to overcome this:

- The development of a list of contact people in target countries, who can help to spread GLU information and identify potential students;
- A more programmed use of alumni as missionaries for the programme. This would include considering giving them special promotional material that they can use;

- Some seminars for national unions (national centres and/or national unions) to discuss the GLU and union needs;
- The use of more languages in promotional literature;
- The promotion of the GLU conferences, research projects and working papers;
- Providing more data on alumni (where have they come from; where have they gone; what kinds of theses have they done; what GLU research projects are they working on) so that global unions, for example, can see where there are national gaps that they could help to fill;
- The production of a GLU newsletter that would enable people around the world to be more knowledgeable and articulate about the programme;
- Encouraging students to maintain much more intense relationships with their unions during the course so that unions are forced to think about how they can use these people.

All GLU partners need to be more proactive when they visit unions in taking GLU material with them. This may be a way of making people more aware of the potential of the GLU.

Mention has been made of the newly registered GLU Association in Germany. It would be worth having a discussion on how this (and maybe any other national GLU Associations that need to be established) can be more flexibly used for this kind of work.

It has been suggested that the global coordination should fulfil a major function of trying to find GLU funds from beyond German bodies/institutions so that the GLU is not reliant so heavily on funding from one country. It was also noted that the multiplicity of funding/donor bodies increases the number of differing bureaucratic application and accounting procedures. It would be worth discussing whether it is possible to get these bodies to accept a more standard procedure, something that the GUFs have negotiated with their various funding/donor bodies.

Part C: Country Developments/Changes since 2008

A reminder that what is being reported in the following country updates are the changes, developments, new views that have occurred since the 2008 report was written. Comments are not in any order of priority.

Brazil

1. In 2008, Jochen Steinhilber, the Brazil FES representative, raised the question of whether there is or should be a relationship between the GLU academic programme and the topics chosen for the annual GLU Conference. Since then, there has been discussion in the wider GLU community as to whether this is something better dealt with in curriculum workshops, especially if they become a regular feature of the GLU programme.
2. Several respondents, and this is true for other countries as well, have commented on the need for the GLU to build a better and closer, more integrated relationship between GLU campuses and trade unions in their country. It is felt by some that, if the GLU is to meet the needs of unions better, unions need to know more about and be more involved in the development of the national curriculum. Further, it was noted in two of the country reports last year that unions do not always know what they can expect nor what they want from universities (and not just from the GLU programme). It may be that GLU campuses could sponsor some seminars and/or discussion groups to address this question.

One staff member made the point that the university does not know who goes from Brazil to other GLU campuses to study. He felt that some understanding of this might help to analyse and solve the problem of why so few Brazilian and Latin American people study at Campinas, since it is not a question of language.

3. In all countries, there have been (and will continue to be) problems of logistical coordination of all of the day-to-day requirements of and on students, especially foreign students. This is especially a problem in Brazil because so few Campinas staff can really cope well with complex English and virtually no students have Portuguese capacity. In a country that is heavily bureaucratic, this puts an enormous strain on the GLU coordinators, especially at the beginning of the academic year. Mariano is very aware of this problem but notes that this coordination will always be very time-consuming. Whoever is doing this work, on day-to-day issues, must have the authority to act, except in areas of academic policy.

Some of the problems relate to visas and civil registration within Brazil. The question has been raised by several people as to whether this is an area where the ILO can help (not only in Brazil) by seeking an agreement with host governments that will ease the bureaucratic burden (and costs) on students, since this is an international programme.

A very specific problem mentioned by the 2008 students (although one 2009 student also mentioned it) is that the process of getting transcripts of their undergraduate course to satisfy the Campinas entry requirements had proved to be very problematic. The assumption that a student had done her/his undergraduate work in the home country was not valid and created difficulties in getting the transcript authorised by the home country authorities.

The overview report comments on multicultural living and learning. There had clearly been problems in 2008. This has now led to more focus being put on these issues early in the year so that students can act more appropriately with one another.

The 2009 students raised the question of whether the scholarship should be constructed in a different way such that accommodation costs in Campinas could be separated out from other course costs. They felt that accommodation was such a difficult issue (and so expensive) that its costs need to be itemised and provided for in a specific manner.

4. Several students (and, again, this is replicated elsewhere) have asked whether some specific GLU funding can be set aside to help with the problems faced by those students with families in cases where the student is on leave without pay but where the family obviously has ongoing costs in their home country. Similarly, several respondents (and not just students) have asked

whether the GLU can relax the policy that, by and large, scholarships are not available for students from OECD countries, especially when the result is that some courses are composed virtually only of people from developing countries. Of course, both of these issues have serious resource implications that would demand considerable extra funding.

Of course, funding is not the only issue here. The reason that some students have to be on leave without pay or even to resign from their position to undertake a GLU course is that many unions in developing countries simply do not have the staffing numbers or resources to let a key person be absent for at least a year and potentially longer. Whilst it is not appropriate for the GLU to interfere in national union politics, it is worth asking whether discussions with some of the Global Union Federations on their policies of encouraging and assisting in union mergers might help with this and related resource problems in some countries. One of the objectives of the GLU is to help with union development and this is a relevant concern.

5. Several of the teaching staff made the point that they do not know much about the countries from which students come, including the economic picture of those countries. Is this an area where FES country reports could be made available to staff when requested?
6. In 2008, it was noted, by the CUT representative, that the CUT had not really made the GLU a policy issue but saw it more as a programme. This year, along with several other areas where the CUT is clearly trying to be more strategic in its approach to the GLU, it was noted that the CUT is dealing more effectively with this issue. It has become more active in the national steering committee and is attempting to define strategies to attract more Brazilian and other Latin American students to the Campinas course.
7. In 2008, the students claimed, contrary to the views of teaching staff, that there were real problems in getting access to English language material in the university library. When I met with the group that was just finishing the course this year, they expressly apologised for that claim. In fact, they said that, once they identified where the material was, they could make better use of than can Brazilian students, few of whom have English language capacity. There is one area where several people did, however, note a problem about English resource material: the fact that Campinas, the CUT and the Social Observatory are all aware of potentially valuable material in Portuguese that could profitably be made available to students in English.
8. I have noted, over the two years of the project, that more and more students have laptops. For some, this may be a new technology and some staff have noted that some students have limited understanding of ICT processes and software. It may be that the selection process for applicants needs to check out student capabilities in this area, since use of computers is a necessity for a modern university course.
9. English language capability amongst Campinas teaching staff has certainly improved since 2008. Several staff follow a weekly English language course; some staff with such capabilities from other faculties have been able to assist with some teaching. Mariano is attempting to get exchange programmes for more staff in English language universities so that they can both improve their English and be exposed to teaching and disciplinary approaches that may differ from those in Brazil.
10. Of course, the language problem was a key issue in the 2008 report. No Brazilian or other Latin American students were in the first Campinas course. The CUT has determined that it must address this situation urgently. It is exploring, along with the FES:
 - Ways of providing English language training for potential GLU students;
 - Identifying more students with English who may be able to study at Campinas;
 - And to work with unions in other parts of Latin America to find ways of getting more Spanish speakers into the programme and to offer some basic economics preparation for students without an economics background.

Mariano raised the question in 2008 of whether a certificate course of some kind would help to develop a larger cadre of Latin speakers who might then be able to go on to a full GLU course.

11. Again, the question of how effectively and in what way the GLU is advertised and promoted arose this year (and, again, on all campuses). It is clear that the GLU global steering committee has to discuss this at greater length. I have left further comments on this to the overview report.

12. In 2008, there had been problems in setting the contract between the ILO and Campinas, including the transfer of ILO funds to Brazil. This now seems to have been largely overcome. However, Mariano made the point this year that the university (as with most other universities around the world) demands a 'cut' out of all money received by faculties/departments for programmes such as this. The German programme has now established a separate GLU Association, independent of the university system. This can make the use of money and other decision-making less bureaucratic and can ensure that all money does, in fact, go to the GLU programme. Perhaps the establishment of such an association in Brazil might be worth considering.

13. In 2008, Jochen had made some comments on the question of whether all GLU partners really do share the same objectives and work together well enough. In answering that question this year, he noted:

In general, they share the same views but they have not yet found the same language. Especially in Brazil, the exchange especially between the CUT and the Unicamp was (is) very limited. Sometimes none of the partners outside of the Unicamp have information about the current curriculum of the course. We tried to establish a committee in which the partners can constantly discuss important issues of the programme and hope that the situation will improve a bit.

14. There is a number of areas where institutional incompatibilities present problems:

- The fact that the academic years are not common across the world, causing problems for students who wish to study at more than one campus;
- The fact that some universities/countries are more open to crediting courses/semesters taken in another country;
- In addition, differing requirements on what counts as a Masters programme.

15. Some staff noted that some students need help in both understanding what is required in written work and how to go about organising the writing process.

16. Several teaching staff commented on the upcoming curriculum workshop to be held in Mumbai later in February. They saw this as a potentially valuable tool in melding a commonality within the GLU and in helping to develop a body of teaching materials and approaches that could strengthen the programme. One felt that already, since 2008, the Campinas team is acting more as a real team.

17. Whilst agreeing that the GLU programme was meeting the needs of unions, the 2009 students felt that unions were lagging behind current issues, especially in dealing with globalisation. One staff member said that he believes that unions are losing a class awareness on the globalisation process – they are too narrow in their approaches – and that the GLU may well be able to help with this issue. Mariano also wondered whether the GLU is meeting the needs of unions in the current crisis

18. Some of these students also wondered whether they might have benefited from an English immersion programme to beef up their writing skills.

19. These same students also felt (although this was very early in their course) that the course lacked an Asian perspective, which they thought would be useful.

20. As noted in the introduction to the general report, the FES had wanted a series of questions on the reintegration process for alumni. For the 2009 students, this was far too early to be other than speculative but those that had thought about it were very confident that they would be going back into their former positions.

For the 2008 students, things are much clearer. Three of the four knew for certain that they were going back to their old union and the fourth was 80% sure that this was going to happen. They all felt that their unions knew what the student was going to be able to offer the union on their return. One felt that he would be very confident now in dealing with World Bank/IMF delegations when they visited his country, that he would add credibility to his union's arguments. His union was now planning to one of his colleagues to the course.

From the CUT perspective, the feeling is that the knowledge and skills that alumni have picked up (and this applies to non-Campinas alumni, of course) have not been used sufficiently by unions in Brazil. Marta felt that prospective students should be talked with and briefed about

expectations before they start the course. She noted that the theses of Brazilian alumni have not been translated into Portuguese and so they have not really fed into the movement. She has tried to develop some criteria for evaluating alumni when they return to Brazil but she feels that the CUT leadership itself needs to develop an interest in these matters.

21. The 2008 students had experienced some problems with thesis supervisors, in terms of getting prompt attention and/or ongoing advice. One or two teaching staff tended to support this to some extent by noting that it was difficult to get relevant supervisors in Brazil who could cope with English. They also felt that, throughout the course, there had not been enough choices available to them in several elements of the course. They also believed that the course needs some improvement: they felt that the second semester was not well organised; and that the summer semester was badly put together.

(This latter point was picked up by the CUT, who felt that the summer course was too academic. Without commenting specifically on that, Mariano said that he believed that summer school was becoming more central to the programme: he wondered whether, as part of the drive to promote the GLU more effectively, it might make sense to invite targeted Latin American unions to the summer school.)

Three of the four people in the course have had constant contact with their union for their research work and they all felt that their research would be of use to their unions.

22. The 2008 report was conducted before the students had arranged and completed their internships, so their views had been speculative. Now that they had finished their course work, they were able to comment on this more clearly in 2009.

On balance, they were happy. They had found the language barrier a problem in terms of finding a host organisation that had English speakers. They also felt that some of the logistical problems that they faced could have been avoided had there been better and earlier communication over the internship arrangements. Marta suggested that some of these problems could be overcome if foreign students were encouraged to undertake a basic Portuguese course before they arrived and also a basic study on the situation in Brazil.

Mariano felt that there needs to be a discussion on what everyone involved in the Brazil programme really expects from the internships.

23. In addition to comments made in the overview report about whether the focus should be on standardisation or flexibility in the global GLU approach, the CUT representative, Marta Domingues, raised the question of whether too common an approach might not run the risk of promoting an artificial and irrelevant 'unity'; rather, the need is to encourage and develop union capacities to debate and handle conflicting positions.
24. Unlike in 2008, this year I also met with Kjeld Jakobsen from the Social Observatory in Brazil, closely associated with the CUT. He was very positive about the programme but, like others, raised questions as to how well unions and the GLU are handling current globalisation issues. He accepted that it is going to take time to resolve this.

Whilst he felt that quality of students in general was good, there is a difference between those from the North and those from the South. The former tend to have better theoretical 'luggage' when they start the course. It might be necessary to put more resources into selecting candidates from the South.

He also felt that sponsoring unions are not supporting their people enough on the programme – not at all in some cases. Unions must be more involved in the selection process.

The Social Observatory has hosted some interns. He has found this a valuable experience, although language remains a challenge. He agrees that logistical arrangements need to be improved.

