



# **Monitoring of the Global Labour University: a 2008 interim report**

**Prepared by:**

**Mike Waghorne**

## Introduction

At the Meeting of the International Steering Committee of the GLU in September 2007 the Steering Committee decided to have an evaluation process of the GLU. 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 have 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

The Evaluator 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 the evaluator was requested to undertake interviews with participants, teaching staff, national trade union centres, Global Unions, donors and support institutions. He 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)

As far as was possible, the same questions were used for the visit to each site but the issue of the timing of the visit within the academic year at each institution meant that some variation was unavoidable.

It was agreed that the project manager would provide the Evaluator with all necessary project documents

Project documents

Progress reports  
 Evaluations of courses by students  
 An alumni and Summer School questionnaire used in 2007  
 Evaluations of internships

Where such documents existed, I have been provided with these.

### Scope of the evaluation

I was requested to visit the GLU partners in South Africa, Brazil and Germany twice each over the period involved and India once. I was also invited to the 2008 GLU Summer School to undertake interviews with GLU Alumni. I was requested to provide a first interim report in mid-2008 and a final report in mid-2009. This report is the first of these.

### Timetable

The original prospective timetable for the evaluation was as follows:

	Working days
Johannesburg, South Africa	3 days, December 2007
Kassel, Germany	3 days, January 2008
Campinas, Brazil	6 days, April 2008
Interim Report	10 days April/ May 2008
Berlin (GLU Summer School)	3 days, September 2008
Johannesburg, South Africa	3 days, December 2008
Kassel, Germany	3 days, January 2009
Mumbai, India	6 days, April 2009
Campinas, Brazil	3 days, July 2009
Summer School/Steering Committee	3 days, September 2009
Final Evaluation Report	10 days November 2009

Later developments in the timing of various conferences and getting feedback from people on draft reports on each site visit have meant that the 2008 deadlines have slipped, such that report is being prepared in June 2008. Dates for later 2008 and 2009 site visits have yet to be confirmed.

### Three interim site reports

I have visited South Africa, Germany and Brazil, as indicated in the timetable above. I have completed three reports on these visits, attached as appendices to this report. They are the basis for this synthesis report.

### Evaluation findings

The bulk of the rest of this report takes each of the terms of reference as the skeleton on which my observations have been based.

#### 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.*

The first point to be made in this regard is that the ILO is, in fact, only one of several partners in this project, including, especially, its role as a funding partner.

It also has to be recognised that 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.

The universities have very different interests. In Germany, there is a very rich and old university history and culture, in which participation in an international programme such as the GLU is consistent with both working to support development objectives and enhancing the reputation of the involved uni-

versities nationally and globally. In all of the other countries, even where the university concerned has a high reputation nationally, the incentive to gain international recognition as a valued partner in a global programme and to build the international reputation of the university is very high, something on which all university administrators with whom I spoke raised spontaneously.

In all cases, it seems to me that the objectives of a development orientation are being well met.

From the students' perspective, there is clear evidence that all students 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 they know what they **want**, long/medium-term, but that is not the same as knowing what they **need**.

There seems to be some consensus amongst students and unions that a circular relationship may exist here: 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 agenda 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 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 have been problems in getting the national centres adequately involved in the objectives-setting of the GLU. Some of this results from the fact that unions and national centres have many issues on their plate and, even if they are committed to the GLU concept, they are not always able to allocate resources inside the organisation to publicise the GLU to members/affiliates nor to developing their own policy attitudes to the requirements of a GLU.

In all cases, 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.

### 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. However, there are some issues that need attention:

- Language: this is discussed below in the section on the selection of candidates.
- 'Northern students' (i.e., those from OECD countries) in those programmes in the south and in Europe: this is discussed in some detail in the next section.
- Internships: this issue is discussed in more detail below.

## 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

So far, results from 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.

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 that website selection and to develop the links amongst all of the GLU partners. It is hoped that the 2008 GLU Summer School and the second round of site visits in 2009 can start to collect evidence on this matter.

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 rank and file 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 centre or Global Union Federation channels. Many are finding it through contacts with other students or through Internet searches. This is an area that needs more attention, although increased efforts have begun in 2008.

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 put down 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 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.

Within that reservation, however, almost all students and faculty are very positive about the multicultural approaches being followed and the education they are experiencing by having colleagues from other countries on their course.

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 three GLU global conferences: (Kassel, 2006; Johannesburg, 2007; and Campinas, 2008). There have all been well attended, with a good mixture of faculty from all GLU campuses, ILO staff, donor/funding bodies and students (usually from the local campus). 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 the ways in which unions/labour are involved in national policy-making around global issues such as trade.

### 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. However, the comments in this section should be read as also addressing some of the criteria in the next section.

In the case of Germany, the problems arise because the number of students involved and the potential of having to contact host organisations throughout Europe and arrange accommodation for students during the internships demands a lot of time and has, for some students, not been completed sufficiently ahead of their placement to have enabled them to have sorted out precisely what they will be doing during the internship or who in the host organisation will be assisting them.

In South Africa, internships have been arranged satisfactorily so far but that has been with very small classes. As the Wits classes grow to an optimal size, more thought will need to be put into internship coordination. The other problem for the Wits course is that there are no global headquarters of GUFs and no significant ILO presence in South Africa – the source of many of the internships in the German programme. Whether union and union-oriented organisations will be able to absorb a full-sized class in that country needs to be tested; otherwise, it may be necessary to find resources that allow students from Wits to travel to Europe or elsewhere. An additional problem with this latter option is that the Wits internship is much shorter than are those in other campuses in the GLU and may make it more difficult to justify the costs involved for such a short period of time.

In Brazil, it is simply too soon to say. At the time of the site visit there, no arrangements had yet started for internships. People were aware that there might be language difficulties in placing English-speaking students in what will be predominantly Portuguese-speaking host organisation.

- *Coordination resources:* Some of the problems of finding sufficient resources for course coordinators have just 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, do 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 these 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.

- *Selection of candidates:* Whilst, in general, faculty have been very happy with the quality of most students, it is clear that, in a few cases, people needed much more preparation before they arrived at the campus, usually because of their language difficulties. 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 issues arise from this:
  - The FES offices in the home countries could be used to interview shortlisted candidates, to assess their current and potential English language capacity. Joachen Steinhilber from the Brazil office of the FES indicated during my discussion with him that that would be something that the FES could and would do as part of their support for the GLU.
  - Latin American unions need to find some way of dealing with the paucity of such students at all of the courses, especially in Campinas. It may be that more effort needs to go into finding potential students who have an acceptable level of English; and a programme needs to be set up to develop English language skills amongst a larger number of Latina American unionists – something that is needed beyond the GLU as far as global unionism is concerned.
- *Access to relevant literature:* From what I can see, all of the courses rely heavily on photocopying English texts for student course work. Some students complain 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 GLU workshop held on the day before the GLU conference in Campinas in April 2008 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, although it was also stressed that this should not be seen as a GLU-required reading list.

Of course, it is also necessary to see whether more effective use could be made of the Global Union Research Network in identifying, generating and holding such material.

- *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, delays that, in the case of Brazil, for example, might have been fatal for the programme had the university not been in the position of funding GLU activities until all necessary transfers had occurred.

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

All in all, 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 supports the achievement of results.*

Many of the comments made above relating to resources for and problems in coordination apply to this section and will not be repeated here.

The management of the GLU is highly dispersed. There is a GLU Council that meets annually, usually at the time of the global GLU conference, and has representatives from all of the partner interests. The Council elects a Global Steering Committee that operates on a relatively informal basis. Composed of representatives from participating universities and research institutes, national trade union centres and 'labour supporting organisations' (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 most 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.

However, the bureaucratic and physical demands of face-to-face meetings have a cost. For cost reasons these meetings need to be associated with other GLU events like the annual conference or the 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.

Council meetings and 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.

### 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. An opportunity will be taken at the 2008 summer school in Berlin to discuss this further with alumni. However, some kind of survey 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, to see 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 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 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.

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. Some people have queried whether it might have been sensible to delay the commencement of both the Brazil and Indian programmes for a further 12 months. Whilst many people believe that, ideally, the GLU should expand to several more countries in the medium term (the UK and Canada have been mentioned), there is a concern that the GLU needs to ensure that it has the governance and administrative capacity to cope with such expansion. This should be put on the agenda of the 2009 Council meeting.

### **Conclusions and recommendations**

The conclusions and recommendations below should be seen as applying to the GLU as a whole or to all campuses. Conclusions and recommendations that apply to only specific campuses can be found at the end of each of the three Appendices to this report.

*Unions and universities:* One issue that arose in more than one country was the question: just what does labour want from universities – not just from the GLU programme? National union centres have all subscribed to and supported the GLU. Yet, it is the case that, 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.

I don't want to suggest that national centres are less than committed to the programme: they would all legitimately deny that. But it may be that one of the issues that the GLU needs to consider is mounting a debate over just what unions want from universities. Some of the 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'. In my own experience as a trade union educator in New Zealand, I can recall a very 'workerist' approach to this kind of thing: some unionists justified poor quality union videos at the time on the basis that 'workers don't want unions to look too professional'. That is arrant nonsense, but there is a generational issue that we have to take seriously here.

Many senior unionists came up through the ranks and, in their union history, 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.

Yet, especially in developing countries, many, if not most, union members will not have had access to university and would not regard university students/graduates as 'proper' union members.

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.

The GLU needs to have a serious discussion with unions on this issue. It could, perhaps, be the subject of a plenary session at the next GLU conference.

*Internships:* in one form or another, internships have emerged as an issue in all three 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:

- Length and weighting: there is no common understanding as to how long an internship should be and what weighting it should have in the overall student assessment. To some extent, this is an unavoidable problem, since national/university regulations for each campus may well set conditions for such issues and these will have to be lived with.
- Purpose: The debate has been over whether the internship is a typical one – the placement of a person in a host/sponsoring organisation where the intern will be given a project that is of use to the organisation and will extend the intern's experience and knowledge – or whether it is an opportunity to do some field research/study for the student's course research study/thesis. Of course, it is not impossible, through negotiation, for both of these objectives to be met in the one placement but this is not always the case.

It is clear that some GLU partners were very specific, in their initial support for the GLU, that the first of these understandings – a classic internship - was what had been agreed when the GLU was established and they would be reluctant to see the second option replace this. This is somewhat different from the first bullet point, in so far as the very short internship in the Wits course tends to move students towards the second option, whilst the much longer internship being considered for the Tata programme leans heavily towards the former.

Again, this is something that the GLU Council might wish to discuss.

- *Student and host organisation expectations*: This relates to both of the previous points. In the negotiations amongst the students, the potential host organisation and the coordinators, there is a need for all parties to agree on the above matters, otherwise the host body thinks that is getting someone who, with support and supervision, will be doing a real 'project' from which the host will benefit (as well as the student, of course) whilst the student may think that he/she is simply getting a desk and an opportunity to ask highly relevant people useful questions that will feed into the course thesis.

