



Education International Annual Development Cooperation Meeting

Brussels, 18 – 19 November 2010

Report



Session I: Evaluating Union Development Solidarity Programmes

1. Measuring programme effectiveness – Quality Monitoring and Evaluation

Erik Kijne, Senior trainer/moderator at the PCM group based in Brussels made a [presentation](#) about project cycle management for successful development cooperation (DC) projects. By proposing participants to list some problems they face in project implementation, he insisted on good project preparation/planning before implementation stage. He reminded participants of the crucial importance of the needs identification at local level when developing DC project. He finally emphasised the need to conduct regular monitoring and evaluation to facilitate ongoing review of project relevance, feasibility and sustainability.

Remarks from participants:

- Teacher union (TU) projects are more political and value-based.
- Teacher unions are not trained to develop project proposals (in both developed and developing countries).
- The culture of project management is distinct from traditional TU working culture.
- Partnering might help to improve TUs' project approach. It would also be a strategy to increase TUs' visibility.
- TUs should explore innovative ways to have more chance to get funding for DC projects.

2. Analytical Framework for Teachers' Trade Unions

Arnhild Bie-Larsen from UEN and Martin Carlstedt from Lärarförbundet made a presentation on the analytical tool they have developed for analysis and measurement of organisational development (see attached). Arnhild presented the [Analytical Framework](#) while Martin presented a concrete case (GTU, Gambia) where the Framework is used.

The presentation was followed by questions for discussion in small groups:

- How may an analytical framework be useful in your DC work?
- Please share your experiences and thoughts

Remarks from participants:

- Using this framework can help in establishing baselines, facilitating evaluation process (as indicators are fixed from the beginning) and smoothing the progress of project implementation.
- The framework is also useful to present DC work within TUs movement.
- It can contribute to changing the perception of donors to understand trade unions not only in place for 'bread-and-butter' issues.
- The questions listed in the paper are an effective situational analysis tool when evaluating the inclusion of new unions in DC project work.
- A useful tool which will be used by other DC partners.

- EI Regional Coordinators could also be trained in the use of the framework.
- The analysis done by DC partners could be shared through the EI DC database to inform and facilitate future analysis.
- The document has no copywrite!
- The framework could be adjusted with a fifth sub-goal expanding on EFA indicators.

Session II: Build the Base: Effective Union Organising as a Development Solidarity Objective

1. Powering Up: An Organising and Union-Building Model

David Dorn from the AFT made a presentation of the AFT organising and union building model. David started by showing participants charts presenting percentage of teachers unionised in several countries (very low in certain countries!). He talked about organising campaigns, issues, tools (one-on-one organising being the most effective) and skills. He then conducted a brief role play using the one-on-one organising tool with the following script: a union representative is trying to convince a teacher to get unionised. He concluded by saying that EI should adopt an organising culture to strengthen organisations. A resolution at the next EI congress will be proposed on organising.

Barbara MacDonald from CTF shared her experience on the CTF organising model. She talked about the importance of in-service training/programmes as a tool to recruit teachers. If in-service programmes work (including child labour, HIV and AIDS, gender issues) the membership is increased. She insisted on the importance of developing strategic partnerships with governments to suggest in-service programmes for professional development responding to the needs of teachers. Examples of Guinea, Malawi and Togo were given.

What is the organising situation in DC partners' countries?

- In Scandinavian countries, 90% of teachers are unionised so the organising desk is not so busy. Lärarförbundet has a recruiting component in each activity (international activities included).
- GEW conducts regular seminars on organising to attract new members.
- NUT has a quite a large organising unit. The emphasis is also on retention.
- Teaching is the most unionised sector in France. There are *ad hoc* campaigns of recruitment at UNSA-Education but no dedicated unit.
- In Finland 95% of teachers are unionised.
- In the Netherlands, teachers are not highly unionised (about one third) but AOb is the only the expanding union in the country. Recruiting of new members is incorporated in the Communication Unit. Recruitment tied onto other more attractive issues.