25. Mariano made some other general comments on developments in Campinas:

- One of the problems with the course requirements at Campinas is that students must be in Brazil over a 14 month period altogether (not consecutively). However, open plane tickets have only a 12 months validity, which means that students who return to Brazil to defend their theses have to find an additional return airfare. He wonders whether there is a solution to this problem.

- He asked whether the GLU could profitably ask other institutions how they handle the selection of international students, including the timetabling of the application process.
- He accepts that Campinas needs to do more in the way of getting teaching staff to write GLU discussion/working papers, developing teaching material that other GLU campuses could use.

Germany

Whilst the same pattern of reporting for Germany will be used as with the Brazilian report, it should be noted that the 2008 report was based on discussions with people at Kassel, plus some comments from two people in Berlin. This year the discussions were held in Berlin and, therefore, may reflect differences between UniKassel and the Berlin School of Economics, rather than just 'development' since last year.

1. In discussing the reintegration process in 2008, some people made a link to the selection process: that, if the GLU is to optimise the percentage of alumni who are going to return to their own union or another body within the broad labour movement, there has to be some certainty about this likelihood in the discussions with sponsoring unions during the selection process. This has been reinforced in the 2009 discussions.

Discussion with the 2008 students in Kassel had revealed a significant level of uncertainty about the reintegration process when they returned to their home country. This had clearly shifted in 2009 and more people were confident about going back into their former employment and/or being utilised more effectively when they went back.

As already noted, the FES had wanted more data this year on the reintegration process after graduation. This was, of course, too early for the 2009 students to answer but they noted that they were either optimistic about this going well for them or, in some cases, merely unsure. None contemplated any difficulty. They felt that the GLU might be able to provide information on job vacancies in unions around the world for the sake of those who were not going to be able to go back to their own union. Most of the current students have maintained close contact with their union during the course. They concurred that not all unions understand what the GLU and its alumni are able to give to unions.

2. It had been noted in the 2008 report that it would be a good idea to put lecture texts or even videotaped lectures on-line for students to be able to go back over these at their leisure. This is certainly now happening at Kassel and it was noted, during the 2009 Curriculum Workshop in Mumbai in February 2009 that Christoph Scherrer is routinely doing this now. It was further suggested in Mumbai that it would be useful to make such on-line material available to other GLU campuses and to consider on-line discussions via video-link between any two or more campuses, which may help with some of the language or specialty problems raised elsewhere in this report.
3. Kassel people had suggested in 2008 that the GLU needed a more permanent global coordinator. Miriam Heigl has subsequently been appointed to this position and people in 2009 suggested that she should have a major function of trying to find GLU funds from beyond German bodies/institutions.
4. There had been a number of domestic issue/problems amongst 2008 students. They had suggested that clear guidelines and discussions on such matters should be held early in the academic year in future. It is clear that such an approach has been adopted for the 2009 group and that this has helped to reduce such problems.
5. Problems were identified in 2008 over the logistical and communication problems involved in arranging internships. It is clear from 2009 that these remain. Whether it is simply a matter of better planning and communication amongst all relevant parties or whether it is more a question of reconsidering the role of internships needs to be discussed.

The 2009 students felt that there were good and bad points about the internships:

- Good points
 - Interactive;

- Networking opportunities (for students, but also for the programme - GLU students act as ambassadors of the programme);
 - Great link between theory and practice (many examples);
 - Great international experiences;
 - Career boosting- affirmation, renewed involvement, orientation;
 - A good connection to the Masters Thesis;
 - Money Well Spent, most had a very positive experience
- Areas to Improve:
- The poorly organized-process was not transparent;
 - There were problems with late expenses regarding internship costs (housing, tickets, etc). The whole timing was too short;
 - More choices are needed – there is too much control in the selection process by the programme. Discussion was inhibited in Brussels and Copenhagen;
 - Who does what? Roles and responsibilities of all parties need to be more clearly defined;
 - Some felt that there was a clash between internships and course assignments. The workload is simply too much for such a short course and this all stops students developing their theoretical understanding without too much stress.

Their recommendations to deal with these matters included:

- Developing a timeline and checklist regarding timing and responsibilities;
- Internship Planning should be started much earlier to save money;
- Longer Internships and also a longer program (maybe up to 18months) would enable the inclusion of a longer internship and more time for writing of theses;
- Information Sharing before starting the internships
- Interns should have time to evaluate and present their experiences together, immediately after the internship.

However, the students also acknowledged that the coordinators are heavily overburdened (and some of them were also aware of the same problem in Brazil).

Bianca Kühl, International Secretary at the DGB in Berlin noted that there are problems in Germany in finding unions with enough English expertise to be able to manage internships. She also felt that it was rather one-way traffic: the students on internships tend not to be able to give as much as they took. She noted that, whilst internships were obviously useful and interesting, it was difficult to host students at the DGB because the students needed a level of support that was beyond the capacity of the DGB to offer. She felt that internships were not 'negotiated' well enough in terms of the 'who' and 'what' on both sides.

6. Students in 2008 had had fairly low expectations of the support that their own unions would give them throughout the whole process. It is clear from the 2009 students that this has changed in a more positive direction. However, some of them said that they would like to be offered the opportunity to be involved in some GUF events in Europe (and to have more GUF inputs into the course). The first of these points tallies with what GUFs themselves said (see the separate GUFs section of this report).
7. Some respondents in 2008 had noted that, although they felt that resources were being utilised quite efficiently, it is important to highlight the 'incidental' resources that giving the GLU its added value: the annual summer schools and the global research projects. This has become a much more frequent comment in 2009.
8. The 2009 students are divided/unsure on the question of whether the programme is meeting union needs: some feel that it lacks practical components (such as negotiating and organising), whilst others feel that it is too academic and theoretical in approach; although they said that the research methods module had presented an opportunity link theory and practice. In summary, they say that it's too early to judge at this stage. This applies also to the research projects, which some saw as also being more academic than 'useful'.

They felt that some of the bloc courses were organised too late, including the distribution of reading material lists. The reading and workload for these blocs were too much. They felt that did not get adequate feedback on their written work. They also questioned whether some teaching staff were really qualified for the specific requirements of a GLU programme. They

found the Kassel 'One-World Seminar' very valuable (they felt that they 'owned' it) and would like to have seen this repeated in Berlin.

Some students felt that too many assumptions were made about their economic literacy at the time they were selected. They had started to attend an undergraduate programme in economics in Berlin on an informal basis and found that had helped but it really too late.

A member of the teaching staff who teaches a non-GLU course in which GLU students participate believes that there is not yet a sufficient balance between the Kassel and Berlin programmes.

The ambivalence expressed by students about whether the programme meets the needs of unions was replicated by some teaching staff: whilst they felt that it was contributing to the internationalisation of the movement, it was not always clear that unions actually know what their needs are (and how the GLU can help to meet them). One faculty member questioned how much some unions are aware of and really support the GLU's focus on gender issues.

Another faculty member is convinced that the GLU provides an effective counter-balance to capitalist think tanks, academically, institutionally and politically in strengthening the rights of workers.

9. The students also feel conflicted about the length of the German course: it is too long for some unions to be able to release key people yet (and can be risky for elected people), on the other hand, the need to fit in the demanding course work, the internship and the thesis is just too much for twelve months. One suggestion they made was to transfer the internship to the end of the course, which means that some people could be back at home when they do this. They also felt that foreign students in Germany find the need to live in three places in the space of one year (Kassel, Berlin and wherever they do their internship) is very stressful and difficult.
10. Some students feel that they need either more content-specific English training at the beginning of the course and/or much better feedback from teaching staff on the quality of their English written work.
11. All of the students believe that they need more help in understanding the requirements for and assistance in achieving academic writing standards, especially those who have been away from university for many years, a comment echoed by at least one faculty member.
12. Whilst 2009 students stress consolidation of the present programmes rather than expansion, the comment was made that expanding into North America and/or the UK might make it easier to attract more women from those places. Two faculty members wondered whether, even if consolidation is the priority, some consideration ought to be given to expanding into central and Eastern Europe, Russia/East Asia or the Pacific.
13. As far as the inevitable logistical problems that crop up in such programmes, the students noted:
 - Moving to Berlin was a problem and they needed guidelines and more assistance;
 - Housing information in both cities was not sufficient;
 - It would be better if the group had been placed together (e.g., at Goerzalle they could have been placed all in one apartment in student housing);
 - The programme in Berlin could look into building a better relationship with Studentenwerk (as is the case in Kassel) so as to ensure that students could get access to better housing in Berlin. Many of them spent a lot of time looking for a place to live.

One teaching staff member said that this not just a problem for students: it was also difficult to coordinate the activities and approaches of Kassel and Berlin faculty.

14. The 2009 students would like to see the GLU alumni networks strengthened – several expressed an interest in being able to join existing projects during the 2009 summer school or of suggesting fresh projects.
15. Bianca Kühl expressed a reservation about the potential of students to move from one campus to another in so far as she wondered whether this might weaken the unity of or solidarity in a student group. This was echoed by one of the Berlin teaching staff. Another of the teaching staff, whilst valuing the potential of student exchanges, wondered whether the GLU at this stage has the infrastructure and resources to exploit this to its maximum.

16. Bianca, in commenting on whether the GLU programme met the needs of unions focused more on the needs of the international union movement as a whole in noting that it is crucial to prepare the G20 unions to handle ILO work and issues covered by the international financial institutions. She also asked whether the proposed new Certificate course at Kassel might help to attract more European unionists and better meet the needs of European unions. She felt that the GUFs need to be much more involved in the programme, beyond just International Framework Agreements.
17. More than one member of teaching staff who takes only a minor role in the programme commented that GLU students bring to non-GLU courses a richness of experience that other students do not have.
18. One faculty member said that there have been some 'challenges' in the quality of some students. However, he stressed that the GLU has a mission to use an academic environment for a variety of students to be able to back to the union movement. It might just be a matter of accepting that some students are just not 'academic'. The same person also stated that the quality of the students' work has been improving over the years, largely because Kassel has put such effort in bringing students up to scratch with methodology, especially those who are not in an academic framework. Two other teaching staff members felt that the work of the students is 'different from that of other students: some have an academic bent, others an activist approach but they expressed a concern that there may be too much emphasis on the student group trying to reach a consensus too readily – perhaps an outcome of union experience.
19. Whilst people on all campuses have varying views on just how much resource material in English is available to students (with most agreeing that the situation is better than originally thought), the real question is not how much material the students can access but well they can handle content. Two other staff members noted that it is not a question of physical resources but a question of the limited amount of time: teaching staff find that GLU work reduces their time available for productive research.
20. On the issue of the advantages or otherwise of a multi-country, multi-campus programme, one staff member believes that the nature of globalisation is such that a multiplicity of institutions is essential. The role of the GLU is to try to 'coordinate' the diversity. However, he felt that cultural problems for some students might mean that some need to have it reinforced that it is legitimate to ask questions and raise challenges with lecturers.

India

India was not covered in the 2008 report because the programme at the Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS) in Mumbai had not officially started at that stage. Therefore, what follows is not merely an update on 2008, as for the other campuses, but a full report of the interviews with all stakeholders held in Mumbai in February 2009. It should also be noted that the make-up of the student body at TISS is different from that in the other places: most students are not, in fact, from union backgrounds. Therefore, the views of three sets of students are reported below:

- Those 2009 students who had a union background;
- Those 2009 students with no union background; and
- A small group of students who had completed the unofficial course in 2008 and who had a union background.

Of course, where all students agree on any points, these distinctions are not made.

1. General questions

- a) *Do you think that the programme is meeting the needs of the union movement? Why/why not? What could be done to address any inadequacies?*

Union students were divided on this question. Some felt that the programme either was meeting union needs or had the potential to do so. Other felt that it was not 'exciting' them in any way and was not as well organised as it should be. Either way, some felt that part of the problem is that Indian national trade union centres were not aware of the potential

in the GLU and so were not putting resources into it, even although these students were convinced that it would be of enormous benefit to union leaders and researchers. One person felt that part of the problem is that Indian unions simply don't have the 'teeth' that European unions have and don't think along these strategic lines.

Non-union students were not sure how well union needs might be being met but felt that the lack of union case studies suggested that it was not likely. The graduate students said they saw little of the practical life of unions in the course.

Faculty staff stated that INTUC and AITUC were not convinced of the usefulness of the programme: they see little use in university studies/degrees. HMS does see some future benefits. However, they saw some signs of a change occurring.

[In Mumbai, I officially met with three people from the Indian union national centres: Rajindra Giri, HMS; Raj Hariharan, speaking for the INTUC; and Renana Jhabvala, from SEWA. To be frank, the first two of these were either almost totally unaware of the programme or vaguely familiar at best. Hariharan does not work or speak for the INTUC. I have done the best I can with the answers of the INTUC and HMS respondents.]

Rajindra Giri felt that the programme is meeting union needs up to a point but he thinks that it is too early to evaluate the TISS programme. Unions do not participate properly and a formal mechanism is needed to integrate them. He thinks that the political leadership is yet to be convinced.

Hariharan from INTUC said that he had seen no workers who have gained an advantage from the GLU and that it is not a benefit to ordinary workers.

