

Supplement to the 2004 Policy Package

***** Adopted on September 12, 2010 *****

Globalization of Higher Education and Research

1. Overview

In 2004, the Education International task force on Globalization, GATS and Higher Education presented its final report and recommendations to the World Congress in Porto Alegre, Brazil. In its report, the task force documented the growing threats to the academic profession and to the integrity and quality of higher education and research posed by the forces of economic globalization and trade liberalization.

In particular, the task force noted the emergence at global level of a profit-driven, cross-border marketplace in higher education, while this manifested itself in different ways between countries. International trade agreements such as the World Trade Organization's General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) were being used to lock-in and intensify these commercial pressures. According to the task force, if left unchecked these developments would not only create a range of challenges for staff and students, but would also undermine the quality, and ultimately the social and economic value, of education and research in ways that would harm the public interest. To counter this, the task force recommended a series of actions and strategies for EI and its affiliates, and proposed the creation of a new international instrument for higher education and research that would protect the integrity of the sector.

EI reactivated the task force in 2010 ahead of the 7th International Higher Education and Research Conference with the aim of reviewing the 2004 report. Members of the task force reconsidered the report and concluded that while there have been some new developments in the interim, much of the analysis and many of the recommendations remain relevant today. The task force decided that rather than produce a fully revised package, it would treat the 2004 report as an historical text and prepare a short supplement to update key developments. The present document should therefore be read as an addendum to, and not a replacement of, the 2004 package of materials. The principles in the 2004 package should remain the basis for policy and action by EI and its affiliates.

The task force also agreed to focus on the ways forward for academic and academic-related unions in the face of the growing threats posed by the globalization and marketization of higher education and research. This document therefore briefly highlights some of the recent global developments in

the sector while emphasizing concrete actions that EI and its affiliates can undertake to move forward from the current situation.

2. Higher Education and Research: Recent Trends

a) The economic crisis

Since the task force's report in 2004, a worldwide trend of falling public investment and rising tuition fees has continued to fuel the rapid growth of the international marketization of higher education. The financial crisis of 2008 and the subsequent global economic recession have severely intensified this process by putting new pressures on public finances and prompting steep cuts in higher education funding in many countries. In responding to the crisis, many governments have wrapped their sharply ideological actions in a cloak of spurious 'inevitability.'

Through the Hands up for Education campaign (www.ei-ie.org/handsup), EI has done considerable work in supporting affiliates, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe, in responding to the economic crisis. The task force believes it is important that the specificities of the higher education and research sectors are reflected in this ongoing campaign. For example, many governments may find it easier to reduce public spending in higher education, particularly by increasing student contributions to tuition costs, than in the compulsory sector.

The current pressure on public finances may also increase the pressure to implement more public-private partnerships in the sector. As the EI Task Force on Public-Private Partnerships in Education reported in 2009, higher education and research is particularly vulnerable to some of the negative consequences of these arrangements. This is particularly true in terms of industry-HEI research partnerships. These research partnerships, when managed in a transparent and open manner, can help improve productivity and raise living standards through the discovery and commercialization of new innovations. However, such arrangements, if not adequately regulated, can also raise significant risks to the integrity and independence of academic research. Many high profile cases have shown that industrial sponsors can exert undue pressure on academic researchers and delay publication of research results that are not favourable to a company's financial interests.

To help affiliates confront the current economic climate and the political challenges arising, the task force recommends:

- Closer sharing of information on cuts in public expenditure on higher education and research, including ideology-driven policies which are presented as necessary responses to the underlying economic situation.
- Challenging conventional understandings of deficit-reduction plans (e.g. the work CAUT and others have done in demystifying the Canadian experience in the 1990s), as well as the myth of 'inevitability.'
- Sharing of information on "good practice" by public authorities in response to the economic crisis.