I don't think that this latter point is a matter for the GLU Council but, rather, for each campus and its coordinators to talk through with its students and potential hosts, assuming that the GLU Council has resolved the two previous issues.

*Research experience*: There was a feeling amongst some faculty that the quality of students, although acceptable at present, could be improved if there was some information at the application stage, of the kind of research expertise and experience of potential students.

*Guidance on multicultural behaviour*: It is clear that there have been some internal dynamics/problems inside the student groups at Kassel and Campinas – personal and logistical - and this has caused some tension. It seems that it will be necessary in future to make it clear to students that, whilst the course coordinator can help with initial logistical problems with accommodation, it is up to students to set up a process that enables them to deal with domestic personal or group dynamics issues; although it will also need to be made clear to applicants for the programme that behaviour which potentially denigrates the GLU reputation or interferes with the ability of other students to pursue their course without harassment will result in a withdrawal of GLU scholarships.

Such an approach ought to be a very early part of the introduction to each course. Whilst I have stressed the responsibilities of the students to deal with their own issues in these matters (they are all adults, after all), it is probably the duty of the university to help them in setting up mutually agreed rules and processes for handling conflicts.

*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.

This is, in some ways, linked to the fact that some students feel that trade union issues are not well integrated into the programme or well planned; that unions are not sufficiently built into the courses. They felt that that there were not enough trade union issues or material in some courses; they feel that

there is a need for more trade union inputs into the teaching. However, some of the students making this comment were not familiar with the annual GLU workshop held in Berlin that covers these issues.

They also believe, and some faculty 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.

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. The FES suggestion that their offices in the countries from which potential students come might be able to interview them to assess their English language ability should be explored.

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

Further, it would be useful for the GLU to explore with the CUT and other Latin American trade union bodies ways in which either potential students who have competence in English can be encouraged to enrol in GLU programme, at UNICAMP especially, or programmes can be set up in each country to develop the English language skills of more trade unionists.

*Union expectations:* It seems that 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. 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.

*Resource material:* Whilst some faculty believe that access to modern English resource material is not really a problem, it is clear that many students do not agree with this view. It would be useful for faculty and coordinators to discuss this with students to see whether this is a real problem or just one of perception and whether some action is necessary. For example, 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.

In this regard, it might be worth exploring the idea that emerged from the workshop held on the day before the GLU conference in Brazil 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 in the main report. As more experience is gained, some of the coordination problems will be solved. If more student classes can be encouraged to follow the example of the Campinas students, by compiling 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.

*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 and faculty seem to be passionate about achieving this objective. An opportunity will be taken at the 2008 summer school in Berlin to discuss this further with alumni. 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, to see 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 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 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.

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. Some people have queried whether it might have been sensible to delay the commencement of both the Brazil and Indian programmes for a further 12 months. Whilst many people believe that, ideally, the GLU should expand to several more countries in the medium term (the UK and Canada have been mentioned), there is a concern that the GLU needs to ensure that it has the governance and administrative capacity to cope with such expansion. This should be put on the agenda of the 2009 Council meeting.

*Meeting union needs:* 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 agenda 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.

*GLU promotion and advertising:* There seems to be agreement that the GLU is not being sufficiently advertised and promoted amongst rank and file 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 Federation channels. Many are finding it through contacts with other students or through Internet searches. The 2008 summer school might be an event to 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.

This is an area that needs more attention, although increased efforts have begun in 2008, after discussion about more widespread use of the GLU poster and brochure, their production in a larger number of languages, the creation of a Wikipedia GLU page and more active use of unions and alumni to propagate the GLU name.

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.

Mike Waghorne  
10 November 2008

## Appendix 1: GLU Project Evaluation: draft report from the first site visit to South Africa

This is a draft report of the visit in late November-early December 2007 by Mike Waghorne to Wits University to evaluate the South African element of the Global Labour University. It is a draft both in the sense that it needs discussion with the people in Johannesburg and it will itself form a basis for a later draft report of the first stage of the global evaluation to be completed in mid-2008.

The evaluation of the whole global programme is still in discussion; for the purposes of the Johannesburg visit, a draft set of terms of reference had been agreed between the GLU and the evaluator, Mike Waghorne, formerly Assistant General Secretary of PSI, now retired, France. It had been agreed that the Evaluator would 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 the evaluator would be requested to undertake interviews with participants, teaching staff, national trade union centres, Global Unions, donors and support institutions. He was to be guided by an agreed set of questions, two components of which are used below in outlining the views of teaching staff and students.

It had been hoped that a further set of questions of relevance to the local trade union centre, COSATU, could have been discussed with one or more people from the COSATU leadership but all of the leadership team was at the time visiting Ghana. Some general comments about known COSATU thinking are included in what follows.

Similarly, it had been hoped that a further set of questions for the Wits University administration, as the host university could be discussed but the person representing WITS in this capacity, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Rob Moore, is very new to this responsibility, so the remarks arising from the discussion with him, below, are rather more general in nature.

Other than that, three sets of discussions were held over the three-day period:

- A general discussion with those course students still on campus at the time, followed by individual interviews with four of these students;
- A general discussion with those members of the teaching staff who were on campus at the time;
- A final debriefing session with Professor Eddie Webster, who is in charge of the programme at Wits.

What follows are three sets of question areas: a set of general questions discussed with all the staff and students; a set of questions discussed with students only and a set of questions discussed with staff only. These are followed by a summary of COSATU and Deputy Vice-Chancellor Moore positions.

### **General questions (for all people interviewed)**

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 strong feeling that the programme is providing for strong capacity building and communication. There is plenty of space to discuss globalisation issues – which some felt they were now able to explain better. However, there was a feeling from some students that some parts of the course are too theoretical and that more practical work would be useful. COSATU needs to be more involved.

However, one student noted that unions and students might well have different needs. She also noted that students from developed countries need to have a high-quality programme – because of the competition from other courses that might be offering similar content. It was felt that South Africa is a good site for the programme because there is a strong union movement there and good official policies on things such as affirmative action.

Teaching staff noted that the programme may be addressing issues somewhat ahead of the unions' perceived needs – such as climate change – but this is an expected role for such a programme.

Staff felt that the programme is meeting the skills need for unions.

It was also noted that the programme needs – and in Jo'burg is attempting – to meet practical needs of unions, such as timing courses to meet time-release requirements for bodies such as COSATU. As will be noted further below, there is an access problem in South Africa, in terms of whether there are enough COSATU people eligible to start a post-fourth year qualification. This is being addressed.

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

Generally, this is an advantage: countries have different educational needs and capacities. Whilst some common elements need to be in all GLU campus programmes, differences should not be seen as a disadvantage. One student wondered how well the Wits programme could handle the needs of European unionists.

There was some disappointment in the small size of this first course, given the potential to deliver so much from interaction. It was also seen as unfortunate that there seemed little European interest in the Jo'burg course. It was this informal exchange that some saw as the main benefit of such a course.

Staff had a more nuanced view on this: it can present problems but also has lots of opportunity. They tended to feel, differently from students, that uniform standards are not possible and local autonomy is essential. On internships, they felt that these could, theoretically, be more mobile but that there is a need to exploit the annual GLU conferences and global research projects emerging from the summer school concept.

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 people felt that was not a major problem although it clearly represents a challenge for those for whom English is not a first language and can cause some communication problems amongst students. It was suggested that some such students might benefit from a longer pre-course ESL programme, either at home or on early arrival.

A related question was that, even if the students left with manageable English, there was still the fact that most useful union research is in English, which does not help other union researchers, etc. with whom these students would need to work when they get back home.

Staff felt that there might be a need to review the assessment of applicants with these things in mind.

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

Whilst everyone was very keen to support flexibility, there was more of a tendency for students to support more globally common elements throughout the GLU as opposed to staff who saw this as more difficult to achieve. Students were keen to be able to interact with those on other campuses.

One student commented that it is difficult to get varied and high-quality internships in the campuses outside of Europe and it would be a pity if this led to the German programme being seen as of more value than the others. Perhaps, she suggested, it was necessary to focus on the differences that each campus could optimise and then advertise those as strengths. This latter was something supported by staff.

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

Everyone saw this as a major advantage of the programme, especially if there was non-local staff available. Staff felt that such people brought in new literature sources and approaches. There was, however, a feeling amongst students that they would like to see more trade union officials used as course teachers/presenters.

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

Most people were positive about the flexibility, although see the comments below on student concerns about the electives part of the programme.

Staff felt that the flexibility and the mixing in of more seminars, etc. might become more difficult as the size of the Wits programme expands. They also agreed that more needs to be done to formalise contacts with unions but they stressed that this must not compromise the essential need to have a first class degree programme. The staff also raised the question of the perceptions of the unions as to what they really want from a university programme, a point that we will revisit in the discussion of CO-SATU's position.

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?

This was difficult for some people to answer: they knew what had happened in their own country but not how the GLU was being promoted internationally or about which channels/media were being used. Could the GLU brochure be translated into more languages? It was felt that it needs a very active promotion through as many channels as is possible. One student argued that the GLU should be seen to benefit GUFs, not just their own union.

Staff felt that there was more need to penetrate deeper into unions and for the Jo'burg people to get to more non-Africans.

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?

There was much less unanimity on this question. Some people felt that the GLU should not expand much beyond its current five campuses until expansion within each country had been taken as far as was possible on a sustainable basis although one or two felt that the Canadian and UK links should be explored as a way of getting more unionists from the South into Northern programmes. There was support for the idea of a more permanent GLU secretariat.

One student suggested that there was need for more interaction with those on other campuses – although that is, to some extent, the objective of the alumni summer school that started in 2007.

### **For students**

In an opening round of discussion, a number of general issues were raised:

- A number of students felt that more concentrated research methods work is needed in the course, although they all felt that their general research and policy analysis skills had improved throughout the course;
- The time for the research report component of the course is too short;
- All students valued the electives part of the course and were disturbed that that is some discussion about this being reduced/eliminated;

- They all felt that their ability to read and write more effectively had improved as had their knowledge of global labour challenges;
- There was a strong feeling that the demands of the course and problems of living in and moving around Jo'burg had limited their chance to get to know the host country;
- People were very positive about relationships between staff and students;
- Some students found the costs of living were a strain on their budgets.

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

Most people were very happy with the programme in general. One student was, however, very critical of the culture of Wits University (as opposed to the GLU programme itself), which she saw as not being student-centred. There was some student concern about the workload of the student Coordinator and the heavier workload placed on GLU teaching staff.

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

As noted from the fact that this and the next question were really intended for people who had completed the course, this was not easy for some students to answer at this stage. There were some who were quite convinced that they were both going to be doing more complex work within their current portfolio when they got home as well as taking on other responsibilities; others were not sure that their union/employer was going to know very well how to use their new/expanded skills. This may need further discussion with sponsoring unions both before and after the course in future.