Jhabvala accepted that the programme is not aimed at ordinary workers but at union officials and leaders. SEWA finds it difficult to find suitably educated people to enter the course but whomever they choose must be representative of SEWA and able to speak for SEWA members. SEWA has taken two interns and may employ two of the graduates but she notes that SEWA cannot offer the kind of wages offered by businesses and NGOs. She summed up: *We need these people but can we get them?*

[I met with Dr Pravin Sinha from the FES in India and he also provided me with some notes that he had written as a commentary on the 2008 overview report.]

Pravin feels that the programme is meeting union needs partially but that it is really too early to tell. Trade unions were not involved in setting up the programme. It needs to be multidisciplinary: it covers sociology but not economics and political science sufficiently. Union leaders work from experience, not from an academic perspective and they lack a wider union vision.

b) What are the advantages, disadvantages, avoidable problems etc. from having a multi-campus, multi-country basis for the programme?

Union and graduate students were all positive about this for the same reasons that others have given. However, they did feel that there are not enough internship options for students in the TISS programme compared to others. Graduate students felt a lack of connection to other GLU campuses; they also felt that some foreign students do too much 'tourism' on the course; they also felt that it was necessary to offer more opportunities to non-union students.

Non-union students said that it would be more useful if there were an exchange programme. They would be interested in being part of this so that they could gain some union experience.

Staff said that they have international students but that the focus is on international issues and they felt that foreign students would expect an Indian focus from TISS. All students are getting an international experience.

Giri thinks that it is essential to have a multiplicity of countries and campuses to account for country differences. The programme needs very significant resources.

Pravin says that we live in a globalised economy, so we need a globalised information base. Theory may be universal but practice – national and global – needs to be learnt. He insists that the GLU must avoid a conflict of objectives. Older unionists may have

confused backgrounds and very divergent backgrounds/interests will only add to this. It is important to distinguish programme objectives (which unions should decide) and how to achieve them (which the programme must decide).

Hariharan believes that there could be cultural barrier problems. He felt that entry levels of students vary too much and that some need a bridging course. However, he accepts that the course could be an advantage in terms of global knowledge.

Jhabvala was not sure about this issue.

c) What problems arise from the English-language-based nature of the programme, both from the point of view of teaching/learning and the use/generation of resource material?

Most students of all kinds were positive about this. One wondered whether Hindi or some Asian languages could be introduced. Non-union students suspected that some foreign students might need some preparatory English support classes.

Teaching staff said that English was not a problem, even although some students would like to see some regional languages used. There are no problems with resource material.

Giri sees no problem in India.

Pravin sees clear language problems in Brazil and for some foreign students in India. Unions should help the GLU to make better student selections. It is important to respect local university rules of selection but get more union assistance in meeting these.

SEWA was happy that it was TISS that was chosen for the programme because of its good name. SEWA has few English-speaking members/officials who can be spared for the programme but, as noted above, would like to be able to employ some GLU graduates. She said that SEWA could send some people if the course was shorter and some regional languages could be used.

d) Is it important to have as much of the global programme 'standardised' as opposed to have very flexible approaches for each campus?

Most students felt that a common approach was needed but that flexibility was still essential since it leads to better quality. They felt that Indian unions lack professionalism and better quality standards are essential.

Teaching staff believed that there should be a standardised GLU 'portfolio' but each campus must have its own regional focus. They hoped that the curriculum workshop would assist in this regard.

Giri thinks that the GLU needs both. Hariharan's view is much the same as that of others but, whilst stressing the importance of flexibility, he notes that it is importance to have a common standard of excellence.

Jhabvala feels that at least some core issues should be present.

e) What are the advantages/disadvantages of having a multiplicity of teaching staff, especially visiting teaching staff?

Whilst most students agree that visiting lecturers bring practical union perspectives to the course and help to create an international union network, they are too often not really connected to the programme. They need to stay longer and to be given clear instructions that it is the programme's objectives that determine what they teach, not their own goals.

Graduate students believed that there is a need for more full-time permanent TIS staff to offer the full course, with opportunities to invite guests. They feel that there are not enough competent permanent staff at present.

Faculty staff said that there were many such visiting/guest lecturers in specific sectors and subjects. They felt that this meant that course is up-to-date. However, they agreed that in most case it's 'one lecture and they're gone.' So, although these people add to knowledge, they do not necessarily add to the course. Too few have any continuing relationship with

the course. They agreed with the student perspective about the failure of some of these lecturers to respect the objectives of the programme.

Giri thinks that such staff are a good idea, even if it costs: they bring knowledge and new perspectives.

Having union inputs could be good, Jhabvala feels.

f) Do you think that programme is sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of all concerned? How could this be improved?

Union students felt that there is space for all parties in the programme but that the course is too young to be truly flexible. There are not enough union students in the course to drive this yet.

Non-students were not sure but they felt that unions are not receptive to them and that flexibility is not as high as it could be. Graduate students were not happy with the lack of flexibility: they felt that there was too much theory and not enough practical material. They also felt there are too many institutional rigidities in India.

Staff were positive about this but suggested that some students need more statistical material. Some were also not able to absorb economic material easily and the staff said that they need to get people from other faculties to assist with this. There are four TISS foundation courses and economics is one of these.

They agreed that the global GLU programme flexibility is great for teaching staff but it is only now that students are finding it easier to get credit from other universities.

Giri thinks that the programme is too long for unionists from India and it is not flexible enough. Pravin agrees that some TISS students think that the programme is not demanding enough, sometimes too casual in approach. He thinks that the internship should be started before students go on holiday. Hariharan said that he did not have an answer to this question. Jhabvala thinks that it is still too early to say yet. She thinks that the GLU would be better served in India if it worked with national unions rather than with union national centres.

g) Do you think that the programme has been sufficiently advertised, promoted and explained to current actors and to others? If not, what needs to be done to rectify this?

Union students were divided in their views on this but it was agreed that more and better promotional channels are needed and alumni need to be used more. Non-union students agreed but wondered whether the GLU conference might add some impetus.

Teaching staff and graduate students agreed with the general view that this is not being done well. The staff suggested that some seminars with unions might help with this. They accepted that messages sent only to trade union national centres do not get passed on. Graduate students said that none of them had ever seen GLU promotional material before they applied for the course.

Giri feels that the GLU has tried lost of channels but that what is needed is a common workshop for union leaders because they are ill-informed about the GLU. Pravin says that the programme is **advertised** enough but not to the right groups. It needs better targeting. Any letters to unions should be followed up with a phone call. There are many applicants for the course, Jhabvala noted, but the GLU itself has not advertised well in her view.

h) Can the programme cope with the current rate of expansion? Should the GLU be looking for a more permanent structure and staffing to support the administration of the programme?

All respondents felt that consolidation is much more important at this stage. Pravin believes that the central GLU secretariat needs strengthening and the global steering committee must have a higher profile and authority. Jhabvala said that she does not enough information on this but her gut feeling is that consolidation is the priority.

Hariharan believed that the programme should be extended so that it could serve more people.

2. For participants

a) *Are you happy with the programme as a whole? Why/why not?*

A majority of the union students were happy with the programme for the reasons expressed on other campuses but one felt very strongly that there is poor quality control, even if one can benefit in spite of this through one's own efforts.

Several non-union students were not happy with the programme – they wanted more theory and the involvement of more faculties. They felt that there is no complete plan for the course and that it lacks focus. They (and graduate students) said that some teaching staff are not really competent for the job and are not giving content for a full paper (although the graduate students, nevertheless, felt that course was good). They thought that there was a lack of flexibility and that there was poor coordination in the course. Graduate students said that more field experience is needed in the first and second semesters and that the labour law of the host country should figure more in the course.

Other non-union students were quite happy, although they stressed that they don't know the future and they are learning new fields of interest. They felt that they were getting lots of empirical studies. All of the non-union students stated that they learnt mainly from what the students themselves present. The graduate students suggested that exchange student applications should be accompanied by more rigorous interviews.

b) *(Alumni only) Did the programme make a difference to your work. What did you do before; what are you doing now?*

This (and the next question) was too speculative for most at this stage but all felt that it was likely to be very beneficial and make real differences to their work. However, the graduate students were clear that they were going to be able to deal with management better now. However, because of their comments in 2 a) above, they felt that the course is not achieving its full potential. They also believe that, given the TISS stress on informal work, it was important to have some more informal worker inputs to the course.

c) *(Alumni only) Was your research work during the course of interest and value for a trade union?*

As per the previous item for most. However, all of the graduate students noted that the course content is the value. They wanted better supervision during the internship. They said that there was too little guidance on research writing.

d) *(Alumni only) What has the reintegration process back into your own country been like? (This will include details of whether the graduate has gone back into her/his original employment or not, what kind of reception he/she has had from that employer and colleagues and whether there is any evidence that the graduate's skills, knowledge and experience are being put to appropriate use.)*

This question was also too speculative at this stage. However, union students had differing views on the likelihood of a successful reintegration to their union. Some were quite confident; others perceived either a reverse anti-academic snobbery in their unions or a failure to understand how the programme could benefit unions.

For non-union students, this was even more speculative, since they were not going 'back' to a union. However, several said that they now knew better about the need for unions and they now have a purpose/objective in their work. Many said that they were now more aware of their rights at work.

Graduate students were much more negative. They feel that employers (including unions) have too fixed a mindset and are not ready for alumni new outlooks or potential. Of the four who were employed before the course, only one was going back to the same employer.

e) *Are there particular problems of a logistical nature – accommodation, travel, living expenses, etc. – that could be dealt with better?*

As in all other campuses, there have been problems, mainly to do with accommodation. Some felt that there was no-one at TISS with coordination responsibilities to deal with their problems.

f) *Is the course work reasonable in terms of workloads and time-scale?*

Some union and all graduate students were disappointed at the weakness of the programme's demands, especially in terms of reading. It was too repetitive. Others found it reasonable. Several felt that planning could be much better in terms of telegraphing work demands and reading expectations.

Some non-union students felt that there was too much of a workload piled up at the end of the course. They would like to have had the opportunity to assess the teaching staff in terms of course organisation. They felt that it was not always clear that what they chose for their presentations was relevant to the course nor that all assignments were relevant, either. They did not get feedback on examinations and written assignments.

g) *What positive experiences for you, for the host organisation and for your union in the internship experience?*

This (and the next question) was too speculative at this stage but all union students felt that it was likely to be very beneficial and make real differences to their work and that it was being adequately planned. Some suggested that there could be a role for the ILO in arranging internships.

Non-union students were in the same position but were much more critical about the internship process so far. Unions seem not to be receptive to them and don't respect their rights. They were not confident that all arrangements would be in place by the start of the internships in June.

The graduate students were quite positive about the experience but felt that TISS needs to provide guidelines on expectations for all parties.

h) *Have there been problems with the internship arrangements? Such as? How could these be overcome?*

As per the above item, except for the graduate students, who said that, in some case, the placements were inappropriate: there was not enough discussion with the hosts beforehand and the students themselves were not adequately consulted on the internship they were given. They think that logistics need to be improved. In addition, for some, the costs involved were very difficult.

i) *Are you happy with the teaching/tutorials/seminars provided through the programme? If not, how could this be improved?*

Union students were divided about this. Non-union students stated that the teaching style and the competence of teaching staff was not meeting the course's potential. For reasons already noted, the graduate students gave a blunt *No* to this question.

j) *Do you feel that you get sufficient support from your union and from the relevant GUFs, both in terms of political support, internship arrangements and in benefiting from your experience when you finish your course? How could this be optimised?*

Most union students were happy here, apart from the issues raised in 2 d) above. They felt that there needs to be a real role for the GUFs in the programme. The question was not relevant for non-union students. Again, for reasons already mentioned, graduate students gave no positive answer to this.

3. For teaching staff

a) *Are you satisfied with the quality of students being selected for the course/ Why/why not? How could it be improved?*

Teaching staff were quite happy with the quality of students: they can cope with the learning challenges; they are looking for new concepts and methods. The staff felt that it was valuable to have a mix of union and non-union students.

b) *Do you think that quality of work produced by students is adequate? If there have been lapses, what needs to be done to rectify this?*

The staff said that students were put under quite some pressure and did well. They were given plenty of reading and presentation assignments. The students tried to exceed expectations.

c) *Are there difficulties in getting other university colleagues or your institution to accept the validity of this programme? How can this be overcome?*

There are no problems at TISS and other universities are happy to be invited to help in lectures on the course.

d) *Do you think that you and the students get sufficient support from the student's unions and from the relevant Global Unions, both in terms of political support, internship arrangements and in benefiting from the students when they finish their course? How could this be optimised?*

In general, they felt that students get some support although some worry about their future security in their union. The staff felt that TISS should aim to attract more union researchers and younger staff, not union leaders. They accepted that they have not aggressively approached GUFs for inputs and support but are now beginning to do that and have had some promises of support.

e) *Do you feel that it is easy enough to get useful and valuable resource material for the programme? If not, how could this be improved?*

This is not a problem, although the staff accepted that they should generate more of their own material and material for the GLU.

f) *How useful do you think the internship programme has been? Could it be improved? How?*

This has been a problem, apart from the support from SEWA. It is a six-month internship and research-paper-writing placement. Such long placements are desirable, they believe, since anything shorter would be of little use to students or host organisations.