- Sharing of information on campaigning strategies and where appropriate, liaising on the implementation/coordination of such strategies.
- Continuing to promote partnerships and collaboration with allies (e.g. with ESU, PSI, etc).
- Focusing on challenging new attacks on pensions for higher education and research staff.
- If the General Secretary of EI is invited to the next World Economic Forum in Davos, EI should produce a paper on the value of higher education in a global economy. The paper should stress the role of higher education in mitigating the worst aspects of the recession, particularly youth unemployment. It should also reassert the wider educational and civic benefits of higher education i.e. as a public good
- EI should launch a specific consultation/survey with Higher Education and Research Unions on the impact of the economic crisis on Higher Education systems, including employment conditions. It should also include opportunities to report “good practice” and strategies by unions to revert detrimental changes

EI and its affiliates also need to monitor the various attempts by governments to use the economic crisis as an opportunity to introduce educational cost-cutting measures or shifts from ‘public’ to ‘private.’ Such measures include the greater reliance on non-university providers (e.g. colleges, private companies, charities) and an increase in the use of distance learning and compressed degree programs. The distinction needs to be made between acceptable forms of diversification, particularly those which sustain or promote access and measures which tend towards fragmentation and privatization, or which threaten quality of provision or undermine staff conditions or academic freedom.

b) Commercialization and privatization

Against the backdrop of the economic crisis, many established higher education institutions as well as new private providers have expanded their commercial activities. At the international level, this has included the aggressive recruitment of overseas students; the development of branch campuses, franchising arrangements, joint ventures and cross-border e-learning; and the rapid growth of the private and for-profit sector.

i. The “market” for international students

Rising demand for higher education worldwide has resulted in increased student mobility. According to the OECD, roughly 2.5 million students study outside of their home country, about triple the figure in 1980. Some estimates suggest that the number of international students will rise to 7 million by 2020.

Higher education institutions in the industrialized world increasingly see the growing body of international students as a potential new source of revenues. In fact, there is now a global competition amongst institutions and governments to increase their “market” share of international students. Some governments have actively encouraged HEIs to recruit more foreign students by deregulating tuition fees

charged to non-residents. The potential implications of this trend for domestic students have yet to be fully felt.

As the task force's 2004 report noted, under the right conditions, the increased mobility of students has the potential of creating greater cross-cultural understanding and contributing to the sharing of knowledge and expertise. However, patterns of student mobility are overwhelmingly one way --- from the global South to the North. As well, the students most able to take up studies overseas are typically the wealthiest and most privileged. Similar trends exist in respect of academic staff. The task force remains concerned that this trend is widening inequalities in wealth and knowledge. EI and its affiliates have a crucial role to play in ensuring that international educational opportunities are more equitably available to all.

Additionally, there is mounting evidence that the marketization of international students can have negative consequences on the broader mission of HEIs. Financial dependence on fee-paying students and the desire to pad revenues can easily distort an institution's mission. In Australia, where universities rely upon overseas students for a substantial share of revenue, many institutions are wrestling with criticisms that they have cut corners and compromised academic standards in their bid to attract overseas students. When maximizing revenues through high enrolments becomes the key objective, there is built-in pressure to admit some students of questionable quality and then push them through to graduation.

These concerns have been heightened in the wake of the increasing number of HEIs establishing joint ventures with for-profit companies to recruit and train overseas students. These so-called "private pathways" programs involve a for-profit company establishing a presence on campus as an "international college" or "international study centre". Fees charged students are well above the normal schedule for international students and the company normally provides the university or college with a share of its tuition revenues. In exchange, the private provider uses the logo and name of the university or college to market itself to international students, recruits students who normally would not qualify for admission, and provides them with language training and "foundational" or "pathways" programs in various disciplinary areas. Upon successful completion of these programs, a student is guaranteed transfer to the regular university or college undergraduate program.

These programs raise a number of concerns. They outsource academic work by employing staff outside of the union and with lower rates of pay, little or no benefits, and heavier workloads. There are also questions about the quality of outsourced programs. Companies rely on student fees for their profits and this creates an inbuilt incentive to recruit as aggressively as possible. Staff working in private pathways colleges have reported being pressured to ensure that students pass their programs even if they have not achieved the program requirements.