- In Spain, 20-25% of teachers are unionised but there is a growing membership, while no dedicated unit the outreach is directly to schools.
- The Australian union covers public schools only. Union membership density is very variable according to region. Union maps membership regionally. Students can have associate membership for free. There is a variety of recruitment strategies.
- In Quebec 95-100% of teachers are unionised. In Canada teachers are members by virtue of certification.
- In the Caribbean, 80-95% of teachers are unionised. This high number is due to presence of shop-stewards at school level.

Session III: Regional case studies (Asia, MENA, Africa)

Aloysius Mathews, Huda Khoury and Assibi Napoe presented DC experiences with teacher unions in their regions. They described the problems faced in the implementation of DC programmes, the positive and negative aspects, lessons learned and impact on the unions. The regional cases are available upon request.

Session IV: Towards a new EI Development Cooperation Policy Paper

Development cooperation has always been a priority for Education International (EI). An EI document on policy guidelines for development cooperation '*For a Transparent and Constructive Partnership*' came into existence in 1997. In 1998, the second EI World Congress passed a Resolution on Development Cooperation which gave status to the 1997 policy document, reiterated support for DC work, emphasised transparency, effectiveness and clarity, established EI's coordinating role and called on EI and member organisations to meet the 0.7% income allocation to DC work, as per UN targets.

In 2007, at the annual EI Development Cooperation meeting, the EI cooperating partners decided to re-examine its existing policy document and to update it to reflect the new global context and meet the challenges with which teacher unions worldwide are confronted. Consultations over the last two years involving DC partners and EI regional and head quarters' staff resulted in fruitful dialogue and in early 2010 a writing group was formed to produce a policy document which captures the collective commitment of the diverse partners.

A [draft EI Development Cooperation Policy Paper](#) was prepared which was discussed and commented during the meeting. Suggestions and comments from participants are the following:

Opening statement (p.1):

- Under opening statement (p.1), 3rd paragraph, 1st bullet, 'trade union cooperation' to be replaced by 'trade union solidarity'.
- Under opening statement (p.1), 3rd paragraph, reformulate 2nd bullet by positive statements: 'helps to promote social, political and economic justice'.

- Under opening statement (p.1), 3rd paragraph, 1st bullet, replace 'the powerful tool' by 'a powerful tool'.
- Under opening statement (p.1), 3rd paragraph, 5th bullet: 'and responsibilities' to be added after 'rights' in phrase 'helps people to become aware of their rights'.
- Suggestion to expand the 4th paragraph of opening statement (p.1) and add 'As EI member organisations we are all guided by a political framework that constitutes the basis of all DC cooperation'.
- Under opening statement (p.1), 5th paragraph, 'children' to be replaced by 'people'.

Objectives (p.2-3):

- Under 'Objectives', bullet 3 (p.3): 'responds to equality, but fighting all kinds of discrimination'. No priority to gender over other types of discrimination. 'Minorities' should be added too. 'Disadvantaged groups' should be reformulated. Recommendation to revisit forms of discrimination terminology.

Principles (p.3):

- Under 'Principles, 'partnership' (p.3), delete phrase 'discouraging dependency', as it is negative and paternalistic. The idea contained within 'equal partnership'.

Roles and responsibilities (p.4-5):

- Under 'Roles and responsibilities', 'cooperating partners' (p.4) - bullet 2 'cooperating partner should try to address supplementary requests' - bullet 3 'unions should work to have contingency options in case that government funding dries up'.
- Under 'Roles and responsibilities', EI should be considered too as a partner (reference to Solidarity Fund) and not only as a facilitator to partnership.
- Under 'Roles and responsibilities', 'cooperating partners will', last bullet: add 'and women' after 'young people'.
- Under 'Roles and responsibilities', 'Development partners will', 3rd bullet, replace 'sufficient' by 'appropriate'.
- Under 'Roles and responsibilities', delete 'a note on terminology'.