They stated that local unions do not understand the internship expectations, although GUFs are generally better at this. Some students are also not clear about the expectations. They suggested that it would be good to have some additional resources for more extended study tours and for international placements such as at the ILO. Some students would like a placement in a labour research unit but these are rare in India.

In summary, they agreed that they need more face-to-face meetings with unions over all of these issues.

g) *Are you satisfied with the support by the ILO; what would you expect in addition?*

Staff were very positive about this – not just for the money but also for logistical support and with arrangements for visiting lecturers.

4. For Global Unions, national trade union centres and any relevant national unions

As noted above, in Mumbai, I officially met with three people from the Indian union national centres: Rajindra Giri, HMS; Raj Hariharan, speaking for the INTUC; and Renana Jhabvala, from SEWA. To be frank, the first two of these had either little awareness of the programme or were vaguely familiar at best.

- a) *Do you see your particular needs and those of the union movement as a whole being met in this programme? Why/why not? If there is some dissatisfaction, what needs to be done to address this?*

Giri from HMS thinks that the expectations are high but it will take time to achieve them. There is a long way to go integrate unions. He thinks that it would make sense to invite all unions to New Delhi for a serious meeting. Hariharan does not see the programme meeting union needs for the reasons he outlines in 1 a) above.

In Jhabvala's view, the programme could well serve union needs in the future: it seems to respond well to needs articulated by SEWA. SEWA and TISS can dialogue well. She values the course because it is the first to really teach about informal work and workers. She also felt that students going into non-union jobs would be able to carry GLU thinking into such places.

- b) *How useful do you think the internship programme has been? Has it posed any problems for your organisation? Could it be improved? How?*

HMS hosted one intern. There was an initial misunderstanding about the purpose about (with a Seamen's union) but this was resolved and it caused no problems for the union. There is a need for better planning and communication. Hariharan said that he could not answer this question. Jhabvala was very positive about the internship programme. SEWA found it very useful. As she said: *We monitored them well and supervised them well. We need students who can be bridges between informal workers and SEWA's leadership, lawyers and elites.* She felt that the internships were well-planned and that there was adequate discussion beforehand.

- c) *Do you think that it is possible and desirable for Global Unions to be more involved in the teaching programme? How and why?*

Giri says that the IMF and ITF have been involved but it is important to involve competent national centres. Hariharan and Jhabvala felt that this was desirable and possible.

- d) *Do you think that unions are sufficiently integrated into the delivery of the programme?*

From the HMS and INTUC perspectives, no. SEWA, on the contrary simply said: *We are.*

5. For other partners (mainly the funders/ILO, etc)

As noted, I met with Dr Pravin Sinha from the FES in India and he also provided me with some notes that he had written as a commentary on the 2008 overview report.

- a) *Do you see a need to look for more effective ways of using the resources that you are providing for the programme? How?*

Pravin thinks that ILIAS could be used more effectively and by all GLU people. The GLU needs more topic-specific booklets, etc. There must be better planning of who is teaching what, when. One student had been removed from the programme: he thinks that this should be a committee decision.

- b) *Do you think that feedback so far justifies your level of support for the programme? If there are deficiencies, what are these and how can they be addressed?*

Pravin says: Yes. The TISS programme and the GLU are still at the start and it has been an excellent initiative.

- c) *Do you think that all the partners who resource the programme share the same objectives and work sufficiently well together? Are they involved in the programme as much as they would wish?*

On this, Pravin says *No*. There is a lack of clarity amongst all parties. There must be more clarity on the roles of each partner.

In addition to the above specific questions, Pravin also noted:

- Unions need to know that the GLU is not a union leadership development programme but that it is about professionalising unions;
- On finance, unions do not have the right mindset: they have to bear some of the costs;
- The GLU must look more closely at family/partner/children costs for some students.

6. Other sources of feedback

During my stay in Mumbai, I also met with Dr Sharad Sawant who sits on the Indian Central Board of Workers Education and has been a long-time advisor and consultant at TISS. He had been involved in early discussions on the establishment of the TISS GLU course. This was not so much a formal question-and-answer session but more a description of his involvement with TIS and the GLU programme over recent years.

Like the TISS teaching staff, he felt that the INTUC was not really involved in the Indian GLU activities whereas some of the younger leaders coming up through HMS are more advanced. There is clearly a gap between trade unions and academia. Unions in India just don't see the relevance of the GLU programme: they see what amounts to an 18-24 months programme requirement as a barrier, as well as the course contents. They want short-release programmes. He would like to see the GLU integrated into the formal Indian workers education programmes. He thinks that there needs to be more intensive work with Indian union national centres and national federations. TISS itself must do this to promote the programme and to help select potential students.

He is not concerned about where graduates go after the GLU programme: for him, just getting different messages into the Indian industrial relations scene is enough.

He thinks that the 2009 students are better than those of 2008.

South Africa

I visited Johannesburg in mid-February 2009. Apart from the usual discussions with GLU stakeholders, I was also able to stay on for two and a half days (23-25 February) of the alumni workshop. Space was provided during the workshop for an evaluation session with alumni. The alumni were divided into two groups: those who were graduates of the Witwatersrand course and those graduates from other GLU campuses. These two sets of responses are to be found in the alumni section of this report, along with the views of those alumni at the Berlin summer school held in September. Otherwise, what follows, as for Germany and Brazil, are any developments, new views, etc, since the 2008 report was completed.

1. The 2008 report noted considerable problems in getting students nominated from COSATU, because of the lack of qualified union people who could satisfy the entry requirements for a Masters programme. It was noted that both Wits and COSATU were working on this. That has continued to be the case and there has been some change over the last twelve months. More COSATU people are coming forward.

Wits has a Certificate course in the Graduate School of Public and Development Management (PDM) which, it was/is hoped might bring enough South African unionists up to the level where they were able to qualify for entry into the GLU programme. This has not been totally successfully and has caused some frustration: students who have 'passed' this course think that this gets them into the GLU programme but entry to a Masters programme demands more than just a pass mark and not enough students have reached this level. Some of the GLU teaching staff are, anyway, not sure that the PDM course is actually appropriate for GLU-level entry so this matter is still unresolved. Two teaching staff members, commenting on the question of consolidation versus expansion, felt that the GLU should expand **downwards**, to pre-Masters level courses.

There is a conundrum here: on one level, some people feel that their university cannot offer block release course that would ease the situation for COSATU and other union bodies yet they also wondered whether it would be better for students if the course was a two-year programme.

A couple of teaching staff noted that COSATU has been antagonistic to FEDUSA involvement in the programme in the past, although this is now changing somewhat. Even where national centres are involved in student selection, at least one teaching staff member believes that Wits has little contact with the student's own union.

In spite of some critical comments about COSATU, one staff member noted that COSATU had been good in generating government funds for the programme.

2. There has clearly been an expansion in numbers taking the course this year; something that all parties were sure would improve the course last year. Of course, it was too early to evaluate this in February but most people were convinced that it has made a difference.
3. In the 2008 report, it was noted that some students were a little frustrated that a number of factors made it difficult for them to exploit the multi-country nature of the GLU. Teaching staff had suggested that this could be alleviated a little by better use of the GLU conferences and through summer schools but they agreed that the GLU flexibility works better for academics than it does for students. One noted that exchange schemes are expensive, although they do build collegiality. The latter has now started, the first being held, as noted above, in late February 2009, with alumni from both the Wits programme and from other campuses.

The 2009 students say that there are logistical problems for students when it comes to exploiting the multi-country/campus aspects of the GLU (and some wondered whether this results in some GLU programmes in some countries land up being seen as 'better' than others). One staff member agrees that, although students want the flexibility to move between campuses, this is logistically not feasible. Where people are moving between countries for internships, the same person believes that the sending campus should notify the host country campus so that some kind of contact/support can be arranged.

4. In connection with this latter point, it should be noted that students in 2008 had expressed a wish to be able to interact with GLU students on other GLU campuses. The 2009 summer school certainly went some way to meeting this wish.
5. Many comments were made in the 2008 report about the question of whether unions, especially COSATU, knew what they wanted out of universities, not just the GLU programme. This internal discussion and the dialogue with the GLU staff have clearly taken this a step further and both parties are working on making this a two-way street.

Some teaching staff feel that the programme is meeting union needs for key leaders in current issues and allowing them to mix internationally. However, it was accepted that it is necessary to discuss with unions the difference between their needs and their wants. One staff member stressed that a Masters programme should deliver conceptual knowledge, not just 'information'.

The 2009 students felt that, on balance, the programme is meeting union needs but there are some caveats. Whilst it cultivates expertise that unions need to do their own research, some felt that the benefits might go more to the individuals than to the unions. Some believe that unions are not necessarily committed to the GLU, especially when it comes to offering real support to the students. There needs to be much better communication with unions on that the GLU is all about. Yet the programme brings out the real challenges facing unions today – globalisation, outsourcing, etc. These students wanted more contact with South African unions.

The students also feel that unions still do not see themselves as drivers of the programme and that. For too many, the length of release time needed for the course was too much of a challenge. One staff member wondered whether it would be possible and helpful if some students could do a part-time course. It was also suggested that it might build better union buy-in if students were bonded in some way for a time after graduation.

COSATU's Crystal Dicks believes that unions and academics should develop the curriculum jointly in so far as that is possible and that more effort should be made to include unionists in the teaching programme. Crystal was not sure of the full answer to this question: yes, logically, the programme should be of use to COSATU, since the course is at Wits and the university

certainly provides an intellectual rigour that unions need but the fact is that there have been, as already noted, few COSATU students. Many unionists have the required conceptual knowledge but not the qualifications. It may be that other channels are also needed to meet COSATU's needs and that the GLU needs more organic links to the union movement. She wondered whether universities could cope with collective learning potentials, as opposed to systems based on individualistic criteria. (I know from my own university studies in New Zealand as far back as the 1970s that collective work, even at master's level, is possible.)

6. Internships were a problem in 2008, so much so that it was felt that they were better seen as field study opportunities for the students' research reports/theses. That seems to be now accepted as the appropriate role of internships. One teaching staff member believes that this approach is the right one. In terms of research, most students said that they had had some kind of discussion with their union over which research topic to choose, although it tended to be more in the way of the student asking: *Is this OK?* rather than the union suggesting what it would like. There is a need to make internships and research work relevant to unions.
7. In 2008, all teaching staff were very happy with student quality and the quality of their work, although it was accepted that, at that stage, student theses had not yet been presented, so this was an unknown. Whilst most staff were still very positive about this, one or two expressed some concerns: they felt that some students were fairly marginal and were not really capable of maintaining a good Masters standard. One said that students were not used to having to engage ideas: another felt that some of them needed better pre-Masters preparation, especially in the area of methodology. Some felt that it is essential to put more resources and time into the student application process and get more substantial evidence of their ability to satisfy course requirements, including any knowledge about student background/skills in research work.

One teaching staff member noted that, although thesis standards were at least average, none were first class. The coordinators wondered whether the use of Skype during the selection process might weed out some weaker candidates. Yet, it was also acknowledged that the GLU students tended to be above average in elective courses. They felt that, where failure seems inevitable, the GLU has yet to work out how to deal with this.

8. Most people still feel that the GLU is not promoting the programme effectively and that alumni need to be used more as missionaries for the GLU. The students noted, as others have done elsewhere, that their unions often had not heard of the GLU: students learnt of it through friends, alumni, the Internet.

One staff member believes that promotion is now being done better in South Africa through the unions; Eddie suggested that more effort needed to go into contacting national unions below the national centres.

Both the past and present programme coordinators think that GLU promotion has been quite good – the GLU brochure has been translated, there are people in the network who can help with questions and there is some local advertising.

As noted in Brazil, it was suggested by one person that it is dangerous for the GLU to be too reliant on German funding.

9. A few teaching staff questioned whether the selection process was resulting in better candidates. It was probably necessary to do more checking on the equivalence of qualifications from different countries.
10. In terms of the reintegration process for graduates, it was noted that, yes, some students go back to their unions and are promoted and used appropriately but others land up having to resign from their union from the outset. Even where the union has 'agreed' to some reintegration, some have reneged on this partway through the course. The coordinators said that students are not getting enough support from their own unions.

For the 2009 students, the reintegration process was still in the future but only one said that there had been no discussion about reintegrating back into the union. All of the others had either had some discussions (the majority) and/or were sure that this was going to work out.

The coordinators noted a number of problems in the reintegration process:

- Unions are not convinced that a one-year Masters programme is credible;

- Students need to maintain contact with their unions during the course.
11. The coordinators stated that the Wits bureaucracy is quite incredibly slow and inefficient. They feel that they are the meat in the sandwich between the students and the local steering committee. All of the rules do structure the programme but they find it very frustrating. They also noted that the 2009 coordinator has been downgraded to a half-time position.
 12. It was felt by some that the thesis is being used well by students and they benefit from it: the question is whether the union benefits.
 13. Although most people feel that flexibility in approaches on each campus is a priority, at least some feel that some standardisation, especially in the area of methods courses, is essential.
 14. Students in 2009 think that visiting lecturers, as part of a real exchange programme, could enrich the courses on 'weaker' campuses. They would also like to know about teaching materials being used on other campuses. One staff member, whilst being positive about visiting lecturers, insisted that each course element must have a core person to whom students could relate.
 15. These students think that there is a clash between the workaday and academic approaches and orientations in the course. They find the academic calendar very rigid and tight. They find the course financially and socially very costly, the latter point including the feeling that the extreme tightness of the programme gives them little chance to socialise amongst themselves. They also wondered whether the selection process should deliberately target students who are willing to debate different points of view.
 16. Whilst students agree on the priority of consolidating current campuses, they noted that, if there were to be some expansion to other countries, the priorities should be North America and the Pacific.
 17. In 2008, I had met with Deputy Vice-Chancellor Rob Moore to get the views of the Wits administration. However, he had admitted that he was new to his position and, although very positive about the GLU, was obviously not familiar with details. For 2009, it was agreed that I would meet, separately, with four university leaders: Professor Yunus Ballim, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic); Professor Tawana Kupe, Dean of the Faculty of Humanities; Professor Eric Worby, Head of the School of Social Sciences; and Professor Roger Southall, Head of the Department of Sociology, within which the GLU is situated. With all four, the discussions were informal and conversational rather than question-and-answer.