These trends also speak to the tendency of HEIs to treat both overseas and domestic students as “customers”. The result is that pressure is being brought to bear on academics to serve as service providers in the higher education “industry”.

Action Points: Given the challenges raised by the emerging marketization of overseas and domestic students, the task force recommends that EI and its affiliates establish more formal ways to share information, resources, campaigns and good practice, particularly in relation to the outsourcing of recruitment and teaching. Further, in collaboration with student organizations, EI and its affiliates should develop a policy statement on the ethical recruitment of international students. The statement could be used as a basis to lobby institutions and governments.

ii. Proliferation of branch and franchise campuses

The rising demand for higher education worldwide has put renewed pressures on the capacity of institutions and systems to meet this demand. UNESCO reports that the percentage of the age cohort enrolled in higher education has grown from 19% in 2000 to 26% in 2007. Today, there are an estimated 150.6 million higher education students globally, roughly a 53% increase over 2000. These headline figures of course, do not reflect the equally rapid change over the same period, in the range of qualifications, regimes and modes of study under which students are now enrolled.

Many HEIs have taken advantage of the rising demand for and relative under-supply of higher education in many parts of the world by establishing offshore campuses. According to the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, there are now 162 branch campuses worldwide, an increase of 43 per cent between 2006 and 2009.

With some exceptions, the vast majority of higher education institutions establishing offshore branches are low-end institutions attempting to take advantage of a perceived market. Most branch campuses are in fact not campuses at all. They tend to provide only a limited number of specialized programs, most frequently in programs such as business management and information technology -- areas of high demand and with relatively low start up costs. They also employ few if any local academic staff, and offer poorer terms and conditions of employment. Characteristically, they will ignore local cultures and academic traditions as well as the local language, reinforcing the hegemony of English and of a model of higher education developed in the Anglophone world.

For some HEIs, branch campuses have proven to be costly failures. Several institutions have recently closed their offshore operations because of mounting costs and lower than expected demand. The financial loss is almost invariably passed on to staff at the home institution through program cuts, redundancies and reduced salaries.

Action Points: The task force recommends that EI and its affiliates monitor and share information, resources and campaigns in relation to branch and franchise

campuses and cross-border provision. Further, the task force proposes that EI and its affiliates consider lobbying institutions and governments to ensure that these meet the same academic and employment standards as the home institution.

iii. Growth of the private and for-profit sector

As the 2009 UNESCO report (A New Dynamic: Private Higher Education) indicates, private higher education represents the fastest growing portion of the sector world-wide. It is estimated that nearly a third of all higher education students are enrolled in private institutions.

Within the private sector, for-profit institutions make up a small but growing share, particularly in developing countries, and this trend is actively encouraged by national and international authorities. A number of educational businesses, such as the private pathways providers noted above but also for-profit e-learning institutions, are now operating across international boundaries. These institutions are run entirely on a business model. Academic staff has little or no job security, and no autonomy or influence over academic matters. Students are seen primarily as customers.

Action Points: The task force reasserts that higher education and research is a public good and recommends that EI and its affiliates monitor and share resources and campaign strategies on the private for-profit sector in higher education, and on the consequences of the hidden privatization in the public sector

c) Rankings and outcomes: the global accountability agenda

The emergence of a global marketplace in higher education has been accompanied by the rise of new attempts to measure and assess the “quality” of HEIs. From national and global rankings of institutions, to the assessment of research impact and student learning outcomes, the focus on quality and accountability in higher education has become a worldwide phenomenon.

HEI rankings have been substantively criticized for the questionable relevance of measurements chosen, the methods by which data are collected, the scoring of each measurement, and the subjective weighting given to each measurement that aggregate to a final score. Nevertheless, rankings continue to proliferate at both the national and international level because of their “marketing” value. That is, they are used and interpreted by prospective students, employers and recruiters as concrete measures of the perceived quality of an institution.

