

# SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY OF EI MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

## Union characteristics/profile

1. Teachers in public education appear to be the most organized cluster in the education system. A great majority (73%) of respondents point to this cluster as their membership base.
2. By level of education, membership bulk come from public primary/elementary (49.3%) and public secondary compulsory levels (49.3%).

## Funding and GDP for public education

3. Though funding of public education mostly comes from the national/federal government, state/provincial governments and to a lesser extent regional governments also provide funding.
4. The majority of respondents (32) have a level of GDP allocated to public education below 6%; 5 have a level of 6%; and only 4 report a level of GDP above 6% (the highest being 14.40%).

## Familiarity with PPP term as applied in education

5. A great majority of respondent-organisations (78.5%) claim familiarity though unions' understanding of the term PPP varies quite widely, confirming in a way the perception of the term as being both generic and confusing. There are various levels too of engagement between the public and private sectors, i.e. national, federal, state, municipal, etc. The private sector involved in PPPs comprised of business companies/consortiums, banks, religious institutions and charity foundations, NGOs and parents in the private actor.
6. When related to GDP grouping, there are overwhelmingly more respondents coming from countries with below 6% GDP in education that expressed familiarity with the term PPP as applied to education.

## Types of PPPs in education

7. There exists a wide variety of PPPs in education among the respondents' countries. Infrastructure PPPs and industry-government partnership for innovation and research appear to be the most common types existing in the countries of the respondents.
  8. There is an observed general tendency that, except in high-income economies, industry-government partnerships becoming more evident or present as the income classification of a country escalates.
  9. Except in Africa, the existence of PPPs involving industry-government partnership is acknowledged by a higher proportion or majority of respondents in each of the regions compared to those that aver otherwise.
  10. A very high share among those that claimed familiarity with the term PPP also identifies the existence of infrastructure PPPs in their respective countries. On the other hand, among those who are not familiar with the term, more than half of point to the non-existence of this type.
- 
-

### PPP actors

11. There is a wide range of actors that are identified as initiating and/or promoting PPPs in different countries. Domestic private-for-profit entities comprised the dominant actor, cited by nearly 80% of respondents, followed by domestic NGOs and faith based organisations, which are listed the as second main actor cited by 60% of respondents.
12. Domestic-private for profit entities are the dominant PPP actors in all regions, except in North America and Caribbean.
13. IFIs are more dominant in countries with a level of GDP allocated to public education lower than 6% compared to countries with a GDP 6% and above.

### Reasons for government involvement in PPPs

14. The three most common reasons for government's engagement in PPPs are: budgetary limits (78.5%), improvement of quality of education (57%), and innovation in management (50.8%).
15. Improving access to education as a government-cited reason for PPP involvement is related to income grouping. This government reasoning is cited by majority of respondents in all but high-income economies.
16. Similarly, improving access to education as government reason for PPP involvement is highly related to regional grouping. As expected, it is in Africa that majority of respondents point to this reason (86.7%), followed by Asia (50%). However, this particular reason is cited the least among Latin American respondents (20%).
17. Among those who claim familiarity with the term PPP, the majority also identifies that PPPs "provide innovation in management" as reason cited by government for PPP involvement.

### Definition of quality education

18. In general, there appears to be a common understanding, in terms of core principles, among the respondents of what quality education is. Principles such as free and publicly-and adequately-funded education and universally accessible education are the most common or recurring concepts identified with quality education.
19. The objectives and outcomes related to quality education seem to be more varied and diverse as some point to more individually-centered objectives such as acquisition of competencies relevant to the job market and employability to the broader goal of building a fairer and democratic society. This divergence may in a way explain variations of responses among unions with regard to questions that involve perceptions on quality education.
20. Some of the definitions put forward also included certain components, requirements or indicators of quality education. The three most often cited are:
  - high quality, well-trained and sufficient number of teachers and educational personnel
  - good, safe and adequate facilities and infrastructure
  - adequately-funded/fair share from the national budget