One student felt that the course would not make much difference to the **nature** of the work that she is doing but that it had helped her to understand more about Africa and development.

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

With above caveat in mind, most felt that the course was going to prove useful and relevant but there may be a need for more clear understanding from sponsoring unions about what they were expecting as an outcome. Students might have a 'selling' job when they got home to show the union how they could now be used. It was also noted by one student that it had been difficult to get data from/about his country for some of the research.

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

Students were generally positive and realistic about this. They were on tight budgets but most logistical issues had been handled well. Jo'burg was a problem in terms of security (some felt that they learnt more about South Africa when they visited Durban and Capetown. There had been initial difficulties with computer/internet access for some. Some students also saw access to books as a problem.

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

All students agreed that the course-work demands were very heavy but they accepted that this was the nature of the course. There was general agreement amongst students that the demands of the research report were too demanding in terms of time available

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

For most of the students, this was the least satisfactory part of the programme: they felt that the internship often related poorly to their research report, was not well-organised and was left too late in the year for them to be able to take advantage of it and to be able to explore more varied kinds of research methods. Later discussion with Eddie suggested that it might be better to stop calling it an internship and to see it as a time for fieldwork directly feeding into the research report and that it needs to be set up much earlier so that its relationship to the report can be more easily clarified.

One suggestion is that it might help to have more pre-course planning and discussion on some of these things before the students arrive.

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



This question largely became redundant, in view of the feelings outlined above about the internship. One problem highlighted by one student was there seems to be no university-union structure to ensure cooperation between these two partners.

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

Most students were happy with the teaching, seeing it as very student-centred although there one or two who felt that, as noted above, some of the course work was too theoretical. One student suggested that it might be interesting to ask trade union education staff to comment on some of the course teaching material. Some students would like more trade union officials involved in teaching; some would have liked more seminars.

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?

Not many students really expected much support from their union apart from the initial sponsorship to the programme, although this was seen in any negative sense. Nobody really felt that they had any contact with any GUFs but this is more likely to be an issue for students in the German programme, who have more GUF contacts.

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

This was a redundant question, given earlier discussions.

#### **For teaching staff:**

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

Staff were very happy with the student quality: students were contributing to other programmes in which they were participating, even if, in some cases, they had some catching up to do. They bring a 'worldly' experience to classes.

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?

It may be too early to tell yet. Course-work has been good and students have visibly improved over the year but research reports have not yet been produced.

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

There have been no problems from other School of Social Sciences and Wits colleagues. The students, as noted above, are well accepted in other courses and seen to be a plus.

At the time of the evaluation, there was a dialogue in progress about fees for the course for non-SADC countries to be charged from 2008 onwards. The question was not about whether the fee was justified but the fact that the university announced the increase rather late, after budgets for the Jo'burg programme for 2008 had been set. Eddie was hopeful that this could be resolved.

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?

It was felt that students get good support, even financially in some cases. However, as already noted in the students' comments, the internships have been a problem and it may be that this needs to be reconsidered and a better relationship with unions developed in terms of better support for these being seen as fieldwork experiences that unions are providing.

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

It was agreed that this question is now redundant in the light of earlier comments.

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?

It was accepted that this could be a problem. It was agreed that the programme needs to evaluate its book ordering for this course – it may not be enough. It was also suggested that the idea of seeing whether it was possible to arrange that students went home with a useful research/resource file of material should be explored.

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

This has already been discussed earlier and there was no further input on this.

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

It was unanimously agreed that Frank Hoffer has been outstanding in his support for the programme and that the ILO's support for the Coordinator position has been very useful.

**COSATU's position**

On the Thursday morning of the evaluation, Eddie and Mike attended a birthday celebration for DIT-SELA – the Development Institute for Training Support and Education for Labour, a joint COSATU-FEDUSA initiative. One of the useful debates that was addressed by several speakers was the question of what trade unions actually want from universities, given that they are much dependent on public/tax finances. Should they be places that equip people, including workers/unionists, to be able to serve the population of the institution's catchment area or places that simply refresh and re-create skills for capital/employers? If they are to be the former, what needs to change in the way these institutions are structured and run? Would unions get more value from better-resourced technical institutes than from academic universities?

The GLU staff had asked in the evaluation whether COSATU and the rest of the union movement knew whether it wanted a theoretically based or a practical research-based programme. Does the programme have to be an MA course – as a 'counter' to MBAs – or could it be something less? The latter question, it must be stressed, was not a question of quality: whatever option is chosen must be a first-class course of high quality.

These are all questions that COSATU has itself been addressing in terms of the Wits GLU programme. COSATU has been supportive of the programme and has nominated applicants. However, its capacity to nominate more applicants is limited by the political realities of South Africa – there are simply few black workers/unionists with the educational experience/background that qualifies them to enter a fifth year university course. There are many with a first degree but few with the fourth year honours degree that would qualify them for the GLU MA programme.

However, a new honours programme has now started at Wits, with COSATU as a partner, and it is hoped that this will generate a pool of students from whom GLU applicants could be selected. If this eventuates, then it would appear that COSATU would feel happier in being a full GLU partner. As noted, however, more work remains to be done on building GLU-COSATU structures and relationships that build COSATU into the programme more effectively and enriches students' fieldwork experiences.

**Deputy Vice-Chancellor Rob Moore**

Rob Moore is relatively new in his position but is technically responsible for the oversight of the Wits GLU programme. He frankly admitted that his detailed knowledge of the programme was very slight and much of the time was taken up in explaining the concept, globally as well as the Wits component.

He was very positive about the need for such a programme in South Africa and flattered that the ILO and the GLU had chosen Wits as the South African campus. He felt that it would add to Wits' reputation and its capacity to be relevant. He believed strongly that the programme must become and be sustainable and acknowledged that Wits had a role in this regard.

He was also interested in the above set of questions raised by the COSATU discussion and felt that the track being followed by COSATU was the correct one, which Wits should support.

He offered his continuing support and hoped to be in a more informed position for the second site visit of the evaluation in 2008.

**Conclusions**

In a de-briefing session with Eddie Webster at the end of my visit, we both agreed that both the GLU as a whole and the Jo'burg people need to address the questions raised in the COSATU section: just what does labour want from universities – not just from the GLU programme.

We agreed that the internship question must be resolved for 2008, preferably by ceasing to call it such and exploring, instead, a better organised basis for union-based fieldwork for the research reports.

It was also felt that it might be useful to look more closely at applicants' background in previous research work, since the research report plays such a large role in the Wits course.

Mike Waghorne  
02 January 2008

## **Appendix 2: GLU Project Evaluation: draft report from the first 2008 site visit to Kassel**

This is a draft report of the visit in Early January 2008 by Mike Waghorne to UniKassel to evaluate the German element of the Global Labour University. It is a draft both in the sense that it needs discussion with the people in Kassel and Berlin and it will itself form a basis for a later draft report of the first stage of the global evaluation to be completed in mid-2008.

The evaluation of the whole global programme is still in discussion; for the purposes of the Kassel visit, a draft set of terms of reference had been agreed between the GLU and the evaluator, Mike Waghorne, formerly Assistant General Secretary of PSI, now retired, France. It had been agreed that the Evaluator would 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 the evaluator would be requested to undertake interviews with participants, teaching staff, national trade union centres, Global Unions, donors and support institutions. He was to be guided by an agreed set of questions, three components of which are used below in outlining the views of teaching staff, students and union partners.

A series of discussions was held over the three-day period:

- A general discussion with two student representatives, followed by a group discussion with all students;
- A discussion with those members of the Berlin staff who were in Kassel at the time for a meeting of the German National Steering Committee;
- A meeting with the University President, Professor Rolf-Dieter Postlep;
- A meeting with Michael Rudolph from the regional office of the DGB.

It had also been intended to interview Dieter Eich, representing the central office of the DGB. This was not possible and it was agreed that he would answer a series of questions by e-mail, which he has done.

In addition, I sat in on the meeting of the National Steering Committee and also had discussions with Ph. D. students on the Global Social Policies and Governance programme, which included two alumni of the GLU programme.

What follows are four sets of question areas: a set of general questions discussed with both staff and students; a set of questions discussed with students only; a set of questions discussed with Berlin staff only; and questions discussed with DGB representatives. These are followed by a summary of the discussion with Professor Postlep.

### **General questions**

1. 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 strong feeling that the programme is providing for strong capacity building and communication but the student reps wondered whether it is penetrating very deeply into unions. They felt that there needs to be a better relationship amongst the GLU, GUFs and unions. They also noted that some of the students have somewhat precarious jobs – either having had to resign from their union employment to take on the course or having been given rather vague promises about their future when they return home. They felt that increased certainty about the future might have to be built into the selection criteria if the goal of having people return to their unions is to be optimised.

They also asked whether the entry requirements for students for this Masters programme might pose class and gender barriers from some countries if they do not have a recognition of prior learning policy such as exists in South Africa.

Berlin staff believed that the programme is still being developed in terms of topics and research projects. They felt that it was difficult to get textbooks with a union focus.

Michael Rudolph from the Regional DGB was positive about this: the knowledge of international processes is important at the local level and a one-year programme can help with this. The national DGB view, as expressed by Dieter Eich, is that union requirements differ greatly around the world and have to be viewed in terms of local needs. The GLU course attempts to weave a common thread between the problems involved and apportions a relatively large amount of blame to the phenomenon of globalisation and its theoretical basis. One important aspect is the question of how this influences the use of theoretical findings and knowledge in everyday union practice.

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

Generally, student reps felt that the programme is still too much in its infancy to be sure about this. They felt that there needs to be a better balance between Kassel and Berlin in terms of economics versus other courses.

However, they accepted that the blend of different experiences (in Germany and globally) gives people a wider view.

They also raised the question of whether it was possible to attract more non-scholarship students since a wider and larger pool of students would be a plus.

Berlin staff thought that, on balance, the advantages outweighed the disadvantages: it can be stressful for some students (moving between campuses) and there are some logistical problems. There are transaction costs, especially in exchange programmes, where money can be a problem. However, it broadens students' minds.

Michael Rudolph from the Regional DGB was positive about this: the knowledge of international processes is important at the local level, otherwise international union work is too centralised. Nationally, the DGB feels that the multi campus has many benefits because it provides an exceptional situation (foreign language, foreign culture and organisational and student-related difficulties) in which a comfortably sized group of people from different countries attempts to organise everyday activities, academic studies and available knowledge. This is a great opportunity for people to work on their own intercultural skills and acquaint themselves with new ways of dealing with others and of learning within a closed group.