More recent attempts to refine rankings are evident in the turn to measure student learning outcomes as a proxy for the “quality” of HEIs. The OECD’s Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO), currently in the feasibility stage of development, is a standardized test to be administered to higher education students to compare the performance of HEIs. According to the OECD, AHELO is intended to “provide member

governments with a powerful instrument to judge the effectiveness and international competitiveness of their higher education institutions, systems and policies in the light of other countries' performance, in ways that better reflect the multiple aims and contributions of tertiary education to society.”

It is difficult to see how the quality of higher education and research can be reduced solely to quantifiable outcomes or subject to any simple performance-based assessment. Simplistic rankings and assessments of higher education institutions based upon research output or student learning outcomes cannot on their own adequately measure quality. Quality has to do also with the conditions and activities of teaching and free enquiry. The drive towards reliance on these pseudo-measurements of quality, accompanied by the market ethos, will strengthen trends towards a hierarchical stratification of institutions and a close match between student wealth and the ranking of the institutions they attend.

Action Points: The task force recommends that EI and its affiliates undertake the following:

- Continue to monitor and critique international ranking schemes and assessments such as the OECD's AHELO.
- Critically engage with student organizations on the issue of “student-centred” learning and learning outcomes.
- To develop alternative criteria for measuring the quality of higher education.
- Address positively the issue of diversification of higher education provision as a public good, with a trade union strategy directed at increasing access and equity while sustaining the quality of the higher education offer.

d) Higher education and sustainable development

The threat of global warming, despite attempts to develop a coordinated international strategy to curb greenhouse gas emissions, remains one of the most serious risks for humanity and the planet. The task force believes there is an urgent need for EI and its affiliates to demonstrate the key relevance of higher education and research to a sustainable and equitable future for our planet. Higher education unions need to urge governments and civil society to recognize and harness the expertise and experience of our members, not only in support of immediate or narrow government and business objectives but the big issues, like climate change, the millennium development goals and sustainable economic policies. The unions in the sector for their part need to mobilize their members to demonstrate their relevance, and the mutual dependence of society and the academic community.

Action Points: EI should work with member unions to promote public awareness of the role of higher education and research in addressing the challenges society faces at the global national and local levels, and support members in their responses to those challenges.

3. The Trade Environment

a) GATS Update

The 2004 task force report noted that international trade and investment agreements can lock-in and intensify the pressures of commercialization and privatization noted above. The report focused on what was then the most significant set of trade negotiations likely to affect higher education and research: the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS).

Since 2004, the GATS negotiations, along with the entire Doha Round of talks, have stalled. While a breakthrough looked imminent following the development of the "July package" in 2008, subsequent attempts to reach an agreement have failed to bridge the deep differences between industrialized and industrializing countries over agricultural subsidies and industrial tariffs.

Despite the impasse on the major negotiating issues, there have been some important developments within the GATS talks. In particular, significant progress has been made on the rules affecting domestic regulation. The draft domestic regulation disciplines, building upon Article VI: 4 of GATS, would apply to:

- Qualification requirements and procedures, which refer both to the educational credentials or professional/trade certification required to provide a specified service, and to the ways that the qualification of a service provider is assessed. This is intended to capture all regulations related to examinations, documentation requirements, and verification of qualifications.
- Licensing requirements and procedures, which apply to not only professional licensing but also to licensing of facilities, such as school accreditation, as well as broadcast licenses, licensing of health facilities and laboratories, waste disposal permits, and municipal zoning procedures.
- Technical standards which refer not just to regulations affecting "technical characteristics of the service itself," but also to "the rules according to which the service must be performed." This is an extremely broad definition that would cover standards related to virtually all service sectors. In the area of education, it would apply to quality assurance requirements.

The latest draft of the domestic regulation rules would require Members, where specific commitments have been taken, to ensure that all education-related laws, regulations, and measures are "pre-established, based on objective criteria and relevant to the supply of the services to which they apply," (emphasis added). These operational terms however are ambiguous and, depending upon how they are eventually interpreted, could have a greater or lesser impact on regulatory authorities.