All four were very positive about the programme. They all noted that the GLU helped to further Wits' desire to have more post-graduate/research courses and to be more international and developmental in outlook and nature, Yunus Ballim (who saw Africa and India as key Wits 'targets') stressing that this was an explicit rejection of a nationalistic approach. He felt that, in making the barrier between universities and the rest of the world more permeable, the GLU was encouraging an exchange of intellectual thought. It is addressing the way a knowledge economy affects the relations of production. He wondered whether there is an urban bias in GLU courses, overlooking rural people/economies.

Tawana Kupe questioned whether the GLU could use its resources more effectively if the coordination was done through the Faculty/School rather than within the GLU programme itself (a point disputed by the coordinators themselves and the teaching staff, who feel that the urgency of logistical problems that arise for GLU students needs direct contact). Otherwise, he thinks that the GLU resources are being used well and that 'the people are solid'. He thinks that the selection process should start much earlier if possible. He also wondered whether the GLU students have enough contact with other students, something he saw as especially important for unionists, who need wider perspectives.

Eric Worby noted that the Social Sciences School is weak in union resources and so the GLU is a valuable addition. He also saw GLU students bringing a maturity, seriousness and good preparation to their work. He thought that logistical problems are being handled better in 2009. However, he noted that there are problems of institutional incompatibilities sometimes, and that the administrative burdens have been heavy at times. Partly answering one of Tawana Kupe's questions, he was sure that GLU students were actively involved in other programmes/lectures. On the issue of visiting lecturers, whilst positive, he cautioned against

the GLU teaching staff not abdicating their own responsibilities. Good planning and integration into the rest of the programme was essential.

Roger Southall agreed with the positive views of the other three university leaders. He added that Masters/PhD students brought much more real money to the university in the way of government funding, making the GLU very welcome. He agreed that the logistical, administrative and financial hurdles for GLU students can be very demanding. Like Yunus Ballim, he noted the difficulties that had been encountered in getting COSATU to be involved and, especially, getting it to respect Wits procedures/processes. He referred to the PDM course mentioned above: some of its graduates were not up to GLU standards and he wondered whether the GLU should explore a 'total' two-year programme formula for union people in South Africa. Non-GLU Sociology teaching staff have been very positive about GLU students, noting, as above, their maturity. He wondered whether the FES could assist in student selection in home countries.

Global Unions

I had not met with Global Unions as a group in 2008. A meeting was arranged in Geneva in June 2009 to which all Global Unions were invited. One felt that it was not really active in the GLU and said it would not attend. The IMF, EI and PSI all attended the meeting. UNI and the ITUC sent responses to the relevant questions by e-mail, since they could not be represented at the Geneva meeting.

General questions

- a) *Do you think that the programme is meeting the needs of the union movement? Why/why not? What could be done to address any inadequacies?*

There was a feeling that the programme is not meeting its full potential but, surprisingly, because the GUFs felt that this is the fault of unions because they are all too busy with short-term matters. One GUF said that it had not really discussed this issue in their secretariat; another, that GUFs needed to be clearer as to what they wanted from the GLU. It was agreed that GUFs need to use the GLU to develop GUF activists and international actors. Another felt that the programme is good but that, as a GUF, it had not done enough to make its affiliates aware of nor of how its unions could use it to best effect.

All accepted that they are supportive of internships globally and regionally. It was accepted that unions need more networking skills.

The ITUC feels that there is clearly a need for research capacity within the trade union movement, and research capacity that is relevant for trade unions. In that sense, the programme seems to provide the necessary skills to trade unionists and improve their capacities as researchers

- b) *What are the advantages, disadvantages, avoidable problems etc. from having a multi-campus, multi-country basis for the programme?*

Most saw no problems here, although it was accepted that language and culture can be problems. There are also high travel costs, especially for the particular GUF that represents the GUFs over a whole Steering Committee 'cycle' of several years. This must be addressed by the GLU and/or the GUFs. The ITUC felt that there might be language problems that restrict some synergies but, in general, a multi-country, multicultural programme should be enriching rather than constraining.

It was also felt that there is a general absence of European unionists in the programme. UNI agreed with this but felt that there has also been a lack, perhaps, of Americans who could bring an interesting perspective: *Many students are really pretty unaware of the USA Labour movement, its history and challenges. In the age of global companies, it is important to have this experience in the programme.*

- c) *What problems arise from the English-language-based nature of the programme, both from the point of view of teaching/learning and the use/generation of resource material?*

This was seen as a real problem in Brazil – for both English and Spanish. The ITUC queried whether an English language course provided as well, since this might be necessary for some students. However, it also noted that many university programmes are in English. The basis that students are required to have upon entry to the programme would mean in most cases familiarity with the English language but might require some additional language courses. Having only English material and teaching reduces the variety of material and different approaches that exist. Multilingual staff would be an asset, however, to circumvent some of these constraints or shortcomings. UNI thinks that it is important not to try to make this a programme that fits all sizes. To be a really international experience UNI thinks that it has to be in one language and that must be English. Other programmes can cope for people with diverse language skills.

- d) *Is it important to have as much of the global programme 'standardised' as opposed to have very flexible approaches for each campus?*

The general view was that some flexibility is important. The ITUC agrees that a certain level of standardization would be needed to ensure similar levels; however in terms of specialization, each programme could also offer different expertise.

In terms of content UNI would like to see a pretty much standardised core on trade unions and the labour movement and global companies. Outside of that core, there could be much flexibility.

- e) *What are the advantages/disadvantages of having a multiplicity of teaching staff, especially visiting teaching staff?*

The question raised here was the role of unions: could each campus identify where a union impact would be useful in a planned way? In turn, GUFs should be identifying what they want to contribute to GLU programmes.

Better planning and integration of these matters is needed. In the view of the ITUC, this can be enriching, although quality has to be ensured.

- f) *Do you think that programme is sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of all concerned? How could this be improved?*

The general view is that this is difficult to judge from a global perspective.

- g) *Do you think that the programme has been sufficiently advertised, promoted and explained to current actors and to others? If not, what needs to be done to rectify this?*

All agreed that this was not being done well: the GLU, ACTRAV and GUFs all need to do this better. The promotion needs to be more systematic. It would help if GUFs had data on all key dates for each country programme – application dates, internship dates, etc. GUFs themselves need to become missionaries amongst their own affiliates. It was important to get their affiliates to identify their needs and potential candidates.

They felt that it would be good to have a network of GLU 'promoters'. It was suggested that the alumni research projects could also be a way of advertising the usefulness of the GLU. The ITUC admitted that it was not very familiar with the promotion (besides through the usual networks, particularly the ILO and the GURN), but it would be good to promote the programme among affiliates of ITUC-GUFs-ETUC.

- h) *Can the programme cope with the current rate of expansion? Should the GLU be looking for a more permanent structure and staffing to support the administration of the programme?*

It was suggested that a wider range of GLU host countries might reduce some costs – especially travel – but that English would remain a problem. The GUFs felt that it would help if they had some data on how many students attended which campus programme

and from which countries, as well as some background on the students. The ITUC felt that answers here would depend mainly on the financing prospects.

The question was raised as to whether some distance learning was possible in the GLU programme. Also: has the GLU considered some kind of contact with Workers' Education Associations, which might help to address some of the concerns about 'elitism'?

For Global Unions, national trade union centres and any relevant national unions

a) *Do you see your particular needs and those of the union movement as a whole being met in this programme? Why/why not? If there is some dissatisfaction, what needs to be done to address this?*

It was agreed by the GUFs that this had been dealt with adequately in the answers above. However, in its e-mailed response, the ITUC noted that the programme addresses the needs of the union movement in particular if the student returns to her/his union and uses the acquired skills. The selection process could be more focused on the chances that the student will return to the union after the programme. This depends on both the student and the union; therefore any measures taken in that respect should focus on the two.

b) *How useful do you think the internship programme has been? Has it posed any problems for your organisation? Could it be improved? How?*

All were positive about the internship programme, with some reservations:

- The IMF had had no problems – their interns have had clear projects and have participated in IMF activities. They felt that they needed to look for more regional internships.
- EI said that this has been useful but agreed that more regional internships would be useful. They also felt that there are logistical problems, especially in finding accommodation for the interns. There should be some limit on how many interns a GUF can accept.
- PSI believed that there needs to be better internship planning and agreed about the accommodation problem. GUFs and the universities need to do better in this area.
- In its emailed response, UNI note that it has not done enough to ensure the best use of the internships: *We are reviewing our processes currently. A GLU document or guidelines on what is expected of the internships might be helpful.*
- The ITUC stated that *the feedback we have had from the interns that we had in the office was positive. They enjoyed the work, the contacts and the "real life" experience of the international organizations. It very much depends on the time they come, however. Some periods are more interesting than others. Due to the limited capacity we have in the Geneva office, the time spent on accompanying the student is relatively limited though, so some degree of independence and entrepreneurial spirit is required to make the experience useful. The period is relatively short to really work on some concrete output.*

All agreed that the reports that they get from interns are good but they would like to see an effort to make them genuine internships.

c) *Do you think that it is possible and desirable for Global Unions to be more involved in the teaching programme? How and why?*

In brief: desirable, yes; possible, more difficult. A more strategic approach is needed. In this regard, people referred back to the answer in question e) under the general questions above.

The ITUC was less ambivalent. It says: *Definitely, since this provides the occasion to match theory and practice and provides students with more practical examples. It might be possible in the form of guest lectures or workshops.*

UNI agreed that it is desirable to have more GUF involvement. It suggested that perhaps there should be a panel of GUF speakers and subjects they can deal with so that the

universities could see more easily where to fit them into the programmes. Philip Bowyer stated:

My personal experience of lecturing has been very interesting for me but I hope also for the students. More GUF lecturers could enrich the experience.

d) *Do you think that unions are sufficiently integrated into the delivery of the programme?*

Unanimously, *No*; (except for the ITUC, which said that it had no comment on this question). This is largely a question of insufficient communication at present.

One further specific point: it was agreed that it is dangerous for the GLU to rely so heavily on German finding sources.

Other donor bodies

FES globally was not interviewed in 2008 nor was the ILO. However, I met with Reiner Radermacher, the FES International Cooperation Coordinator, in Berlin in May 2009 and relevant comments are reported below. The ILO is, of course, a GLU partner and the ILO Director General has indicated very publically his support for the GLU. I interviewed by phone Dan Cunniah, the Director of ACTRAV (the Workers Activities Bureau at the ILO), the ILO department that is responsible for day-to-day GLU cooperation.

The FES

Reiner's views were as follows:

1. He hopes that the GLU programme is meeting the needs of unions but he acknowledges that it is a work in progress. Unions in the South need expertise on globalisation issues and he feels that FES in general works on this with patchy success. The GLU may be a short cut to this end but it is still too early to tell.
2. The exchange between campuses offers a potential to offer opportunities to more people. However, cultural differences can be difficult to deal with. It is also the case that some people, uprooted from their environment can disempower them and it is not always possible to deal successfully with their problems.
3. His views on the centrality of the English language to the GLU programme are much the same as others have expressed. He notes that this is especially a problem for Latin America whose union leaders are not being enabled to participate in leading and directing the GLU.
4. On the question of flexibility versus more commonality in the programme, he thinks that some standardisation on the principles of the key modules is essential but the GLU needs to respect the rules of each campus and the perspectives unique to each country. However, he thinks that it is essential that each country be seen as an equal in setting the direction of the GLU.
5. Whilst accepting that the use of visiting/guest lecturers is good – it can build a commonality into the GLU – proper planning and integration of these inputs is essential. Further, he believes that individual interests of visiting faculty must not dominate.
6. He thinks that there is not a **lack** of promotion of the GLU but we need to do better, to get the right channels. He'd like to see FES offices helping more with candidate selection but he thinks that this should be oriented to the political choices being made, not the technicalities of assessing candidates' English language capacity.
7. He sees consolidation of the existing programmes as being more important than expanding to other countries/campuses. In particular, he thinks that the GLU needs to pay much more attention to the transition between coordinators as one team moves on and is replaced by others, since these people are crucial to the programme.
8. Reiner does not see a need to use the existing resources better but he does think that the FES should put more emphasis on supporting the annual curriculum workshops rather

than GLU conference. FES is committed to its current five scholarships in Germany but would like to extend these to other countries.