3. 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 people felt that was not a major problem although it clearly represents a challenge for those for whom English is not a first language and can cause some communication problems amongst students. Long and/or dense course texts can cause a problem for some students. It was suggested that having written lecture texts and/or perhaps taped sessions put on the website might help non-native speakers to be able to go back over these at their leisure. In fact, the student reps suggested that closer attention be paid to exploiting IT possibilities.

Berlin staff felt that it was difficult to check the English ability of students very well before they arrived and, for some of them, thesis writing is a problem.

Michael noted that English as a global language is a reality and so such a programme was good. Dieter's view was that, depending on students' educational background (and with the exception of the few native speakers in the group), the English-language course presents the same hurdles for all students who are faced with learning a new language and using it in everything they do. Teaching staff face similar challenges because the German lecturers are forced to work far more intensively with available English-language literature and must use it almost exclusively for this one particular course. Acquiring the literature and access to English-language publications pose less of a problem.

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

Whilst everyone was very keen to support flexibility, differences should be optimised. At the least, it should be possible for students from different course to have a common discourse. Some key modules should be common, thought Berlin staff, but each site should develop its own strengths.

Michael believed that regional/country differences are important and knowledge of them can serve local needs. He wondered whether the local DGB should be on the national steering committee. The DGB national view is that it is important to standardise a specific theoretical section of the course and to update it at regular intervals to take in the latest research results. This means that partner universities should use the same academic literature in similar courses.

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

Everyone saw this as a major advantage of the programme. Staff felt that such people brought in new literature sources and approaches. There was, however, a feeling amongst students that they would like to see more trade union officials used as course teachers or presenters. The use of visiting lecturers could create a problem if there were too many and students could not establish ongoing relationships with them.

Berlin staff saw this as very important but not yet sufficiently advanced. More teachers from the South are needed (and *vice versa*). It would help if visiting staff could stay long enough to be able to take part in grading some course work and/or in theses.

Michael was positive about this: it brings a variety of staff, although there can be problems if they do not stay long enough. [There was discussion at this point on how much of the German IR system should feature in the course.]

Dieter felt that it is important to bring on board the teachers involved in key problem areas. The finer nuances open peoples eyes to the very heterogeneous situation resulting from similar phenomena.

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

Most people were positive about the flexibility and student reps valued the electives. The latter thought that there was perhaps too much of a US orientation in the lectures.

It will not always be possible to consider everyone's needs according to Dieter. Attempts will however be made to identify the key elements and take them up.

7. 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?

The student reps felt that the programme was not well advertised and that too many people came across it by accident, rather than through a well-marketed process. They felt that some union leaders have an anti-academic bias and do not pass on GLU material throughout their union.

Berlin staff felt that this has not been done well in Germany and the rest of Europe but they were not sure whether this was a marketing problem or whether such a course was less interesting to European students. If the course is to be attractive to business for funding and support, this may be a problem, since business may not see it as a useful course. Certainly, getting to rank-and-file unionists is a major problem: we need to find out **how** the message gets out.

Michael, who has spent some time in working in Italy with unions there, believed that more GLU material should be in other languages, even if the course itself is in English – especially in brochures and the GLU website, so that it reaches more people without the filter of national leaders. Perhaps there should be more pre-course English language programmes.

He felt that more GLU material should be got out to rank-and-file list-serves.

The national DGB view is that the target community is very big. Distribution lists have already been tested, but there are still some gaps. Trying to reach people interested in the course through advertising is futile. It is far more important to sensitise union circles and the alumni organisation.

8. 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?

There was much less unanimity on this question. Some people felt that the GLU should not expand much beyond its current five campuses until expansion within each country had been taken as far as was possible on a sustainable basis. The idea of a steady, managed, step-by-step expansion was supported. There was support for the idea of a more permanent GLU secretariat but also for the development of a GLU cadre/network that could act as promoters of the GLU.

The Berlin staff thought that suggestions such as Christoph Scherrer's proposed new Certificate course should be explored. They also wondered whether it might be possible to double the German programme by having one half start in Kassel and the other half in Berlin.

Christof Diertele felt that the promotion of the GLU needs to be more professional: perhaps the FES can help; there needs to be more discussion with the GUFs; the GLU needs to use the summer school more actively for course promotion. He noted that new global coordinator who was being appointed whilst I was in Kassel would be able to address some of these issues.

Michael was not sure about this: perhaps there could be parallel course with global and local focuses?

Dieter believes that the current expansion phase, which takes in Africa, Brazil and India, is extremely ambitious. The situation in India is very different from that in Brazil. The language barrier is less evident in South Africa and India than in Brazil. It is important to signal that the GLU is not Eurocentric but wishes to maintain the high standard of being as diversified as possible. This is an established and robust structure in Germany. The GLU should therefore encourage more cooperation with partner universities and, once two courses have been completed, assess whether the deficits can be remedied or whether the GLU should concentrate on cooperating with fewer partners in future.

## **For students**

I. Are you happy with the programme as a whole? Why/why not?

Most students were very happy with the programme in general and valued the opportunity it was providing. Inevitably, there were a number of logistical and programme issues which they wished to mention but the fact that many of these, scattered over the rest of this section, are negative should not obscure the truth of that first sentence, which the students as a group endorsed at the end of the discussion with them.

Several felt that the trade union strategies block of course-work was not well integrated and not even well planned in terms of other commitments that at least one of the teaching staff had. In general, it was felt that there were not enough trade union issues in some courses or material on state policies. This question was brought up again under question viii) below but it was clear that there was considerable division in the group about the trade union strategies block. More material on developing countries would be appreciated.

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

As noted from the fact that this and the next question were really intended for people who had completed the course, this was not easy for some students to answer at this stage. There were some who were quite convinced that they were both going to be doing more complex work within their current portfolio when they got home as well as taking on other responsibilities; others were not sure that their union/employer was going to know very well how to use their new/expanded skills. This may need further discussion with sponsoring unions both before and after the course in future. Several people felt that it would help them with collective bargaining.

Some said that the course would help them personally but were not sure that it would help them to deal with issues in developing countries.

III. Was your research work during the course of interest and value for a trade union (Alumni only)

With above caveat in mind, most felt that the course was going to prove useful and relevant but there may be a need for more clear understanding from sponsoring unions about what they were expecting as an outcome. Students might have a 'selling' job when they got home to show the union how they could now be used and also in countering anti-academic bias in some cases.

A few students had discussed how both they and their union viewed the course before they left home and had discussed likely useful research topics

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

Students were generally positive and realistic about this. They were on tight budgets but most logistical issues had been handled well. Whilst the student accommodation itself was OK, there had been problems in getting odd problems fixed, especially if the Coordinator was temporarily away. It was suggested that it would be useful for students to have a list of all people/agencies involved in the accommodation contract or with responsibility to attending to problems such as water heating.

Some students had experienced travel problems in getting to Kassel, because of the complexity of the Frankfurt connection. Many felt that pre-departure information was too late, inadequate or even misleading (such as accommodation costs).

There were seen to be problems with the exchange programme but that may be because the Brazil programme was just starting this year. More information on such possibilities would have been appreciated earlier. Some people wondered whether account had been taken of the different cost structures in some internship countries.

The Student reps noted (and this was confirmed by Kassel staff) that there had been domestic problems between groups of students and the student reps were not sure that this was their role to deal with. It was suggested that, after an initial month at Kassel, it might be worth the course management scheduling a formal meeting with students to establish ground rules for dealing with problems. Students as a whole felt that, as adults, they ought to accept responsibility for this.

V. Is the course work reasonable in terms of workloads and time-scale?

All students agreed that the course-work demands were very heavy but they accepted that this was the nature of the course. As one person said: 'it's doable', but it was noted that for those not on a scholarship, the workload made the possibility of part-time jobs to earn extra money in Kassel out of the question.



It was also felt that reliance on the internal e-mail system for important course messages (especially any rescheduling of sessions) sometimes causes problems if such messages are sent out too late for those not able to access e-mail frequently. One or two students complained about the inadequacy of computers in the university library but others indicated that these people obviously had not picked up on the wider range of internet-capable computers in the university. It was suggested that the GLU should explore the possibility of getting computers for GLU students. [In this regard, there is an NGO in the UK, Computer Aid International that provides used, upgraded computers for developing countries and they might be worth approaching to see if they can assist with GLU students from such countries.]

VI. What positive experiences for you, for the host organisation and for your union in the internship experience?

For this and the next question, it needs to be remembered that, although arrangements for internships had been made (for most), nobody had yet experienced their internship. There was a feeling that a number of administrative problems relating to deciding on internship host organisations, internship projects/content and local logistical issues had been problematic, especially in terms of adequate planning lead times. Questions were asked as to whether more of this could be done before people arrived at Kassel.

One suggestion is that it might help to have more pre-course planning and discussion on some of these things before the students arrive.

People agreed that the internships are very flexible although some felt that they might be too long. There was no unanimity on whether they should be seen as stand-alone placements or closely related to research topics. There was some agreement with the notion that internships should enable students to compare theoretical knowledge with pragmatics and help with developing the curriculum.

VII. Have there been problems with the internship arrangements? Such as? How could these be overcome?

This question largely became redundant, in view of the feelings outlined above about the internship. As noted, I had a session with a group of Ph. D. students that included two alumni who had been through the course, one of whom was assisting with internships arrangements for the current students. They felt that the debate on whether the internship programme should be a stand-alone placement or field research was worth pursuing but that the internship in the German programme came too early for people to use it for the latter, since they had often not yet chosen their research topic. The original idea had been that this is a chance to learn about global labour bodies.

They also questioned whether GUFs always knew what they wanted researched/done during an internship. Was it possible to use their affiliates more?

They also agreed with the doubts raised elsewhere as to whether unions knew how to use the students at the end of their course and that it might be worth trying to build this into the application process. They also suggested that it might be worth surveying alumni on their experience of the transition back into their own union and that students should be encouraged to keep in regular contact with their union throughout the course.

They and other Ph. D. students all felt that GLU students brought valuable experience and insights into other courses in which they participated.

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

Most students were happy with the teaching, seeing it as very student-centred although there one or two who felt that, as noted above, some of the course work was too theoretical. It was agreed that structure of the course was good but that there was not enough critical analysis in some courses. Resource material was readily accessible, although some felt that on occasions, photocopied material was handed out too late for students to be prepared for the relevant session. Several students felt that there were too many European authors used, even for material on developing countries. Some ses-

sions had been dominated by a few students familiar with the topic – more effort was needed to get inputs from everyone.

All agreed that more on trade union issues was needed. One suggestion was that the One World Seminars may have been over-planned and that more informality might have allowed more union information and exchange to be covered.

It was suggested that a session on the German industrial relations system earlier in the course would be useful, since so many references were made to this subsequently, assuming that students were familiar with it.

- IX. 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?

Not many students really expected much support from their union apart from the initial sponsorship to the programme, although this was not seen in any negative sense. However, as noted earlier, some students felt that there was not good political support from their union (either indifference or silent opposition) and some had been forced to resign in order to take up the course. Several students were not sure of their future on their return home.