For instance, the draft disciplines require domestic regulations to be "based on objective" criteria." The term "objective" is not defined in the draft text, but could be understood along a continuum of meanings, from less intrusive to more intrusive on domestic regulators. Objective can mean: reasonable; not arbitrary; relevant; not subjective; and, least trade restrictive. Justifying regulatory measures as "reasonable" is a far easier task than showing they are "not subjective". In higher education, many licensing regulations are by their nature subjective. Institutions are often required to show a "commitment to intellectual diversity"

or “academic freedom” or to operate in the public interest or the interest of the academic community. In other words, many legitimate regulations are often based on “subjective” judgments about the quality and relevance of a service. Similarly, quality assurance standards that often require the exercise of broad discretion and subjective judgment. Narrow interpretations of “objective” may also conflict with any measures which require regulators to make decisions with due regard to the public interest. In such cases, this will require balancing competing interests which requires some subjective judgment.

A restrictive reading of domestic regulations ignores the reality of how educational regulations and regulations in all sectors are developed. Rules and standards most often emerge through compromises between various and competing interests. As a result most regulations are by their very nature neither the most nor the least trade restrictive. Requiring all regulations to be least trade restrictive would limit both the content and the process for democratic decision-making.

b) Bilateral trade agreements

Facing an impasse in GATS talks, many countries have been negotiating bilateral and regional trade agreements. The number of free trade agreements notified to the WTO has exploded from 20 in 1990 to 159 in 2007, and stood at 474 as of January, 2010.

Many of these trade agreements include provisions governing services, including education services. For instance, all of the countries that have signed bilateral agreements with the United States in recent years have undertaken more ambitious education commitments than in their GATS schedules or offer. For example, El Salvador, Guatemala and Oman made education commitments across all education sub-sectors without limitations in their agreements with the United States.

Another feature of the recent wave of trade agreements is that they most often bring together developing and developed countries.

c) Intellectual property rights

Intellectual property rights (IPRs) have become increasingly prominent in trade negotiations and this has important implications for the sector. The development of the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA), a deal being negotiated by mainly industrialized countries, has arisen against the backdrop of growing demands from developing countries for more flexibility in global copyright and patent rules through the World Intellectual Property Office (WIPO). Developed countries are responding by trying to ratchet up IPRs through new instruments such as ACTA.

ACTA and similar provisions in bilateral trade agreements seek to impose new restrictions on the use of copyrighted material. The main effect of ACTA would be to create new international copyright rules that go far beyond what currently exist in treaties under the

United Nations' World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). The deal would establish a new global institution with a secretariat and with a legally-binding dispute resolution process. ACTA could grant border guards increased powers to search people and personal property, including laptops and other electronic devices, raising some serious privacy concerns. It would create criminal provisions that would apply not only to the commercial infringement of copyright, but also to infringement for non-financial gain, such as educational, research, and personal uses.

If extended to the developing world, the treaty could dramatically reshape domestic copyright law. In many countries where textbooks and educational materials are scarce or prohibitively expensive, higher education and research staff and students have little choice but to infringe copyright in order to access the information and resources they need.

Action Points: The task force recommends the following:

- That EI and its affiliates step up their campaigning on trade liberalization at the WTO, regional and national levels. In particular, given the impasse in GATS negotiations, EI will need to focus more attention on bilateral talks, providing support and analysis to affected affiliates.
- That EI and its affiliates monitor and campaign against the ACTA agreement. Further, EI should develop a policy on copyright and through its observer status at WIPO lobby for broader exceptions for fair use or fair dealing.

4. The Bologna Process and Regionalization

While not a trade agreement, the Bologna Process and the creation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) is taking place in parallel to a process of increasing globalization of higher education. The Bologna Process represents an attempt by European governments to harmonize their higher education systems and promote cross-border education. Launched by Ministers responsible for higher education from 29 countries coming together in 1999 at the University of Bologna, the Process now involves 46 countries with the objective of increasing student and staff mobility, enhancing the attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area, and improving the quality of higher education and research to ensure the further development of Europe as a stable, peaceful and tolerant community.