General comments:

- 'Public' should be added preceding 'education' throughout document. Problem for EI as not definitive policy, even if it is EI preference.
- 'Teacher unions' should be replaced by 'education unions' throughout document.
- Making distinction between partners does not need to exist as it clashes with principles of partnership. No need to have 'cooperating' and 'contributing partners'. Consensus on merging partner terminology.
- Ensure consistency when referring to equality.
- Need to define the purpose of the document – is it guideline document or policy? If it is conceived as guidelines it is good, if it is policy there is need to work on content, the document does not go deep enough to define a new paradigm for union involvement in a very different DC world than 1993. Response from writing committee: But it is work in progress, hybrid document neither political nor technical which doesn't address union crisis worldwide, engagement with NGOs etc. It is a guiding document for unions engaging in or beginning to engage in cooperation.
- The document should encourage lateral not vertical dimension. No top down approach.

Comments on French version:

- In French version, under 'Principles', 'Long-term' (p.3), 'viabilité' to be replaced by 'durabilité'.
- In French version, under 'Objectives', last phrase (p.3), 'cadre contraignant' should be replaced by 'cadre indicatif'.

Follow-up process:

In order to reflect the views of unions participating in DC work in all regions it was decided to send the current draft to all EI regional conferences and/or committees to get their input and be validated by end of January 2011.

The text of the policy will subsequently be fine-tuned by the writing group and circulated to all DC partners for very last comments and approval by end of February.

It will then be translated/adjusted into French and Spanish, presented to EI management and submitted to the EI Executive Board in March 2011 for adoption.

The Policy paper adopted will then guide EI and DC partners in their future DC efforts.

Dates for the next EI annual development cooperation meeting

Based on proposals and suggestions received by participants, it has been decided to hold the next annual development cooperation meeting on **Tuesday 15 and Wednesday 16 November 2011**.

List of participants

Darcel RUSSELL, **AEU**, Australia
Morten BRYNSKOV, **BUPL**, Denmark
Flemming SORENSEN, **DLF**, Denmark
Tore ASMUSSEN, **DLF**, Denmark
Pedro GONZALEZ LOPEZ, **FE.CC.OO**, Spain
Charo RIZO, **FE.CC.OO**, Spain
Carmen VIEITES, **FETE-UGT**, Spain
Gaspar Antuña CERREDO, **FETE-UGT**, Spain
David EDWARDS, **NEA**, USA
Ritva SEMI, **OAJ**, Finland
Agnès BREDA, **UNSA-Education**, France
Trudy KERPERIEN, **AOb**, The Netherlands
Manfred BRINKMANN, **GEW**, Germany
David ROBINSON, **CAUT**, Canada
Jeannie REA, **NTEU**, Australia
Jens VRAA-JENSEN, **DM**, Denmark
Joseph O'REILLY, **ATL**, UK
Henrik HERBER, **Lärarförbundet**, Sweden
Eva ELMSTEDT FRISK, **Lärarförbundet**, Sweden
Martin CARLSTEDT, **Lärarförbundet**, Sweden
Amy NORRISH, **NUT**, UK
Samidha GARG, **NUT**, UK
David DORN, **AFT**, USA
Patricia KEEFER, **AFT**, USA
Lajla BLOOM, **UEN**, Norway
Ingrid CONVERY, **UEN**, Norway
Arnhild BIE-LARSEN, **UEN**, Norway
Richard LANGLOIS, **CSQ**, Canada
Barbara MACDONALD MOORE, **CTF**, Canada
Hilarion MELANSON, **CTF**, Canada
Chris WEAVERS, **NASUWT**, UK
Rob COPELAND, **UCU**, UK
Florian LASCROUX, **SNES**, France
Reginald SOREL, **CECI**, Canada
Assibi NAPOE, **EI Regional Office Africa**
Combertty RODRIGUEZ, **EI Regional Office Latin America**
Aloysius MATTHEWS, **EI Regional Office Asia**
Virginia ALBERT, **EI Regional Office North America & Caribbean**
Huda KHOURY, **EI, Coordinator MENA Initiative**
Fred van LEEUWEN, **EI General Secretary**
Jan EASTMAN, **EI Deputy General Secretary**
Nicolás RICHARDS, **EI HQ, Solidarity & Development Unit**
Delphine SANGLAN, **EI HQ, Solidarity & Development Unit**
Alex RUEDIG, **EI HQ, Solidarity & Development Unit**
Yann GELISTER, **EI HQ, Solidarity & Development Unit**
Julie KAVANAGH, **EI HQ, Solidarity & Development Unit**