9. He is very happy with feedback on the programme so far.
10. Whilst he thinks that all GLU partners share roughly the same objectives, he feels that they do all have the same sense of urgency: the universities tend to be happy; the FES and GUFs less so. GUFs and unions are not as involved as they should be. The Indian union problem is very specific but he noted that a meeting planned for August 2009 might resolve this. GUFs especially need a more constant reference/contact person within the global Steering Committee.

Dan Cunniah, the ILO

General questions

- a) *Do you think that the programme is meeting the needs of the union movement? Why/why not? What could be done to address any inadequacies?*

This is a project we support and will continue to do so as long as we have resources. The problem is the resources that unions, especially those in developing countries, **don't** have: many think that they cannot afford to employ GLU graduates if they cost more than they did before they went on the GLU course and they cannot compete with other employers who hire Masters graduates. Unions need to realise that they are going to have to deal with more complex issues today and they will need to have qualified people to handle these issues.

- b) *What are the advantages, disadvantages, avoidable problems etc. from having a multi-campus, multi-country basis for the programme?*

There are the obvious advantages – shared experiences and perspectives. However, it has to be asked how the costs of the GLU compare with the cost of relevant university programmes nationally that unionists could take. Some unions are negotiating with universities to get courses that suit their needs, although these will often lack a union perspective. There is no one-size-fits-all solution and costs and benefits have to be considered.

- c) *What problems arise from the English-language-based nature of the programme, both from the point of view of teaching/learning and the use/generation of resource material?*

It's a problem. English is the global language but the present situation means that the GLU is not able to attract potential students from French- and Spanish-speaking backgrounds

- d) *Is it important to have as much of the global programme 'standardised' as opposed to have very flexible approaches for each campus?*

Whilst one has to have some commonality, this should not be too rigid: the local and regional flexibilities are important.

- e) *What are the advantages/disadvantages of having a multiplicity of teaching staff, especially visiting teaching staff?*

This is linked to item b) above. They bring new experiences and perspectives. However, their inputs must be integrated and perhaps some arrangement needs to be made such that students can have some follow-up contact with, even if only by e-mail

- f) *Do you think that programme is sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of all concerned? How could this be improved?*

It seems to be flexible enough.

- g) *Do you think that the programme has been sufficiently advertised, promoted and explained to current actors and to others? If not, what needs to be done to rectify this?*

We are doing reasonably well but can always do better. The ILO sends the material to union national centres, the ITUC and GUFs. It's not clear how much they, in turn, pass the messages on. We should look at alumni and help them to become missionaries for the GLU. If they speak with potential students, they are familiar with all of the logistical problems/issues and can guide such applicants.

- h) *Can the programme cope with the current rate of expansion? Should the GLU be looking for a more permanent structure and staffing to support the administration of the programme?*

This all depends on resources and whether we have the capacity to cope with expansion to other countries. Certainly, the current priority should be the consolidation of the existing programmes, to get them to optimal class sizes. Too much expansion to other countries/campuses could affect quality and that must be a priority.

Questions for other partners (mainly the funders/ILO, etc)

- a) *Do you see a need to look for more effective ways of using the resources that you are providing for the programme? How?*

We are using our resources as effectively as we could. It is an expensive programme.

- b) *Do you think that feedback so far justifies your level of support for the programme? If there are deficiencies, what are these and how can they be addressed?*

Yes, it's serving a good purpose but unions need to do their part to make sure that these people are employed.

- c) *Do you think that all the partners who resource the programme share the same objectives and work sufficiently well together? Are they involved in the programme as much as they would wish?*

The global Steering Committee does a good job in this respect, making sure that all partners are sharing their objectives. What is perhaps lacking is direct input at the global Steering Committee from national centres: the GUFs are at these meetings but perhaps we need brief written reports from national centres or national steering committees for each global Steering Committee meeting.

Alumni

There were three different alumni inputs to this report:

- At the Alumni workshop in Johannesburg in March, there were alumni from the Witwatersrand programme and others from other programmes. These were split into the two relevant groups and their views are reported separately. In general, I have not edited the responses written up by a volunteer in each group, other than tidying up some language and syntax.
- At the Berlin summer school in September, alumni from all programmes were to be asked their views. These are not yet recorded in this draft report but will be included in the final report.

1. GLU South Africa Programme Alumni Evaluation

1. *Do you think that the programme is meeting the needs of the union movement?*

Individual responses were as follows:

- *Some aspects of the course meet the requirements. Certain issues are neglected: e.g. collective bargaining, organizing. That should be the core of the course. Personally, I gained a lot from the course: e.g. research skills.*
- *Yes and no. Yes – In my case, I'm a member of the union, not the staff of the union. In my place of work, I'm part of the management; I now help the management to solve labour issues. No – some limitations as to the contents – as in the comment above.*
- *Somehow: the programme should focus more on topics practical for unions - like OSH, labour laws.*
- *To a certain extent. There is a lot of theory during the programme. What unions in practice do (labour law, bargaining) was not covered. However, the programme meets the needs to a certain extent.*
- *To a certain extent. Sometimes the programme produces knowledge that is not entirely possible to be consumed by the unions, which do not appreciate it fully.*
- *To some extent: on one side the awareness of the programme back home is not enough; on the other, not enough alumni from a particular country have graduated to educate everybody back home.*
- *To a larger extent – about 70%. The course brings the type of skills needed by the union. The course gives the unions an academic backbone that unions need to engage with stakeholders. However, there are shortcomings: in my view there was no enough gender analysis of labour problems*
- *The course does meet needs of unions. However, these needs are not static and they change. But the course does bring academic capacities needed by the union*
- *Yes. On one hand – academic capacities that are brought by the programme; on the other – some shortages in terms of practical knowledge and skills.*

2. Did the programme make a difference to your work?

Eight of the nine respondents said Yes to this question. One said that the programme did not make difference but that *it did help me to make the difference.*

3. Was your research work of interest and value to your trade union?

Individual responses were as follows

- *The topic of the research was of interest but it is not enough if the unions do not use it. Therefore, the topic was of interest but of no use in my place of work.*
- *Not to my trade union. I had to do a South African case study. But the research was of value for the organization I did it for (a South African organization).*
- *Yes, it was of value. My area of study is related to SA but many problems applied to my country.*
- *At the present moment, it is not possible to make a fair judgment. I will be publishing my article soon so then it will be possible to evaluate it.*
- *I cannot answer I never presented my research to trade unions. It was of use to our government, not to the trade union. The government agendas were well met by the research.*
- *Very useful to my union. They intend to use it.*
- *My research is rather more relevant to the government than to the union. I'm in the process of publishing this aspect of it.*
- *I had to make the research on South Africa. But I really enjoyed it. I sent my report to my union in my country. From the response, I can judge that it was of interest.*
- *Not to my union. The topic was not specific for my country. However, it would be of use to international union organizations.*

Conclusion: there are limitations coming from imposing on us the need to do research on South Africa. The outcome – sometimes the research is not of value to our unions.

4. What has the integration process back to your own country been like? (Details on whether alumni went back into the original job or original union? What kind of the reception you get from your employer and colleagues? Is there evidence that your skills/knowledge and evidence were put to an appropriate use?)

Individual responses included:

- *Some of us are excluded from the scope of the question. I did not manage to go back to my country. However, I am actually feeding in to the sister institution in South Africa. I was able to invest my research skills to work with them. When I go back home I will bring knowledge I got in South Africa, especially on organizing, which is crucial for my organisation*
- *I am back to my original job. The reception from my employer and colleagues has been very cordial. Skills and knowledge: – I managed to put these in into practice. I help management to deal with labour issues in order to avoid conflict.*
- *The reception was good. Perhaps it was because they needed the project coordinator and I was needed. When I went back for my research in June the reception was not that good.*
- *Finally, I did not go back to my union. When I arrived back at the union, they gave me my office, they said please continue the work you left. I was very well received. However, I went to the research institute, which is, however, very much linked to my union. My skills were to an excellent extent put into practice.*
- *After the programme, I went back home, tried to work where I had left my work. The reception was not good – they did not expect me to be back. They did not have the capacity to employ me; they did not know what to do with me. Now, however, I'm using my skills outside of the union. I'm still to some extent in the labour movement. I'm currently underemployed – unutilised. For the type of education I have, I could be used more.*
- *When I arrived back, I took back my previous position. The reception was excellent, perhaps because the general secretary was supporting me in doing the programme. Skills – I am applying my skills. However, I also feel I'm underemployed. Unutilised - for the type of education I have, I could do more.*
- *I did not go back to my job. I had had to resign before taking the programme. After coming back the colleagues said 'it is good to see you' – as friends, but no relationship or reception in terms of employment. I tried to reapply for my job while being still on the programme but I did not get it back, with no explanation. Skills – I got skills to do some consultancy. I'm on a contract. I'm also underused – I do simple data processing not the analysis I have skills for.*
- *I got a good reception both from the general secretary and colleagues. I also received a nation-wide support. I was elected in the nation-wide trade union elections. My skills are used properly. I could be underemployed but I do not allow that.*
- *Reception was passive. The union was ready to ignore the research and skills. However, it did not help but also did not disturb when I attempted to actively use my research elsewhere.*

Additional comments

- *The position that I left is an elective position. I could not be elected after the programme.*
- *The programme was supposed to be named 'labour and development'. At the end, they named our Programme 'industrial sociology'. This is not what we applied for. This created some problems.*

5. Support from my organization

Individual responses:

- *I was during the programme on unpaid leave. The union paid the €1500 required contribution for me.*
- *Union paid the €1500. I was on paid leave. They supported me to come.*
- *Due to disagreements, I had to resign in order to take the programme. The union did not give me any support. All was on me.*
- *I was on paid leave. The union paid the €1500. We did not get the receipt of payment from Wits. What happened to that money?*
- *My union told me that it could not afford to pay the contribution (€1500). I had to pay it. I was first on unpaid leave; then I was dismissed. Coming to the programme was the form of separation from my union, leading to 'divorce'.*
- *I was supported emotionally. The contribution I had to pay myself. I resigned so did not get any money*

- *I was on a project so did not get any support. I paid the contribution by myself*
- *The only support from union was a recommendation letter. My employer (not the union) paid my leave during the programme. The contribution I paid by myself*
- *I received a recommendation letter. They managed to pay the contribution. I was not supported during the programme (unpaid leave) but had a lot of emotional support.*

2. Evaluation of alumni in Johannesburg for the alumni workshop but from non-South African programmes (all from Germany, I think)

Does the GLU programme meet the bulk of needs of the union movement?

All participants agreed that the GLU was definitely meeting the needs of the TU movement. More specifically, the unique combination of academics, trade unionists, diverse groups in leading the discussion on labour-related issues that the GLU offers benefits the trade union movement as such. Even so, we regretted that the number of people educated in the framework of GLU is not sufficient for those countries people come from.

Participants unanimously highlighted two most important dimensions on which GLU meets the needs of the labour movement. On the one hand, there is its strong impact in terms of building capacity. We understand capacity in a broad sense. It is not only about the increase in intellectual capacity of trade unionists, - especially regarding policy-analysis, data collection, basic arguments, research & competence, analysis (especially financial and economic problems). Some noted that in trade unions people know much about strikes but do not possess much intellectual capacity to discuss issues with employers. In addition, the development of critical thinking, formal and informal learning skills that the GLU offers also benefit the capacity of unions as such. It is the cross-coordinating of ideas and the transfer/exchange of experience that further strengthen the capacity-related impact of GLU.

On the other hand, the GLU offers a broad scope of opportunities and a platform for building quite strong links with the German community and for network building also beyond Germany as well. It is of particular importance for trade union movements, especially with the spread of globalization, to ground networking across sectors and across countries. The sustainability or systematic basis of follow up and networking in which the GLU has succeeded has so far resulted in a particular value to the GLU's impact.

However, beyond that, yet other participants noted that not all needs of the labour movement were being met comprehensively but rather certain needs of specific unions. To some extent, it is also about indirect impacts of the GLU. As one participant noted, *Yes, the GLU meets the labour movement's need indirectly. My input helps to achieve the organisation's needs but not a full worth of myself as a person*".

Finally, yet importantly, it was stressed that the urgent need of organizing for unions was not met as such by the GLU. It was left to debate later on as to where the GLU could make a contribution in this regard.

Did the GLU programme make a difference to your own work in both competency-related and personal terms?

All participants agreed unanimously that the GLU makes a difference to our own work. In particular, many stressed that they understand now more in terms of labour-related issues. This makes our own work much easier but also more competent. However, it was also recognized, that, to some extent, it is difficult to utilize knowledge in practical settings and that the knowledge one gains should better correspond to the directions in which trade union organisations we belong to are going. Additionally, it is not easy to transfer the knowledge acquired further downwards.

Depending on the fields of activities of every participant the following was mentioned:

- a) The development and strengthening of critical as well as analytical skills, including critical evaluation of different issues increases our personal effectiveness;
- b) Better knowledge of labour law and policy behind makes it easier to work for people dealing with legal aspects of TU activities.
- c) *Networking* benefits each of us in our own work undoubtedly;
- d) TU –related projects, and related jobs came out

- e) For those dealing with international relations of trade unions, GLU's impact on their work was more than that. The opportunity to develop networks, and collecting in-depth knowledge on labour practices in other countries significantly enrich the experience in international and foreign issues.
- f) On the personal level, several participants also emphasize gaining more (self-) confidence as a mean to express GLU's impact for our own work.
- g) The last should also be seen within the certification as an issue in society / credibility / market value context

Was your own research work of interest and value to your own union – directly or in the long-term perspective?