Education International's Pan-European Structure became a consultative member of the Bologna Process at the Bergen Meeting of Ministers responsible for education in 2005. Higher education staff have expressed concern about how the Bologna Process has added to the bureaucratic workload of academics and placed new requirements upon them. The Bologna Process expects academics to speak multiple European languages, to be mobile as much as possible, to better address a diverse student population in the classroom and to publish research findings beyond their national context, in addition to the traditional tasks required of them. The Bologna structure regards quality as a cornerstone of its work, and has had robust discussions on this issue. It has also placed a strong emphasis on the social dimension and on student and staff mobility as core issues in its public pronouncements although it has achieved less in reality in these areas. The last ministerial

statement issued in Vienna in March, stressed the importance of providing supportive conditions for academics to work, but what this means has yet to be worked out.

The “external dimension” of the Bologna Process refers to the internationalization of the EHEA. To date, this facet of the Process remains a subject of debate between those promoting academic cooperation between Europe and other regions of the world, and institutions and governments who are focusing on marketing Europe’s higher education abroad. Several Bologna countries have recently introduced or raised tuition fees for non-European students, and many HEIs are now aggressively recruiting international students.

Action Points: The task force recommends that EI and European affiliates critically engage with the Bologna process, including a more concentrated consideration of its global dimension in the sense of co-operation instead of competition, from a trade union perspective.

EI should encourage and support its affiliates in other regions to work together to assert constructive ideas and make proposals for regional development on the basis of co-operation and collegiality

5. Development cooperation and solidarity

As the task force report of 2004 noted, the negative fallout of the globalization of higher education has been felt disproportionately by colleagues in the industrializing world. Inequalities between nations are promoting a greater brain drain of talent from the South to the OECD countries. The privatization and marketization of higher education is eroding the salaries and conditions of employment. Precarious employment is on the rise. For example, in Latin America where growth in higher education has been driven by the private sector it is now estimated that 80 per cent of staff are employed on fixed-term contracts.

Meanwhile, UNESCO reports an increase in the systematic attack against teachers, academics and students worldwide. Some of the worst-affected countries are Afghanistan, Colombia, Thailand, India, Iran, Iraq, Nepal, Pakistan, the occupied Palestinian territories, Thailand and Zimbabwe

The situation demands greater solidarity and increased support for colleagues and unions in the industrializing world. EI has considerable experience in development co-operation. However, very few higher education unions are involved in this work. Similarly, very few higher education and research unions in Africa, Latin America and Asia are affiliated to EI, often for structural or financial reasons.

Action Points: The task force recommends that higher education and research unions become more involved in EI’s development cooperation work, including attendance at the annual meeting of EI’s development cooperation network. We also call on EI to develop a new organizing strategy for higher education and research unions.

6. Defending the profession

The market-led changes sweeping higher education at both the international and national levels are undermining the professional rights and employment conditions of staff. The trend toward a more

corporate model of higher education is leading to a weakening of academic freedom and collegial governance. Privatization and public sector cutbacks are accelerating a longer-term trend toward precarious and casual employment. More and more staff are being hired on low pay, with few if any benefits, and without procedural protections for academic freedom. Meanwhile, attempts to promote equity and inclusivity in higher education face new challenges brought on by rising fees and public funding restraint. The situation is being exacerbated as the ‘baby boomer’ generation of academic staff in many countries approach retirement. This will require unions in many parts of the world to pay particular attention to the status of young people in the profession, including doctoral candidates, post-doctoral fellows, and young academic staff. The unions in the sector must work harder to better represent young and early stage academic staff and researchers, by recruiting and retaining them, and devising structures and policies involving them more fully than at present.