**For Berlin teaching staff and Christof Diertele, the Kassel coordinator:**

- I. Are you satisfied with the quality of students being selected for the course/ Why/why not? How could it be improved?

Berlin staff were very happy with the student quality: they are an interesting group with different knowledge, even if they are not all well-up in economics. There is a preparation course for weaker students. They are highly motivated and eager to learn and bring a 'worldly' experience to classes.

Christof noted that FES staff could be a great help in getting information on applicants and their unions. However, he agreed that it might be useful to add into the initial information from the sponsoring union some questions on how they see the union using the student at the end of the course.

- II. 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?

Yes, compared with other masters students. 'We mix them with other students and they are more advanced on political questions'. They have produced good quality papers and are very practical.

- III. Are there difficulties in getting other university colleagues or your institution to accept the validity of this programme? How can this be overcome?

There have been no problems from other Departments and the university as a whole, which seems to believe that the GLU adds to the university. Other colleagues are keen to teach in this course. They are very union-friendly.

- IV. 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?

The Berlin staff felt that GUFs play no role but it would be good to have more involvement from them (although it should be noted that there is a significant GUFs component in the Berlin Programme but it is not taken by the School of Economics people and so they may not be fully aware of its contents). There is good support from the DGB and they provide some lecturers. They felt that some students get good support from their unions.

- V. 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?

The Berlin staff noted that students could get easy access to all libraries in Berlin and to FES resources.

VI. How useful do you think the internship programme has been? Could it be improved? How?

Berlin staff are not involved in this, although they felt that students benefited from it. Christof noted that the organisers try to start arrangements early but it is difficult to match students with hosts. GUFs, especially, need more information on students' interests and students need to know what GUFs can offer. This sometimes depends on timing if the relevant GUF staff person is due to be on mission somewhere. The logistical arrangements for some internships can be problematic.

VII. Are you satisfied with the support by the ILO; what would you expect in addition?

It was unanimously agreed that Frank Hoffer has been outstanding in his support for the programme as a problem solver.

In addition to the above comments, Christof also noted that the programme is resource demanding and that funding is a problem. He felt that this was the source of many of the logistical problems. Donor money helps with the exchange programme (which is very time-consuming) but the fact that each 'donor' has different reporting requirements creates more bureaucracy.

He also felt that there were some cultural problems amongst students arising from different expectations about the course: in some cases there is a dependency syndrome.

### **The DGB position**

I. Do you see your particular needs being met in this programme? Why/why not? If there is some dissatisfaction, what needs to be done to address this?

Michael Rudolph noted that the local DGB is involved through one student. There has so far not been much institutional contact between the DGB and the university although this is now being established. There have been minimal meetings with students. He felt that local unionists did not yet know how to relate to GLU students. In 2008, there would be a good guest lecturer both at the VW and the GLU

Nationally, the DGB notes that the current programme was adapted on an ongoing basis to take in students' needs. The GLU should, however, try to transfer the complex political and economic issues into the respective unions' everyday practice. This will prevent it from staying on a metalevel and ensure that it remains adaptable and flexible.

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

Michael felt that he was not yet familiar enough with the programme to answer this but believed that the local DGB should be sending more local students to the GLU to deepen their international work.

Dieter felt that this flexibility is to be expected because the feedback facilities provide for ongoing contact with students and for their needs and wishes to be taken into account. His overview focuses solely on the course in Germany, however. The GLU should make this a point of focus for the Steering Committee to ensure that this requirement and its management is discussed and becomes the norm.

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

The internship has been a problem locally because of language problems: there are simply not enough local union people who can handle English. It is easier to place students at the central DGB and the Hans Böckler Foundation.

Dieter's view is that the internships allow important cultural encounters with German unions and their associated organisations. They provide an insight into the everyday realities of the various organisations, enable reflection on one's own work, highlight potential for improvement and reveal workable transfer opportunities. These encounters and meetings must continue. He felt unable to judge whether or not it always makes sense to introduce large groups to the ILO in Geneva.

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

Again, Michael was not sure on this point but Dieter believes that, as regards the Masters degree course, the GLU should avoid placing too much focus on the respective political strategies and needs of the global unions. What is important is the academic base of this course of study, which is currently being enriched by extending invitations to specialists from the global unions. However, he warns against overloading the course in this way.

#### **University President Professor Rolf-Dieter Postlep**

Dr Florian Buch, the university person responsible for strategic planning, accompanied Professor Postlep. Christof Diertele briefed them both on the current students and the 2007-2008 programme.

The President indicated that the GLU objectives are close to those of the Department of Social Sciences. The new Professor of Didactics was very familiar with developing country issues.

He felt that the GLU fits very well with the university's internationalisation objectives and strategies: it was attracting more foreign students, more Ph. D. students, more research collaboration with other universities on a wide range of topics in which Kassel was specialising. The university now had 12.95 of its students from abroad from 110 countries.

He felt that the GLU helped Kassel to get the right balance between 'getting' and 'giving'. He was happy that it was able to put some resources into the GLU programme. He was not aware of any problems posed by the GLU for Kassel: 'I want to further this programme' he concluded.

The Berlin staff noted that their university President was also very supportive of the programme.

#### **For other partners (mainly the funders/ILO, etc):**

Dieter Eich also provided a set of answers aimed at other partners, as follows:

I. 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 still in the implementation phase. This question will only be relevant once the various programmes are in place in India, South Africa and Brazil and the first two courses have been completed. In Germany, the use of funding for the programme alongside the summer school, etc., is an extremely good choice.'

II. 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?

'I think the feedback between students and teachers and between the teaching body, students and the Steering Committee – supplemented by many personal talks – allow for proactive relationships and excellent communication.'

III. 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 various partners are well informed as to the needs and objectives of the GLU and are actively involved. I know of no areas in which improvements have been identified that have not yet been implemented. This is probably due to the fact that much has been done while the courses have been in progress. Cooperation between the sponsors is excellent. One important aspect in this regard is *GLU-Verein der Freunde und Förderer* (Friends of GLU) which supports and sponsors the Masters degree course. All those involved have the opportunity to inform themselves about the current programme and to ask questions or submit suggestions.'

#### **Conclusion**

It is clear that there have been some internal dynamics/problems inside the student group currently at Kassel – personal and logistical - and this has caused some tension. It seems that it will be necessary in future to make it clear to students that, whilst the course coordinator can help with initial logistical problems with accommodation, it is up to students to set up a process that enables them to deal with personal or group dynamics issues.

It is clear that some better resolution of the internships arrangements needs to be found: either converting them into field research experiences that help prepare for the research report exercise or find-

ing a way of making sure that students and their host organisation can agree much earlier on precisely what each party will be offering and gaining.

It would be good if a way could be found for the local DGB people to be more closely involved with the programme but it is clear that language is the barrier here. Certainly, students would like to see more trade union people and trade union issues built into the course.

It should be recalled that some students felt that the trade union strategies block of course-work was not well integrated or well planned. They felt that there were not enough trade union issues in some courses or material on state policies. Since this was not a universal view, it might pay to spend some time before the next course starts on this block of work to get a clear understanding on both sides of what the objectives are and whether everyone's expectations can be met.

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.

It seems that 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. 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.

Mike Waghorne  
09 April 2008

## Appendix 3: GLU Project Evaluation: draft report from the first site visit to the University of Campinas

This is a draft report of the visit in from April 23 – May 2 2008 by Mike Waghorne to Brazil, and the University of Campinas to evaluate the Brazilian element of the Global Labour University. It is a draft both in the sense that it needs discussion with the people in Campinas and it will itself form a basis for a later draft report of the first stage of the global evaluation to be completed in mid-2008.

The evaluation of the whole global programme is still in discussion; for the purposes of the Brazil visit, a draft set of terms of reference had been agreed between the GLU and the evaluator, Mike Waghorne, formerly Assistant General Secretary of PSI, now retired, France. It had been agreed that the Evaluator would 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 the evaluator would be requested to undertake interviews with participants, teaching staff, national trade union centres, Global Unions, donors and support institutions. He was to be guided by an agreed set of questions, three components of which are used below in outlining the views of teaching staff, students and union partners.

A series of discussions was held over the period of the visit:

- A general discussion with students on the Campinas course;
- Discussion with members of the Campinas teaching staff, broken down into a number of discussions with one or two members of staff dealing with specific topics in the course;
- A meeting with the Director of the Institute of Economics at Campinas, Professor Mariano Francisco Laplane, who has overall responsible for overseeing the GLU programme on behalf of the University;
- A meeting with the three course coordinators;
- A meeting with three representatives of the CUT; and
- A meeting with Joachen Steinhilber from the Brazil office of the FES.

In addition, I sat in on the GLU Workshop in Campinas on April 27, the GLU Conference, also in Campinas on April 28-29 and the meeting of the GLU Council meeting on April 30 in São Paulo.

What follows are several sets of question areas, each set designed for each interest group, as well as a preliminary set of questions put to all parties. It should be noted that this evaluation is somewhat

more speculative than either of the two previous evaluations in Kassel and Jo'burg because the Campinas course has started only two months before these interviews and there were many areas where respondents were simply not yet well-acquainted enough with the issues to have formed informed opinions.

### General questions

1. 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 strong feeling that the programme is providing for strong capacity building and communication but there is a question as to how far the programme is penetrating very deeply into unions. Several people concurred with a view that suggest a circular relationship here: that students go back home and, with their new skills and knowledge, help to extend the agenda, including the bargaining agenda of unions, which then, in turn, heighten/deepen their expectations of what the GLU should/could do, a view held strongly by Joachen from the FES. A common concern was that, whilst unions exist in a changing environment, they were themselves not changing. One faculty member noted that unions need to beef up their communication and economic analytical skills but that the GLU students will contribute to this.

Students felt that the programme was empowering them for their globalisation/international work, in so far as they would be able to contribute to the policy analysis that unions need to do.

Students certainly felt that the ideas and materials encountered during the course were very valuable.

Teaching staff felt that already there was evidence of students improving so much that they would be of benefit to their unions on their return.

The coordinators and one faculty member noted that Campinas has a long-standing programme in social and economic issues, has worked closely with the CUT and, therefore, understands union needs quite well. Knowing the needs of unions in other countries may not be so easy. So far there has been good feedback but this question needs further analysis later.

Mariano believed that the programme has put Brazilian unions in touch with universities in a way that has not happened before. The international links are also very valuable.

Joachen noted that he had been in his present FES position for only three months so was not fully conversant with the whole programme but believed that it met most partners' needs, both in terms of international communication and increased knowledge on globalisation issues. He raised the question of the relationship between the GLU academic programme and the annual GLU conferences: for example, given the current international financial situation, why was there not a strong financialisation element in the GLU conference?