It depends on the topics chosen and the scope of activities or capacity of our trade unions as to whether the use of the research work is positive. We have collected different experiences so far and all are considered to have been positive. For example, a paper on the legal framework of union activities and globalization came out later on as a union's position paper on the issue. Others, based on their MA theses, were invited to speak to conferences. Yet, other papers exactly met the interest of trade unions (e.g. unions and cooperatives). Even if not used once defended, research work was considered as making a long-term impact. Here, in particular, it is important to think about language-related issues as the research is conducted in English so that the issue-accessibility of this research can undermine the research's potential impact for unions. In other cases, research could be only put on the web site for potential use. There was only one case where the research issue was outside the current thematic scope of the person's union, so that there was no feedback directly (but the potential is still there).

The re-integration process back into your own country.

- a. Most of us are back in the original job; even if not – they are still back in the union movement.
- b. However, beware of the human factor: the reception from the employer and from colleagues is not always friendly.
- c. Skills/knowledge/experience have been put to an appropriate use but a better understanding by the leadership of union is urgently necessary to have more progress in this area.

The majority of us have stayed in touch with our organisations while spending a year at the GLU; some even kept doing a part of their work whilst studying. Some just faced challenges (not least also personal) with persons who were entrusted to do the student's work while he/she was away. Many from our group returned to their previous work and there were several, though not many, cases of promotion of GLU alumni in their own organisations. Those who did not go back to the same position/organisation, nevertheless, have stayed in the trade union movement, even if the concrete sphere of activities changed. It is important to stress for us that, in particular, doing a PhD somewhere else also ensures our (even if different) contribution to strengthening the labour movement. It is not only about the issue of further skills and capacity development which is consequently re-invested then in the labour movement but also of making further inputs into trade union work. Yet, in some cases, for example, a PhD in another country (in some cases fully supported by our organisations) ensures even better access or larger opportunities (not least financial) of being able to keep doing the previous work for the same organisation, even if staying away physically. It is important for us to get that recognized. Additionally, one person, who got into the GLU from outside the trade union movement, at the end of the day got a union-related job.

In general terms, it seems better to start the answer to this question from looking at the commencement of our participation in the programme. Whereas some did have it easy to get leave for studying, others faced difficulties already at this stage. In the former cases, some were granted sabbatical leave, were further paid their local (food) wages while studying in Germany and enjoyed the support of their employers and colleagues. Once returned home to their countries, they were cordially received by both employer and colleagues. They did not face any reintegration problems.

Yet, others who enjoyed initial union support before leaving in the framework of a mutual understanding of the GLU in terms of capacity development were given a hostile reception on their return. In some cases, the leadership feels, to some extent, threatened by one's acquired skills; colleagues also react in a hostile manner. Any chances for promotion deteriorate. In order to ease

these particular difficulties, alumni must be able to show, in spite of hostility, evidence of union involvement. In such cases, employer perhaps recognizes that one is good at one's work but in an indirect manner, without explicitly stating it and allocates relevant responsibilities indirectly.

More importantly, many of us faced problems at the beginning before leaving but did not have any problems with re-integration. Here, at the beginning in rare cases, there were sometimes extreme levels of employer's hostility towards the intention of their employees in applying for the GLU. Certainly, to some extent others see it as an individual opportunity for individual growth. Sometimes they don't expect you back any more. However, once returning to their organisations, one's reluctance to lose the skills acquired leads to the fact that skills are later put to appropriate use. In addition, some colleagues can also use the alumni's skills, depending on the issues.

Finally, yet others, and those are, indeed, not single cases but several, faced real hostility and political problems once coming back to their union. In some cases, returnees received more senior jobs, as their former position was occupied. If some succeed, with colleagues' support, in getting back to their original job, others were stuck on less important jobs for a while. No union support has been evident to enable alumni to participate in the follow up or alumni activities.

In summary, we highlighted two points:

- As regards skills utilization and appropriate use, we would like to stress **the lack of employers (union leadership) and colleagues' clarity on how to utilize the knowledge and skills** acquired by alumni. Whereas some of us could be helpful in terms of various skills for their colleagues - what we called indirect skills utilization - others could not, as the understanding of what exactly alumni can do when they return is missing. In this regards, we suggested that alumni should be given an opportunity to speak to the leadership and to explain benefits of the GLU, complemented by GLU organizers and supporters more extensively communicating with the union leadership.
- Finally, we also note that **there is a need among trade unions (and organizers and supporters of the GLU) to acknowledge a person's intentions and personal development ambitions**, which are always there, but to accept that, nevertheless these in no way diminish the benefits and returns of the GLU

Berlin Summer School

The following are three evaluations by alumni groups that met on 17 September 2009 at the GLU Summer School in Berlin, edited for language only.

Group 1

Pre-LPG understanding between the student and her/his union There was strong support for one student prior to attending the LPG programme and this support continued upon return. For others there was weak support prior to attending the LPG and on return they experienced difficulties in re-establishing their position and responsibilities in the union. Others were forced to resign prior to attending the LPG and on return they found that the position was filled by another person. Others were not supported by their direct union employer but were supported by the country central labour body or their GUF. There seems to a connection between support before attending and on return; similarly for those lacking support prior to attending LPG, the same reluctance to reintegrate was apparent on their return.

a. The reintegration process

- i. *Whether or not people went back into their original union/position/employment:* Of the eight respondents, two went back to their original union (albeit with the role having been restructured); four did not go back to the original union but made conscious choices to pursue other opportunities, the rationale being that the union did not support the original application to LPG, so the respondents did not feel that their return would be welcome.

- Two respondents did not return to the union full-time but their LPG time did not impact negatively on their employment: it has enabled them to continue to study and contribute to previous union work.
- ii. *Reception on return:* Some reported a warm personal reception from colleagues but new skills were not always appreciated; for those not returning to the original union, it took some time to get full time employment.
 - iii. *Post-programme use of the graduate's skills, etc.* For those who did not return to their original union and went to a new union skills and knowledge have been used and were attractive to the new union.
 - iv. *Whether the programme had made a difference to the work being done by the graduate:* Some former students were able to get new and more exciting jobs on returning to their home country; others reported returning to the same work and being able to make that work more interesting, given the skills and knowledge acquired.
 - v. *The usefulness of the students' research to the union:* Some reported an interest in their union about the research undertaken but unions did not read the thesis and apply this to the union's work. One respondent reported being asked to present a summary of the thesis at a conference; one participant reported running a workshop on the thesis; one participant reported presenting the thesis to a labour audience and having the thesis published as an article in a labour studies journal. One issue identified was the language barrier, with the thesis in English not being accessible to the union.

b. Is the programme meeting the needs of the union movement?

The prior question must be: *Who is defining needs?* Specific responses included:

- The LPG does not meet immediate needs around organising.
- The programme anticipates strategic and long term needs: this is in contrast to the union's need to act quickly on immediate issues
- The programme anticipates what the union's needs should be and tries to fill in the gaps: the leadership of unions is more concerned with immediate needs such as recruiting and maintaining membership;

Inadequacies: More space is needed to exchange experiences between countries and greater opportunity to explore different experiences of trade union development and strategies. Also needed are sufficient international expertise and experience to provide a semi-structured space to allow this to happen.

c. Are alumni happy with the programme?

Overall yes: it provides a space for opening up new possibilities; new perspectives; cultural interchange; cultural shocks; different food; meeting different people; developing an understanding that things can be changed.

There are problems: it is ideologically not diverse - a general social democratic line is dominant; exposure to more radical view points and an opportunity to discuss and debate are needed.

d. Is the programme flexible enough for all parties?

We define 'all' as more than students: it includes lecturers and donors. Therefore, we can only address the question as students:

- There is a good framework in mixing different countries, cultures and experiences.
- If we try to assess the impact on donors, we would say that continuing to offer internships is a good indicator that it meets their needs.

e. Has the programme been sufficiently well advertised and promoted?

This group asked whether the GLU could translate invitational e-mails into various languages. Students reported that advertising was not disseminated well if the person receiving the e-mail in English did not understand English – this resulted in the e-mail being deleted and not forwarded around. Students are willing to assist in translations.

The GLU should encourage national federations to put the GLU hyperlink on their website. The GLU should have a presence at global conferences distributing information – students can also take responsibility for this.

f. This group added an additional question that one of the other groups also picked up: *what, if any, role in the GLU should there be for an alumni network? They felt that as the GLU grows, the relationship between alumni and the programme requires further discussion and development.*

Group 2.

a. The reintegration process

A number of alumni gave their individual responses to this:

- No discussion or understanding (I am not back yet). I had a quarrel before leaving because they didn't want me to leave. Yes, I had a conversation and they were very supportive but there was a lot of bureaucracy. Yes, I talked to my executive committee but it wasn't clear enough what they expected from my return. I had a discussion and I had a formal commitment to go back to the union and serve for 2-3 years. I had moral support (plus a little financial) from my union to attend this programme. My institute is very supportive of the programme and hence supported me very much. My university was very supportive and I had a contract to work for at least 2 more years.
- I went back to the original employer: I returned for the same position but I changed to a lower position for 5 months as there were elections. I went back to the original union. I went back to my original employment - back to the employer. I went back to my original work.
- Not relevant because I didn't return to the employer. I did international work for the union on a freelance basis. I didn't find any hostility but had to catch up with what has happened in my union. Some friends received me very well but the executive committee was rather cold. I had a good reception in terms of elected union officials but some colleagues were a bit suspicious. Everyone was happy and none had any problem. I was very well received. They are happy and relieved that I went back, as I respected the contract.
- I am using the experience but doing something else on a labour oriented research institute. My skills were recognized by my union. My union benefited from my expertise and I also benefited personally from my skills development. I went back to the union and they acknowledged the additional skills I have learnt. Everyone recognizes my skills but they become scared of you. Maybe my skills haven't been appropriately fitting to the local union but some of my skills (better knowledge of union policy, writing and presentation skills) I was able to use and got an upgrade of my position immediately after I went back. The knowledge I got was far greater than what I could use but I can use some of the things I learnt. I apply most of the knowledge that I acquired at the programme, also because my research work has an international dimension. I published more books and did more research.
- It made a great difference as I was a union organizer and now, being a researcher, am having more diverse work now. It helped me to compare academic work and activist work; now I do a combination of them. The programme has helped me a lot, as before I was using basic traditional tools but now I know many more tools and have a broader picture and have a wider network. Before, I was just working on recruitment and addressing wage problems but now I have involved myself with other activities and feel more confident. The programme made a great difference but it is not what the level of the union I am working at now can use much. This programme is not a programme for unionists at the regional level as it provides a higher qualification. The programme made a little difference because most of my qualifications were not used from the local unions although I tried to expand and integrate aspects of the programme that I attended. It made no difference as I had the same job. I was promoted six months after I got back: I have now more responsibilities and act in more areas. The programme made me do more union work and studies and network with unions.
- I am doing research for union organizations so the programme made a great difference. My masters thesis was not of interest but the other research work I undertook later was more valuable. It also led me to do more research as the union became really interested. The union was very interested on my research thesis work but more broadly than my specific union. The

union had no interest, because my research could be used for other levels of organization, and not for the local level. For my union, it was not of interest but more for the national level and it was difficult for me to present it to the targeted leadership that could have made use of that. The research was of some interest to the union but more to the international trade union. The research was not at the interest level of the union but it was appropriate as I applied it in my every-day job in the discussions about methodology. My research was of interest to BWI.

- One graduate noted that what has changed in the last twelve months is that: *I went to the national level and there I have chances to be useful but it remains to be seen.*

b. Is the programme meeting the needs of the union?

The programme is directed and meets the needs for unionists at the national level but not for local unions. The programme meets the needs of the labour movement in general but there is a lack of appreciation from the labour movement on the benefits they can draw from the programme. In terms of capacity building and trade union networks it meets the needs of trade unions but there is space for unions to express their needs more clearly. Yes, it meets the needs of the labour movement but unions in particular sectors can benefit more than the others - metalworkers benefited more than the bank sector unions.

Addressing inadequacies: GLU networking with other academic programmes around the world is needed. Trade unions should take more lead and involvement in the preparation of curricula. There should be some common activities between local alumni and trade unions to bring together better the needs of the unions and the capacities that are created by the programme – to be organized by GLU. There should be more harmonization with programmes in different campuses. Intensifying faculty exchange could help to address better any inadequacy.

c. Are you happy with the programme as a whole?

- Yes, but the trade union curriculum prepared in Brazil should be circulated also in other campuses.
- Happy but because of lack of appreciation from the unions, it has created alienation of the students from the unions.
- The other campuses (Brazil and India) still need to do a lot to deal with administrative and organizational issues.

d. Sufficiently flexible?

It is flexible enough to meet the needs of all concerned. Some of the needs of the students in campuses such a Brazil do not reach the global Steering Committee – there is a structural problem of information, etc.

e. Is the programme sufficiently advertised?