These trends are unsustainable. Academic staff lies at the core of higher education’s mission. Without the appropriate terms and conditions of employment and professional rights required to nurture a talented and committed pool of teaching and research personnel, higher education simply cannot fulfill its public responsibility. The 1997 UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel makes the point in affirming the following:

- higher education teaching personnel and research staff are entitled to academic freedom which includes the right, without restriction by prescribed doctrine, to freedom of teaching and discussion, freedom in carrying out research and disseminating and publishing the results thereof, freedom to express freely their opinion about the institution or system in which they work, freedom from institutional censorship and freedom to participate in professional or representative academic bodies;
- the right to education, teaching and research can only be fully enjoyed in an atmosphere of academic freedom and autonomy for institutions of higher education;
- tenure or its functional equivalent, where applicable, constitutes one of the major procedural safeguards of academic freedom;
- higher education teaching personnel and research staff should enjoy the right to freedom of association, and the right to bargain collectively as promoted in the standards and instruments of the International Labour Organization (ILO); and
- working conditions for higher education teaching personnel and research staff should be such as will best promote effective teaching, scholarship, and research.

Action Points:

- i. *Defending academic freedom and collegial governance:*
 - EI should continue to monitor and report on attacks on academic freedom at the institutional and individual levels.
 - EI should continue to act as an advocate for academic freedom, tenure or its functional equivalent, and collegial governance through participation in the ILO/CEART process.
 - EI and its affiliates should continue to restate the centrality of the 1997 UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel, and insist on its increased relevance in light of the current political and economic environment, and actively make use of it as appropriate.

- For World Teachers Day, EI should provide affiliates with resources specific to higher education so that they may better use the occasion to publicize the importance of academic freedom and staffing conditions.

ii. *Promoting the employment rights and conditions of fixed-term staff:*

- EI and its affiliates should act as a clearinghouse to promote and publicize good practice of affiliates, including collective agreement language and legislative initiatives, on ways to improve the terms and conditions of employment of fixed-term staff and to promote paths to permanent or continuing employment as articulated in the 2007 EI resolution on.
- EI and its affiliates should monitor and report on the position of new faculty in the profession, and develop a joint strategy to put the concerns of young faculty higher on the agenda of unions and the academic community;

iii. *Promoting equity and inclusivity:*

- Given that the equality agenda is likely to come under attack, directly or by default, when cuts or the re-shaping of the sector are considered, the task force recommends that unions in the sector be pro-active in defence of equality. There is considerable experience and expertise in member unions and networking is particularly fruitful in this area. A recent example is the GEW/SULF/UCU project on work/life balance in higher education which was supported by EU funding.
- EI could play a valuable role in promoting and fostering networking and joint work on Equality (and no doubt, other issues) between member unions. These could include:
 - Producing a document highlighting best practice in promoting equity within organisations
 - Taking a public stance on issues facing marginalised groups and oppressed minorities, particularly the rise of xenophobia
 - Providing templates to identify areas that are in need of rights-based legislation, as well as examples of equity directives, such as those from the EU, being adopted into national law
- EI should standardise the use of the word “equity” rather than equality, as this reflects more accurately our desire for an agenda that goes beyond rights-based legislation.

7. Conclusion

In reviewing the 2004 report and package, the task force has highlighted the intensification and acceleration of many of the trends which were identified six years ago. The global trade in higher education, despite the economic recession, has rapidly expanded. This expansion against a background of recession seems certain to have a number of disturbing and negative consequences for higher education and research. This combination of phenomena continues to pose a number of threats to staff, students and the sector as a whole.

The task force emphasizes that this supplement to the 2004 report is intended to focus on ways that EI and its affiliates can develop new tools, tactics and strategies to carry forward the work needed to defend the sector and the profession. EI and its affiliates must be steadfast in their determination to mobilize their members, students and representatives of higher education institutions to not only assess and where necessary, actively challenge the impact of globalization of the sector, but also to develop and promote an alternative and more sustainable vision of higher education and research, and urgently to build the collective capacity to deliver that vision.