The CUT representatives (see the note later about their representatives) noted that the programme is aimed at assisting unions in their strategies a good programme. Yet, there is a need for better integration between the university and unions, to meet union needs, nationally and globally. The unions need to have better knowledge of the curriculum.

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

Generally, students valued this, since they believe that union challenges are multifaceted and that a one-size-fits-all approach does not work. They also saw a close connection with question VIII discussed below. They felt that organisational matters have been awkwardly/badly arranged although they accept that this has been a pilot year in Brazil. Yet they see the opportunity as brilliant, even if there are rough spots.

They saw problems arising from the fact that the academic years in the North and South are out of kilter with one another. They also think that, although gender balance is a programme objective, family responsibilities faced by women may undermine this, even if a multi-campus basis can help to alleviate this.

Some teaching staff noted that the students are very heterogeneous, with quite different knowledge/discipline backgrounds, which can be a challenge. This means that faculty are learning as much as students are. Another noted that exchange of experiences is a plus, even if a challenge, but that this should be evaluated by the GLU after ten years of operation.

The coordinators believe that the course brings cultures closer together – a major plus. Each campus has its own specialty and having students who have been exposed to other GLU campuses enable useful comparisons to be made. However, it was noted that having different academic years and accreditation rules in each country can make for difficulties.

Joachen stressed the importance of the North-South networks that could be built and the potential of student exchanges. He saw, however, language as a limiting factor.

The CUT felt that although there have been some problems, this has been generally positive – globalisation problems call for international contacts. There is a need to look for other ways of exchanging ideas as well. Tino noted that he has suggested to the UT leadership that they should regard the GLU as a policy, not as a programme; TUCA should also be involved in this.

3. 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 felt that this was not a major problem although it clearly represents a challenge for some teaching staff in Brazil. Long and/or dense course texts can cause a problem for some students but there have been problems in accessing modern, useful English material in Brazil where books are concerned. Internet access has been really good and this has helped. Some students have found GURN/ILIAS good, although response times can be slow. Some felt that getting an adequate supply of photocopied material at the beginning of the course would have been helpful.

One member of staff acknowledged the problem of access to good English material but also felt that there was a need to adapt material for use in other societies.

In the quantitative/statistics course, language was not seen to be a problem, since data is not so language-dependent as are the more theoretical course components – although it may present more of a problem for the faculty to teach in English. From the point of view of resource material, these staff also noted that some students were encountering computers for the first time and this had been a problem.

Campinas has used the services of a non-course faculty member to teach Portuguese. She was happy with progress so far but felt that, if future classes were much like the present intake, it would be better to break the group into two: one for those with some Spanish language competence and one for the rest. Mariano noted that Campinas is well known throughout Latin America (LA) but faculty need to become more competent in English, since the GLU needs a common language.

The coordinators noted that the faculty teaching in the second semester need more English language training and support and this is being done through weekly classes. An attempt is also being made to get experience for some of them in English language universities. It was noted that only one student on this course has real problems with English.

Joachen felt that the GLU council (and the Brazilian steering Committee?) must address the language issue. He shared some of the comments of others about the Hispanic/Portunol issue but tended to stress the higher priority of English courses for LA unions.

The CUT shares most of the concerns and possible solutions about the problem of English for Brazilian/LA unions. They noted that they have lots of material that would be relevant to the programme but it is a question of how to make this available to students.

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

Whilst everyone was very keen to support a common core, differences should be optimised; in fact, one faculty member noted that a common core would help to strengthen the flexibility. At the least, it should be possible for students from different courses to have a common discourse. Students felt that they were isolated from the Brazilian union movement.

Everyone, I think, supported the idea that some key modules should be common, although everyone also agreed that each site should develop its own strengths. Mariano, however, cautioned that maintaining a common core is difficult and potentially expensive.

Again, the stats faculty saw no problem, since all students handling this material must use common approaches, even if they deal with different national data-sets.

The coordinators feel that it is important to have some global GLU common elements if the GLU is to tackle globalisation coherently but each campus should have its own focus.



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

Everyone saw this as a major advantage of the programme. Staff felt that such people brought in new literature sources and approaches, especially for teaching staff, for whom this programme could offer incentives. There was, however, a feeling amongst students that they would like to see more trade union officials used as course teachers or presenters. The use of visiting lecturers could create a problem if there were too many, if students could not establish ongoing relationships with them and if they were not well-integrated into a coherent programme.

The coordinators and some faculty agreed with that statement but felt that it is sometimes difficult to 'time' visitors' interventions programmatically, since they often came at times dictated by extraneous events such as conferences. Students need some fixed reference points but that is not just a question of whether teachers are 'visitors' or not.

The CUT asked whether a way could be found to ensure that unions are also part of the exchange, as well as faculty and students.

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

Many students felt that there was not enough flexibility in course selection and they wondered whether this was because there were not enough Campinas staff with English skills. Some asked whether unions would get 'value-for-money' from the course but felt that answer would be 'Yes'. It will create a corps of trade union experts for the movement.

Other than that, people felt that the programme, both globally and at Campinas, is very flexible. Mariano commented that the Campinas programme had been a gamble by the GLU and more students from outside of Latin America (LA) had been attracted than had been anticipated so more experience and learning was needed before coming to a judgement. Clearly, he felt, CUT-LA links are insufficient: would a certificate course for such people/unions help?

Some students and the coordinators raised the question of whether the GLU should revisit the question of not offering scholarships to (at least some) students from the North, since the present approach means that few such students are on these programmes and that weakens the idea of global exchange.

Some faculty felt that it was still too early to answer this although one noted that, for some unions, the loss of a key person for a year might be a problem that needs addressing.

Joachen thinks that trade unions need to engage much more in the GLU and there needs to be much better communication amongst the partners. Unions need a strategy to think about their relationship with academia (recall the comments in the Jo'burg report on this issue). The programme is flexible, he said, but are unions?

The CUT agrees that the GLU is flexible – it is based on a collective construction and is union-based. But they felt that an attempt should be made to find integration beyond the GLU conferences.

7. 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?

Virtually nobody thought that the programme was well advertised and that too many people came across it by accident, rather than through a well-marketed process. Some students from developing countries felt that, if ministries of foreign affairs knew about the programme, they would promote it to their people. They also wondered whether there is a misunderstanding – that the programme is for union staff only.

The coordinators felt that unions need to be helped to be much more involved in promoting the programme: this cannot be done only through paper and the Internet – there must be active face-to-face promotion/proselytising of the programme to unions (especially national centres) and to prospective students.

One faculty member thought that, for the Brazil programme at least, people are still learning and the whole approach may need to be broadened. Several respondents noted that there might be a need for either a specific Hispanic/Portuguese programme or very targeted promotional material for the Latin America union movement.

As Joachen noted, the GLU programme is not on the CUT website front page, for example, and the CUT seems not to have distributed GLU material widely. He felt that GLU material needs:

- To be promoted widely
- Specific presentations to identified potential students (with planned English language training in LA).

But he felt that FES should also do this.

The CUT people said that CUT's national board and affiliates know about the programme but do not disseminate it widely enough. Tino and his colleagues know CUT people who speak English and approach such people but it might help if the GLU website was also in Portuguese, even if the course stays in English.

8. 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?

There was general agreement amongst students (and others) that each of the national programmes should be expanded to its optimal sustainable size (around 20) but that perhaps there should be some consolidation for a few years in terms of finding additional campuses, so that the GLU does not try to expand to further countries after India (although not everyone agreed with this position). On person, agreeing with this, asked whether one semester could be offered in 'candidate' countries to try them out.

Students asked the question: is there any data to answer the question as to whether each national programme is getting equitable GLU resources?

Campinas faculty felt that the programme had much to offer the CUT and that ways must be found to incorporate CUT students.

The coordinators think that the GLU does need a more formal structure that could help with the flexibility of funding transfers.

In Joachen's view, the Brazil programme happened too fast: it would have been better to learn more from the German and South African programmes first. However, he questioned whether there should be a discussion about a programme in central and eastern Europe.

### **For students**

1. Are you happy with the programme as a whole? Why/why not?

Most students felt that the programme met their expectations and were happy with the academic components, especially the economics. They were, however, concerned that they were in a silo in Campinas.

2. Did the programme make a difference to your work. What did you do before; what are you doing now?

This question was coming too early in the course for anything other than speculative responses. There were some who were quite convinced that they were both going to be doing more complex work within their current portfolio when they got home as well as taking on other responsibilities and several mentioned specific issues that they felt were going to contribute to this. They agreed that the potential was very great. Some were not sure that their union/employer was going to know very well how to use their new/expanded skills. This may need further discussion with sponsoring unions both before and after the course in future and students felt that the GLU itself needs to 'market' these advantages of the programme.

One question asked was whether the assumption of the GLU is that most students are/will be union staffers and whether this may colour the programme orientation

3. Was your research work during the course of interest and value for a trade union

This question was simply too speculative to answer at this stage, although most were optimistic.

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

There have clearly been a number of logistical problems for this first batch of Campinas students, mainly because they, the university and the programme coordinators are learning as they go along. There have been problems with visas, bank accounts, getting mobile phones, accommodation. Students were generally positive and realistic about this although they felt that better and earlier information from Campinas might have either prevented the problems or lowered students' expectations.

The students were full of praise for the work of the coordinators and were working on a dossier of avoidable problems that could perhaps be used for the next year's intake.

It is clear that some of them relate to either the very bureaucratic nature of Brazilian society and/or to language problems, which, they felt, would probably have been reduced had there been Brazilian students on the course.

5. Is the course work reasonable in terms of workloads and time-scale?

All students agreed that the course-work demands were very heavy and, although they accepted that this was the nature of the course, they also felt that the reading requirements put on them were much too onerous. Better guidelines on what they should be looking for in the readings might have helped, they suggested. Yet they thought that the course content was very good and relevant.

One specific concern was that students felt that it was not really clear as to how they were going to be assessed.

6. What positive experiences for you, for the host organisation and for your union in the internship experience?

This and the next question were simply too early to be of use at this stage. People were concerned at how difficult it might be to find internships in Brazil that could cope with English-speaking students. They were worried that the workloads being carried by the coordinators might make coordination of internships very difficult.

7. Have there been problems with the internship arrangements? Such as? How could these be overcome?

This question largely became redundant, in view of the feelings outlined above about the internship.

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

As noted, students were not sure about the assessment process. Most students were happy with the teaching, seeing it as very student-centred although there one or two who felt that they would like to see more group work built into the programme.

It was suggested that, although course work early in the programme should be 'solid', there should also be recognition that there were many logistical 'tasks' that needed available time in the first few weeks.

9. 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 people felt that they received informal support but not much in any formal sense. Some had had good experiences with one or two GUFs. Most felt that the real test was going to be on their return home – would their unions/employers know how to use them?

They wondered whether the GLU has any useful data on how alumni from other programmes have been treated/used when they returned home (a matter that might well be taken up with the summer school participants in September this year).