### Union perception of PPP impact

---

---

21. Overall, the perception that PPPs change the ethos of public education and provide financial and technical support (in public education) topped the list. However, perceptions on PPPs impact on public education vary and may depend on other factors.
  22. Union perception on whether PPPs provide financial and technical support is influenced by their level of GDP. Those with GDP for all education of less than 6% tend to agree that PPPs provide financial and technical support while those with GDP of 6% and above tend to reject the perception.
  23. Independently of the level of GDP, unions' perception on whether PPPs raise management standards is overwhelmingly negative. Among the respondents with GDP in all education below 6%, 42.3% are of the opinion that PPPs do not raise management. This perception is shared from 92.9% of the respondents in the group of respondents with GDP level 6% and above.
  24. The majority of respondents (56.3%) from countries with a level of GDP in public education lower than 6% are of the opinion that PPPs do not save public money. On the other hand, there is a clear divide among respondents with a GDP of 6% and above as the number of respondents who agree with the perception is the same as the number of those who have a negative perception. Meanwhile, the proportion of respondents who do not know whether PPPs save public money is higher (more than the total of those who agree and disagree with the perception).
  25. Among the respondents coming from countries with a GDP level lower than 6%, half of them claim that PPPs change the role of teachers while 43.8% stated otherwise. The respondents coming from countries with a level of GDP 6% and above present the opposite tendency as only 11.1% of them thought that PPPs change the role of teachers. An overwhelming majority in this group of respondents is divided equally between those who see no change in the role of teachers and those who do not know.
  26. Respondents' perception on the impact of infrastructure PPPs on several areas, though varied, tends to be more on the negative. The majority of respondents perceive that infrastructure PPPs do not: (1) provide greater discipline in procurement (69.1%); (2) provide financial support to educational reforms (58.1%); (3) save public money (56.4%); (4) provide adequate & acceptable quality education (48.4%); and (5) provide innovation in management (41.9%). More respondents are of the opinion that infrastructure PPPs: (1) change the ethos of public education (43.6); and (2) change the role of teachers (41.8%). The direction of change is predominantly negative.
  27. Similarly, the respondents thought that private operation of education facilities: (1) do not provide greater discipline in procurement (64.5%); and (2) do not provide financial support to educational reforms (58.1%). A significant proportion of respondents likewise do not agree that this type of PPP: (1) saves public money (48.4%); (2) raises management standards (48.4); (3) provides innovation in management (41.9); and (4) provides financial & technical support (38.7%).
  28. It is only on the provision of needed financial and technical support to the educational system that outsourcing of curriculum design is positively acknowledged by a higher proportion of respondents.
  29. Overall, findings reveal that in all types of PPPs, the only area where more of the respondents acknowledged the positive impact of PPPs is on the provision of needed financial and technical support to public education.
-

30. The perception that PPPs provide needed financial and technical support appears to be overwhelming among the unions in Africa with nearly 80% of respondents responding positively. Europe ranks second, though this perception is not shared by the majority. Likewise, in Asia-Pacific, about 35% of respondents claim the positive impact of PPPs in providing needed financial and technical support. However, unions in Latin America and North America and Caribbean do not perceive that PPPs provide needed financial and technical support.
31. Overall, respondents from Africa positively point to three perceived impacts of PPPs in education: provide needed financial and technical support, provide adequate and acceptable quality education, and provide financial support to education reforms. Such perception is not shared by majority of respondents within other regional groupings.

#### Entity that determines wages and working conditions in PPPs

32. Private entities determine wages and employment conditions according to 34.2% of respondents. This arrangement somehow influences unions' perception of the impact of PPPs on working conditions.

#### Impact of PPPs on casualisation

33. In general, there is no common perception among respondents on the impact of PPPs on casualisation.
34. The variable 'PPPs impact on casualisation' is found to be significantly related to three areas of union perception on the impact of PPPs in general, namely: changing the role of teachers, changing the ethos of public education, and helping in the provision of quality education.
35. A great number among respondents that indicate PPPs change the role of teachers note that PPPs have a great deal of impact on casualisation. It could be surmised that the perception of PPPs' impact on the role of teachers influences the perception on the extent of PPPs' impact on casualisation.
36. Likewise, the perception on the extent of impact of casualisation is determined by the perception on whether PPPs change the ethos of public education. If indeed PPPs change the ethos of public education, it is likely that PPPs have a great deal of impact on casualisation.
37. Among respondents that note that PPPs do not help provide quality education, respondents that claim PPPs impact greatly on casualisation outnumbered those that claimed lesser impact. It could be surmised that, since PPPs are not perceived to help providing quality education, PPPs impact greatly on casualisation.