The general agreement is that the programme is not sufficiently advertised, often because of impediments from the unions. Proposals for improvement included:

- Using trade union activities to spread the information more intensively.
- The GUFs could advertise more. The GUFs can talk directly with political leaders and press the unions to send more people.
- Use union congresses and other events to advertise more.
- Use the regional level of unions to advertise the programme.
- Research are always in English: hence many unions can not appreciate properly the value of the programme and so send more unionists to the programme. Some translation could help.

f. The formation of the GLU alumni and voice at the Steering committee

The GLU alumni have agreed to press to have 5 representatives in the international steering committee. They also created a committee to improve and enhance the voice and participation of students.

Group 3 (10 people)

a. The reintegration process

People who went back to original employer: seven returned to same employment, several reported changing jobs in the labour movement within a couple of years

Reception from employer and colleagues:

- Cold smile for a while, then a promotion.
- Neutral response, then promotion.
- Neutral reception then slowly more openness and new and bigger tasks. I then moved to a new department. A mixed colleague response - many couldn't understand the programme.
- I returned to a serious crisis at home so options are limited severely in the near term. I have only support to try to find other work. There is widespread vulnerability but not about participation in the course. I have found other options now and have good support from colleagues.
- I returned to the same organization and then promotion with more responsibility and tasks. I am still trying to fit skills with the new position.
- I returned to same employer for one year. No change or strange reception.
- I was not accepted back to the previous job. No union job possible so far but great and supportive response from the confederation. Good use is being made of my skills. Great support from colleagues.
- I left the union for study purposes and am freelancing now.
- Returned to same job with no difference for two years.

Were Skills & Knowledge put to use?

There was a broad consensus that skills are being put to good use. Specifics were:

- Not with that employer but hopefully with new employer.
- Initially no but now yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, in research.
- Not at first (30% initially) but now, yes.
- Yes, yes, yes.
- Yes, absolutely.
- Yes; utilized by the organization and the broader council (others in the labour movement).
- Yes, I am in a more central position in the union movement now. More inputs now.
- Skills are being used by outside folks, not internally, because I didn't return to my job. Overused skills by the confederation.

Has it made a difference to your work?

In general, the answer was positive: it made a significant difference for the majority of people., Specifics were:

- I moved from the private sector to the union movement.
- Yes.
- Yes. I changed jobs completely.
- Yes - a new job as a result of my thesis research.
- Yes. More visibility now. I am doing international and research work now instead of organizing.
- Yes, much more confidence now. I have a wider perspective now.

Was your research work of interest and value to the trade union?

There was a general feeling that '*people are not reading our theses but our research gets used and integrated by us in our work for unions and this leads to ongoing research (GLU and beyond)*'.

One person noted that the union was not using the research but NGOs and civil society people were. Another reported that the union was using it directly and largely from the thesis: it had also contributed to some global debates about organizing.

b. Is programme meeting needs of the union movement? What can be done to improve this?

There was a confident Yes to this but some uncertainty about how to measure how it's meeting the needs. Specific answers were:

- There is a need for more direct connections with the union movement and confederations.
- There is a need more trade unionists involved with the programme.
- There is a gap between theory and practical work. This is wide and needs to be bridged.
- Yes in the sense that it makes space to 'think outside the box'. We are not too sure if it's meeting the needs.
- We want more opportunities to use our knowledge in the union movement.

Recommendations included:

- Solicit concrete feedback from unions to see whether needs are being met.
- Solicit research requests directly from unions and GUFs for student papers and theses.
- Use alumni to build more connections with the unions.
- Make more direct connections with the union movement researchers that already exist.
- More alumni control/choice/initiation concerning choice of research projects topics is needed. (But the gender group process was great and well organized in this respect) More focus on global issues instead of only national is needed. Many have our own interests in research. We need to find a better balance in terms of union and academic interests. Unions should also have some direct say.

c. Are you happy with the programme as a whole? And why?

The general feeling was *Yes as a whole but...* There is a great need for more ideological diversity in readings/courses; a need for more radical perspectives/discussion. There is also a need for more 'cross-pollination', with the students talking to each other: – for example, across campuses for classes and internships. *We need to include South Africa somehow* was one comment.

d. Flexibility?

The present flexibility in terms of different curriculum is good but there is a desire for more radical political ideas/debates. The programme needs to listen to a broader range of stakeholders and needs more diversity. Structured childcare support would/could widen the range of applicants because of where the target group is in terms of real lives.

e. Sufficient advertisement and promotion?

The general feeling was *No*. Material needs to be sent to all national confederations and concerned organizations; advertise at universities on their web sites; assist alumni to make small presentations in coordination with unions/confederations and in their education departments.

The annual GLU Conference and the Curriculum Workshop

I was also asked to make some comments on the GLU conferences and the curriculum workshop held in Mumbai in February 2009. The GLU conferences have been held annually, one each in each of the countries involved in the GLU programme. Four conferences have been held so far: Germany (2006), South Africa (2007), Brazil (2008), and India (2009). The latter three conferences were held just as the first course was beginning. In my own view, this may have been a very good way of incorporating the new country into the GLU 'family' but was quite a stress on coordinators and others who were already struggling to get the logistics of the new programme sorted out. If another country were to be added to the GLU programme, I would suggest that no conference be held there until after a full year of the programme has been completed.

The GLU conferences

As noted, the conferences are held each year. The normal pattern is for the host campus to negotiate with the GLU global steering committee over the theme and general logistics of the conference. It then

manages the call for papers, which is sent to all GLU partners, to academics who have been involved with the GLU in the past, to all alumni and also is put on the Internet.

Because the conference theme is normally set at the meeting of the Steering Committee held at the site of the previous host, there is always the risk that, by the time the conference is held, key global developments have occurred that had not been anticipated in the previous year. This was certainly the case for the conference held in Mumbai in February 2009: the theme had been agreed as financialisation but this was before the global economic crisis struck and one or two people informally suggested to me that some important features of the crisis were therefore not addressed. However, I see no real alternative way of dealing with this if people are to complete conference papers (and, for academics, perhaps arrange funding to attend the conference) in time for the host campus to be able to print and circulate the conference agenda and all paper abstracts.

Protocol demands that an organisation with so many partners and being hosted by a university must have an array of keynote and introductory presentations made during the conference. However, given that most conferences are two full days only (with perhaps an 'opening' session on the night before the first day of business), it is important to devise a way of minimising the time taken up by these formalities. Many people have travelled at quite some cost in terms of time and money and want to be able to maximise the formal discussion time when papers are presented and the informal time at coffee breaks and the like.

One of the real values of the conferences is that it allows local GLU students to be exposed to an international conference on globalisation and labour issues at no real expense and to meet GLU academics and some alumni from other campuses. If this helps to build an alumni network, it is a real plus.

Some alumni have expressed the view that, if they can get funding to attend a GLU conference, they would like the opportunity to present some (draft) findings from their theses or written papers. This has occasionally happened but perhaps this could be explored a little more, accepting that alumni may need more support and encouragement during their session than a more seasoned academic.

My own view is that there are perhaps too many papers crammed into some sessions to allow both the presenter to expand sufficiently on her/his topic and for participants to engage in debate and discussion. Already, the conferences operate on the basis of three or four parallel streams: if it is not possible to limit the number of presentations to deal with the problem identified above, it might be worth increasing the number of parallel sessions.

Certainly, academics, perhaps naturally, dominate the sessions. There have been few union people either at the conferences or presenting papers. It would be worth exploring with both global unions and host country national centres as to whether they could make some relevant presentations, on the proviso that these must meet the same standards as other papers/presentations. This is perhaps one reason why the FES has indicated to me that it is less interested in funding the conferences than in funding the curriculum workshops.

One of the more serious problems with the conferences is the gross gender imbalance. Very few women present papers and on panels or in opening speeches they are virtually absent. Some way of encouraging more visibility of and participation by women must be found.

The conferences are very traditional in format: a number of papers briefly outlined by the author(s) and then some discussion. If it does not present funding problems for some of the academics, some of whom have to present a 'paper' to get university funding, it might be worth looking at other formats as well, such as poster sessions, some drama or debates, etc.

The Curriculum Workshop

At the 2008 meeting of the steering committee in Brazil, it was agreed that, following a successful trial one-day curriculum workshop the day before the Brazil GLU conference, a more programmed workshop would be attached to the next GLU conference. The idea was to allow an exchange, mainly amongst GLU teaching staff from all campuses, of course material and approaches, styles of teaching, course content, GLU resource material, discussions on the preparedness of GLU students for economics discussions and research methods and related issues. The workshop was held on the two days immediately preceding the GLU conference.

Most of the parallel sessions were relatively informal. It was not expected that any formal decisions would be taken, although people were reminded that one of the original GLU agreements had been

that academics should post on their own campus website and/or on ILIAS their course outlines and resource material.

One session that I attended featured Christoph Scherrer from UniKassel showing how he used the ILIAS web-based system to video some of his course sessions at Kassel such that students who had missed a session or who, because of language or conceptual difficulties, wanted to go back over the session at leisure on a computer could do so. This led to an interesting discussion on whether it would be possible for students in other countries to access such material on topics that their own campus was not strong in teaching. Alternatively, could it be arranged that a live video conference could be held such that a professor from one campus could interact with students on another campus. The obvious answer in both cases was Yes.

It seems to have been agreed that the experiment was very successful and worth repeating in future years.

Appendix: 2009 Questions used for the GLU Project Evaluation

The following questions were used in the meetings with relevant stakeholders. The only change from the 2008 questions is 2 d), a detailed question on the reintegration of alumni into the labour movement.

1. General questions

- a) Do you think that the programme is meeting the needs of the union movement? Why/why not? What could be done to address any inadequacies?
- b) What are the advantages, disadvantages, avoidable problems etc. from having a multi-campus, multi-country basis for the programme?
- c) What problems arise from the English-language-based nature of the programme, both from the point of view of teaching/learning and the use/generation of resource material?
- d) Is it important to have as much of the global programme 'standardised' as opposed to have very flexible approaches for each campus?
- e) What are the advantages/disadvantages of having a multiplicity of teaching staff, especially visiting teaching staff?
- f) Do you think that programme is sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of all concerned? How could this be improved?
- g) Do you think that the programme has been sufficiently advertised, promoted and explained to current actors and to others? If not, what needs to be done to rectify this?
- h) Can the programme cope with the current rate of expansion? Should the GLU be looking for a more permanent structure and staffing to support the administration of the programme?

2. Questions for participants

- a) Are you happy with the programme as a whole? Why/why not?
- b) (Alumni only) Did the programme made a difference to your work. What did you do before; what are you doing now?
- c) (Alumni only) Was your research work during the course of interest and value for a trade union?
- d) (Alumni only) What has the reintegration process back into your own country been like? (This will include details of whether the graduate has gone back into her/his original employment or not, what kind of reception he/she has had from that employer and colleagues and whether there is any evidence that the graduate's skills, knowledge and experience are being put to appropriate use.)
- e) Are there particular problems of a logistical nature – accommodation, travel, living expenses, etc. – that could be dealt with better?
- f) Is the course work reasonable in terms of workloads and time-scale?
- g) What positive experiences for you, for the host organisation and for your union in the internship experience?
- h) Have there been problems with the internship arrangements? Such as? How could these be overcome?
- i) Are you happy with the teaching/tutorials/seminars provided through the programme? If not, how could this be improved?
- j) Do you feel that you get sufficient support from your union and from the relevant GUFs, both in terms of political support, internship arrangements and in benefiting from your experience when you finish your course? How could this be optimised?

3. For teaching staff

- a) Are you satisfied with the quality of students being selected for the course/ Why/why not? How could it be improved?
- b) Do you think that quality of work produced by students is adequate? If there have been lapses, what needs to be done to rectify this?
- c) Are there difficulties in getting other university colleagues or your institution to accept the validity of this programme? How can this be overcome?
- d) Do you think that you and the students get sufficient support from the student's unions and from the relevant Global Unions, both in terms of political support, internship arrangements and in benefiting from the students when they finish their course? How could this be optimised?
- e) Do you feel that it is easy enough to get useful and valuable resource material for the programme? If not, how could this be improved?
- f) How useful do you think the internship programme has been? Could it be improved? How?
- g) Are you satisfied with the support by the ILO; what would you expect in addition?

4. For Global Unions, national trade union centres and any relevant national unions

- a) Do you see your particular needs and those of the union movement as a whole being met in this programme? Why/why not? If there is some dissatisfaction, what needs to be done to address this?
- b) How useful do you think the internship programme has been? Has it posed any problems for your organisation? Could it be improved? How?
- c) Do you think that it is possible and desirable for Global Unions to be more involved in the teaching programme? How and why?
- d) Do you think that unions are sufficiently integrated into the delivery of the programme?

5. For other partners (mainly the funders/ILO, etc)

- a) Do you see a need to look for more effective ways of using the resources that you are providing for the programme? How?
- b) Do you think that feedback so far justifies your level of support for the programme? If there are deficiencies, what are these and how can they be addressed?
- c) Do you think that all the partners who resource the programme share the same objectives and work sufficiently well together? Are they involved in the programme as much as they would wish?