**For teaching staff, including the three course coordinators:**

As noted earlier, what follows is a result of five interviews with one or more members of the teaching staff. In general no attempt has been made to identify particular people.

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

All teaching staff and coordinators were generally very happy with the student quality (although not all faculty members have yet taught classes with the group): they are an interesting group with different

knowledge, even if they are not all well-up in economics. There is a preparation course for weaker students. They are highly motivated and eager to learn and bring a 'worldly' experience to classes.

However, the coordinators think that the GLU needs a better application and selection process that enables earlier and better communication with the students' unions.

One faculty member believes that student quality is not high enough: too many have inadequate perspectives on other countries and some lack a solid background

2. 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?

It is too early to answer this other than to note that the students seem to be very conscientious. One person noted that the students are very 'sharp' and can actualise theory well.

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

There have been no problems from other Departments and the university as a whole, which seems to believe that the GLU adds to the university. In fact, several people noted that the university is very proud of the fact that this is Campinas' (and maybe Brazil's?) first graduate programme in English. It was also noted by the coordinators that the problem of funds transfer from the ILO would have proved fatal for the programme had the university not been prepared to carry the project until this is resolved. The university has been very helpful with logistical issues.

Campinas has a good record of cooperation with unions, many people noted.

4. 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?

The general view is that it is too early to know yet although most faculty and the coordinators noted that they have had no direct contact with the students' unions. It seemed agreed that the CUT has given good formal support but there was some uncertainty as to how much day-to-day cooperation and involvement there has been. One person felt that many of the sending unions are quite weak and cannot offer much.

5. 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?

The faculty did not see a problem here, although it was agreed that more English books need to be bought and most who said this believed that the university is very willing to do this. It was also accepted that much of the material being provided may be too long and some attempt may need to be made to provide some more concise reviews.

However, one faculty member believed very strongly (and repeated to me several times after the interview) that buying books on the Internet in Brazil is far cheaper than buying in Brazil and should not be a problem.

6. How useful do you think the internship programme has been? Could it be improved? How?

It is too early to say yet although one member of staff felt that would surely be one of the most valuable parts of the course.

7. Are you satisfied with the support by the ILO; what would you expect in addition?

It was agreed that the ILO and Frank Hoffer have given great support for the programme although there have been problems in transferring ILO funds to Campinas. It was accepted that this is a bureaucratic problem. One person noted that if there is a problem, it is that the 'ILO' equals 'Frank' and there is concern that this means that a lot rests on Frank.

One person noted that he would like to know more about what other GLU campuses are offering and what material they are using.

### **The Global Unions and national trade union centres**

I met with a three-person delegation from the CUT: José Celestino Lourenço (Tino), Marta Regina Domingues and Clair Siobhan Ruppert.

1. Do you see your particular needs being met in this programme? Why/why not? If there is some dissatisfaction, what needs to be done to address this?

The CUT people said that *we are still building the programme*. CUT is compiling reports on it but it is difficult to judge its impact at this stage – they have not yet had a chance to evaluate alumni. Tino noted that the CUT does not get GLU feedback on the outcome of student applications.; he believes that there is a need for communication between the GLU and unions before final student selections are made.

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

The internship question is too early to deal with yet.

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

It is important to have GUF inputs to the programme – they have a global vision – but national centres must also be involved. It was noted that PSI, EI and the IMF are involved in the programme.

### **Professor Mariano Francisco Laplane**

Mariano, in addition to his comments on the general questions, also noted that the university benefits from the fact that staff have to develop material in English, which helps with Campinas' international reputation and attractiveness to English-speaking academics. The university has a clear agenda in this regard and sees the GLU programme as a key tool in this strategy as other graduate programmes also start English courses. The university has assets and an LA name that will help in this regard.

The programme also extends the horizons of and opportunities for Campinas' other students.

The university has been happy to put its own resources (time and money) into the programme (although there have to be limits to this) and is very happy with the GLU.

### **For other partners – in this case the FES:**

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

Joachen thinks the the FES has a role to provide finances for scholarships and conferences and could use its own resources to help the GLU nationally and globally. There is a good FES network to provide this support, including the idea of interviewing prospective students from countries where English is not a native language.

2. 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?

There has been good feedback globally. Nationally, there have been problems but FES is willing to reinforce its support levels.

3. 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?

In Brazil, the CUT has official support for the GLU but internal divisions have stymied this on occasions and union divisions may also be causing problems; this must be rectified. Joachen feels that there is not much transparency in the national GLU budget and not enough communication amongst the partners.

He feels that UNICAMP values its prestige but that unions lack a perspective on how to optimise this.

### **Conclusion**

It is clear that there have been some internal dynamics/problems inside the student group currently at UNICAMP – personal and logistical - and this has caused some tension. It seems that it will be necessary in future to make it clear to students that, whilst the course coordinators can help with initial logis-

tical problems with accommodation, it is up to students to set up a process that enables them to deal with personal or group dynamics issues, although it will also need to be made clear to applicants for the programme that behaviour which potentially denigrates the GLU reputation or interferes with the ability of other students to pursue their course without harassment will result in a withdrawal of GLU scholarships.

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. Specifically, in Brazil, ways need to be found to enable more dialogue between GLU students and Brazilian people who speak only Portuguese, especially trade union colleagues.

Further, it would be useful for the University to explore with the CUT and other Latin American trade union bodies ways in which either potential students who have competence in English can be encouraged to enrol at UNICAMP or programmes can be set up in each country to develop the English language skills of more trade unionists.

It seems that 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. 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.

Whilst some faculty believe that access to modern English resource material is not really a problem, it is clear that students do not agree with this view. It would be useful for the faculty and coordinators to discuss this with students to see whether this is a real problem or just one of perception and whether some action is necessary.

Students feel that there is a need for more trade union inputs into the teaching. They also believe, and some faculty agree, that it is necessary to programme better the interventions made by visiting lecturers.

It was a common view of most Brazilians with whom I spoke that there needs to be better communication amongst all partners in Brazil, especially between the university and the CUT.

Other recommendations that I could make are not specific to Brazil and will be included into the first synthesis report from the three campuses visited so far.

## **Appendix 4: Evaluation of the programme by alumni**

At the GLU 2008 Summer School in September 2008, there were two sets of discussions aimed at eliciting an evaluation of the GLU programme by participating alumni. The first was a general discussion on the Summer School itself, which is now an integral part of the GLU programme, held in a plenary session, and the second was a more guided discussion on the GLU programme at the various campuses, focussed around three specific questions.

### **THE GENERAL SUMMER SCHOOL DISCUSSION**

1. The Alumni expressed interest in being more involved in the preparation of the summer school. Three or four alumni representatives will be invited to join a virtual working group on the conceptual and methodological preparation of the summer school.
2. The presentation of individual research projects of Alumni has not always been interesting for everybody. Plenary sessions also did not allow for good feed back. It was suggested to spend half a day on presentation of research work that is currently undertaken by alumni. There should be sufficient parallel groups that everybody can present his/her work and receive substantial feedback in small working groups. Everybody should also be invited to bring a poster presentation of his or her work. This can be put on display and people can individually also approach colleagues.
3. The common GLU research projects should have more space. (3 days?). They are the key element in creating active networks and GLU outputs. The groups should be invited to prepare on the first day a short 20 minutes introductory presentation of the work already undertaken. Time discipline should be enforced rigorously. Then there should be two and a half days of group work and a final plenary session to present the new ideas and plans.
4. Otherwise plenary sessions should be limited to keynote speakers. They should be invited to have a written presentation that could easily be published afterwards.
5. There should be a special session for Alumni only to discuss further networking and representation in the Steering Committee.
6. There should be an evaluation session.
7. Two weeks is quite a long time. 10 days would be sufficient. This would also reduce the funding and allow an increase in the number of participants.
8. The IG Metall training centre is quite interested in becoming more involved in the Summer School. They will be invited to join the working group mentioned under item 1 above.
9. The Hans Böckler Foundation suggested also that it would be useful to open the Summer School for a limited number of other students funded by the Hans Böckler Stiftung. During the second week, the summer school could be organised more like a conference and be open to a broader audience.
10. For 2010 it would be good to combine the summer school with the GLU conference, as both events will take place in Berlin.
11. Consultation on the topic of next year's summer school should start in January 2009 and be finalised in February 2009.
12. Given the growing number of Alumni it will be impossible to fund the participation of everybody who will want to attend. Some selection will be inevitable, perhaps based on trade union- and research-related criteria.

### **THE GUIDED QUESTIONS**

The analysis presented below falls into two sections: one set of responses from the bulk of participants (mainly from the German programmes); and a second set from participants in the South African programme. Apart from basic editing, as far as has been possible, the responses that follow have been kept in the language used by participants.

## GERMAN PROGRAMME RESPONSES

*Question 1: Do you think that the programme is meeting needs of the union movement? Why/why not? What could be done to address any inadequacies?*

It was argued that particularly for union researchers, this programme perfectly fits to the need of research department of a union by providing broad knowledge about global issues. Also, the programme helped some of us to strengthen our capacity to carry on research on various issues regarding trade union policies in our unions that suffer serious time limitations and finance problems. Plus, the programme facilitates international cooperation since it has developed networks among different unions all around the world. However, some felt that, although the research work helps unions, the latter need to communicate better to the GLU their research needs.

To gain deeper inside of trade union movement and globalisation; to develop capacity to deal with on global issues; to better understand challenges at national level and to analyse different perspectives as well as new dimensions on global issues, this programme can be very useful instrument for unionists. Better understandings can bring new strategies. No doubt that this programme is a life changing experience from which we learnt a lot. Despite the fact that we all agreed on significance of this programme, some challenges still remain.

Some felt that the programme helps participants to see the successes/failures of unions working under similar circumstances.

*Challenges and difficulties:* In some countries unions are not involved to academic researches due to the lack of time and resources. While many unions are struggling with daily issues with their limited capacity, there is no enough space for further research. Therefore, in some ways, the programme does not directly meet needs of union movement in certain countries or in specific contexts. It, instead, gives more enlightenment to the individuals. In this case, the individual evaluation is important to see that how the programme affected their experience with their unions. For some of us, it is still not very clear how we can use the knowledge we gained at best way for our unions.

In addition, one of the biggest challenges for us is the issue of going back to our union, due to power struggles within unions: we become 'outsiders' to our own unions through participating in this programme. Although the programme helps us to understand different trends and challenges within the global labour movement and to gain a profound experiences on labour issues, for some of us it was/is still difficult to incorporate our knowledge to the union structure. Some unions still neither understand the importance of this programme for unions themselves nor encourage their staff to attend. There is always a danger that unions tend to see this programme as individual career development. Some felt that there is a need for more practical examples of theory for each region.

Lack of communication between unions and the ILO/GLU is crucial which should be eliminated by efforts of both participants and the programme. This could be done with a good monitoring system through the ILO to see how participants are doing. To this end, taking advantage of some international gatherings such as the ILO Governing Body or the International Labour Conference could strengthen networking. As we witnessed some bad experiences from our colleagues who had to resign to be able to attend this programme and have serious problems with their unions with regards to applying their knowledge, strong communication should be one of the priorities of this programme.

Another issue pointed out by one of our colleagues is that the programme covers limited courses on leaderships and mostly focuses on academic issues. From his point of view, it seems that neither content nor aim of the programme targets leadership position of unions. Training programs for leaders could be taken into account. However, most of us agreed that this is an academic programme and the union work is to be made when we get home. It was otherwise agreed that the programme helps to develop the capacity of union leaders.

But some people raised the question of whether it is possible to answer this question unless unions actually know what their needs are: some do not. Some unions want information; others seek international contacts; some want research; many need material on building group democratic processes

*Question 2: Are you happy with the programme as a whole? Why/why not?*

In a very short response, yes! Some people did question whether their personal satisfaction was as relevant as the satisfaction of unions. What this programme provided us are, among others:



- Strengthening our capacity as researchers
- Building networks among us as well as among unions
- Providing new opportunities to gain experience at international institutions
- Getting new dimensions of global labour issues, exploring different perspectives and rethinking of new strategies
- Providing substantial knowledge for our future works
- Building further cooperation and solidarity among us.

However, there are some critical issues that should be addressed:

- Interaction between trade unions and the programme should be strengthened. We, both the participants and the programme, need to think about what can be done more to draw union's attention to this very important opportunity.
- Different expectations and assumptions before the programme might lead to some disappointments. What programme can offer and provide might be indicated more clearly.
- The programme is more academic oriented. However, the reality of union agenda could be different from the academic world. Therefore, as it is aimed, interaction between academic and union life should be at the centre.
- One year's stay away from union is a challenge for union leaders. Plus, some of us had to resign from their position before the programme starts and more problems have continued for some after the programme. To avoid this adverse affect, it is necessary to find out some new ways to strengthen the connection between unions and the programme.
- More efforts could be made to enrol more students from trade union background and also further efforts should be made on the part of global labour movement (GUFs) to draw their attention to this programme.

*Question 3: Did the programme make a difference to your work? What did you do before; what are you doing now?*

Many people said that it has made a huge difference: it has broadened their knowledge; opened their minds and awareness. Some of us were promoted or found new positions in national unions or international organisations. However, as we underlined several times, some of us had to resign before or after the programme and some are still looking for a job in the unions: many unions seem not to understand the potential of the GLU or of the summer school. This brings the important question is that the ILO should be closely communicate with confederations about the programme. Involvement of national centres in this programme is crucial. This is, however, not only the responsibility of the ILO and the programme but also of the GUFs and national centres or local unions. Any monitoring system would reduce internal friction within the unions.

In addition, integration of our knowledge to our work could be difficult to realise due to high engagement with daily issues, limited resources or lack of political will within unions. Nevertheless, it was argued that even though in the short run we and our unions have rather limited benefits from the programme, we hope that in the long run we will gain more positive results and further contribute to our union's work.

*Question 4: Was your research work during the course of interest and value for a trade union?*

It was extremely helpful to understand the challenges of trade union movement at the national level. Some of the work done during the course was offered to the union and they appreciated it. It was felt that there is a clear union need for good research but the question raised was how GLU programme research topics are chosen. Some people felt that their union has not used their research work

There is a need for better communication between the GLU and unions on research needs of unions: who exactly **needs** the research being done? Is there a process for starting research projects? Would it be useful to ask alumni to brainstorm ideas on that union research needs are?

*Question 5: What positive experiences for you, for the host organisation and for your union in the internship experience?*

*And Question 6: Have there been problems with the internship agreements? Such as? How could this overcome?*

Internships can be used as a period for developing our research projects, to collect relevant materials and to improve our personal abilities. But also, the internship is an important opportunity to work in an

international environment and to build communications between the international organisations and our unions.

Early planning for the organisation in which we want to do our internship and connecting the internship with our thesis is very helpful. However, it should be kept in mind that last moment changes might happen due to poor communication between the programme and the union contact person.

During our internships, some of us conducted research on agreed issues and provided a report at the end of the research. For those who worked together with their supervisors, the internship period was a very productive and learning process.

However, some organisational problems still exist. In some cases we didn't have the opportunity to choose the organisation in which we wanted to work or we were chosen by other organisations. Plus, in some cases, internship was not efficient enough due to the fact that supervisors were very busy with their own work. In these cases, it would be better to find persons who have enough time to work with interns on certain projects. For this, early communication with supervisors or contact persons is necessary in order to clarify tasks of the intern and expectations from the organisation during this period of time. Some people found the internship too short.

Having a fruitful internship means that the student her/himself should be rather pro-active, using the experience and networks that has been built during the work with unions. This would make more room for the students that haven't had such interaction before and so the internship coordinator would have to deal with fewer problem cases. At the end, organising a successful internship is not an easy task and help is needed from those who already have some networks.

Unions at different levels are faced with limited resources in confronting challenges and the same goes for the international organisations. One idea could be that the candidate intern contacts early enough the person responsible for the internship in the international union and discusses areas where research is needed either at a national or international level. To ease the problems mentioned earlier, with regard to national unions being distanced from the programme, it may be beneficial to develop a triangular relation amongst the international organisation in which you may have worked early in your country, the union at the national level and the student to find out areas of research which could strengthen the cooperation of national and international unions and upgrade the cooperation from being patchy or superficial to a deeper understanding of problems and challenges and ways to confront them.

There are, of course, language problems for internships within Germany. There are questions of resources for transport/travel and accommodation costs in some internships.

To achieve some of these objectives, it is necessary to build a better awareness of the GLU amongst unions, including the potential of the summer school and its research projects.

In addition, these participants felt that it is necessary to have a fresh debate about the purposes of the GLU programme. For example, the need to build a cadre of researchers and policy advisors needs to be stressed. It is essential to build stronger connections between academic and practical union issues. In general, the GLU simply needs to be promoted more effectively.

## **SOUTH AFRICAN PROGRAMME RESPONSES**

### **General questions**

i) *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?*

More or less/to some extent.

### **Why?**

The programme is sometimes too academic and does not always teach the things trade unions need. There is a lack in terms of meeting one of the programme's aims – creating more cooperation among

trade unions at the national and regional or global level – because (due to the programme's limited capacity) usually only one person from one union is trained at a time.

#### What can be done?

Bringing more trade union experts as lecturers; using the students' (trade union) experience. Assure more resources for scholarships; pick more students from one country at a time.

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

#### **Advantages**

Increased cooperation, exchange of experience, common research, political campaigning among different countries/regions.

The multi-campus, multi-country (one of the greatest advantages of the programme) nature of the GLU, especially that all the crucial regions (South America, Asia, Africa, Europe) are covered. GLU is a unique academic programme.

The programme increases capacity and understanding of unionists in national, regional and global policy issues to enable them to engage in effective participation.

#### **Disadvantages; avoidable problems**

Not enough cooperation between programmes. No cooperation between students of various campuses (e.g. between campuses of the South and North). There is a danger of creating 'first class' (northern) and 'second class' (southern) programmes (by, for instance, giving opportunity of internships in global/international institutions only for students of the German programme). Perhaps this problem can be addressed by increasing cooperation between programmes (e.g. common research projects).

iii) *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?*

Problems with dissemination of research on the national level (in case of the non-English-speaking countries). There is no way to avoid this - it cannot be helped; it is not the programme's fault.

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

Programs in various countries should be standardised to the extent that they are equal (in terms of academic value). Some courses should be identical (e.g. Labour and Development if it is taught in two or three programmes) and others should be flexible.

#### **Questions aimed specifically at programme participants**

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

There were mixed views on this. For those who were very happy with the programme, it was one big opportunity to expose trade unionists to a uniform academic and analytical training.

For those who were less happy, there were problems with getting South African supervisors' assistance after leaving South Africa (during the crucial process of writing the research report, the supervisors were not readily available to assist us).

Some of the courses were good (e.g. Economic Sociology, Development in Ideology and Practice, HIV/AIDS in Context), because they were focused and in-depth; some of them were not (e.g. Labour and Development, because it was too general, Economic Policy). The other compulsory course, Labour and Globalization, had very good reading materials but it lacked focus. It is necessary to improve the core lectures.

ii) *Did the programme make a difference to your work? What did you do before; what are you doing now?*

For some, the programme made a difference to their work. It has improved the capacity to understand and analyze policies. One participant noted that 'Thanks to the programme I am doing more policy formulation in addition to policy analysis'.

Others felt that it did not help. For students from the South it is best to go to the North to study. Trade unions in the South do not care for the South-oriented research: they prefer North-oriented research. Then they can get funding from big Northern unions – FES, DGB, and FNV. One participant noted 'My position did not change when I got home'.

iii) *Was your research work during the course of interest and value for a trade union?*

One participant felt that it was not really useful: 'Research focused on South African experience that is of less interest to my union'.

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

We would prefer that internship would consist of working for the host organization, not doing an individual project separately from the union staff. We feel that we are capable of interacting with the host organization. We would like our experience and expertise to be used. One participant said 'The host organisation benefitted from my experience and my articles I wrote for them'.

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

In South Africa the internship is shaped to be research project-oriented, not practice-oriented. Host organizations should be better prepared to host students – there is a need for them to develop an idea of what they want the students to do, what work they can give to them.

Internships were done at the time when students' research proposals were not yet approved. Therefore, whilst the internship was meant to enable students to collect data for their research, the proposals were yet to be approved. In this case, the data collected during the internship sometimes were not very useful for the project.

The internships were limited only to South Africa.

To improve this, maybe joint research projects of alumni from different programmes and countries could be tried.

About the GLU Research Network: The alumni students should participate in the choice of topics of the GLU research projects. It is necessary to bring different perspectives; e.g. from developing countries and not only research from faculty's ideas.

Another problem – we feel that students are not left entirely academically free to choose their MA research projects.

#### GENERAL ISSUES

*There was considerable discussion at the summer school over the extent to which the GLU needs to take a more pro-active approach with unions in finding out why they 'sponsor' participants, what they expect of participants when they leave for the course, how they intend to use the participants on their return home, in developing some guidelines on the ways to make the return process more productive or less stressful and what actually happens to participants when they go home. Not that the participants expect the GLU to be solely responsible in this area – it is accepted that participants themselves need to discuss expectation with their unions, that they must maintain contact with the union during the course and that they have a responsibility, on their return home, to sell both themselves (and their new skills and knowledge) and the GLU potential.*

It was also felt that, if a database of current students, research projects could be maintained, alumni could be asked to support them with data and useful advice. Alumni should also play a more active role in searching for potential GLU students.