#### PPPs' impact on organizing

38. There is lack of a common perception among majority of respondents that PPPs do impact on organizing. This may be attributed to the diversity of opinions and diverging views among unions on what quality education is.
  39. Nonetheless, among those that indicate that PPPs change the role of teachers, nearly 40% note that PPPs impact greatly on organising.
  40. Among those that indicate that PPPs change the role of support staff, PPPs are perceived to impact greatly on organizing.
- 
-

41. To the extent that PPPs do not change the ethos of public education, they do not have any impact on organizing – meaning PPPs will not hinder or constrain organizing. On the other hand, if PPPs change the ethos of public education, they impact greatly on organizing.

#### PPPs' impact on working conditions

42. There are more respondents (36.7%) that claim that PPPs damage working conditions than those that opine that they improve working conditions in general (21.5%). About 28% do not know.
43. Respondents that note that PPPs damage working conditions also stress that PPPs greatly impact on organizing. To the extent that PPPs do not impact on organizing (which almost always negatively) or in other words do not hinder or constrain organizing, it is more likely that PPPs may improve working conditions. If PPPs impact a great deal (negatively) on organizing, then indeed it is more likely that PPPs damage working conditions.

#### Conditions to minimize/mitigate the adverse impact of PPPs

44. Respondents point to a range of options as necessary conditions to minimize or mitigate the impact on PPPs. Ranked according to the number of respondents in descending order, these conditions are:
- Transparency in PPP contract awards and processes (68.4%);
  - Participation of union in PPP evaluation (56%);
  - Participation from unions in the implementation of PPPs (50.7%),
  - Identification and effective involvement of other stakeholders in the planning and implementation stage of PPPs (41.8%).
45. Nonetheless, a number of respondents who elaborate on this point are of the opinion that unions should fight against the introduction of PPPs in education.

#### Existence of union policy on PPPs in education

46. The majority of respondents claim to have a union policy on PPPs, while 38.0% do not have. Only 2.5% respond “do not know”.
47. All respondents from Latin America claim to have policies on PPPs. A great majority of European respondents (70.3%), too, and half of respondents from Asia-Pacific have union policies on PPPs. Meanwhile, the majority of unions from Africa (73.3%) and North America and Caribbean (62.5%) lack union policy on PPPs.
48. Nonetheless, although the existence of a union policy may temper the extent of impact of PPPs on organizing, it does not eliminate the impact of PPP on organizing.

#### Union involvement in PPPs

49. Arguably, union involvement in PPPs may temper the (adverse) impact of PPPs on organizing. An important issue here is the kind of involvement that unions have with regards to PPPs.
50. Only 22.8% of the respondents claim involvement in a PPP programme or project, against 67.1% reporting no involvement. The level of involvement per PPP type is rather low, the highest being the one in outsourcing of significant support services (27%) and the lowest outsourcing of curriculum delivery (13.6%). There is limited union involvement because of two main reasons, namely: (a) many unions oppose PPPs in the first place, and (b) PPPs are relatively new or limited.
- 
-

51. The lack of involvement of unions in any PPP program or project cuts across all income categories of countries. Nonetheless, except in lower-middle economies, a number of respondents from other regions claim involvement of their union in a PPP program or project.
52. There are generally positive statements with regard to union involvement on PPPs. Main areas in which unions are thought to have an impact are:
  - Protecting working conditions;
  - Slowing down the process of PPPs; and
  - Changing the direction of PPPs by making them less profit oriented.
53. About 48% of respondents indicate that they would consider union involvement in PPPs if there would be opportunities. About 22% answer negatively to this and 17.7% were undecided. Forms or types of PPPs which unions want to involved in are:
  - Infrastructure PPPs
  - Upgrading of teachers qualifications and quality of teaching
  - Outsourcing of educational services
  - Innovation and management

#### Foreseeable trends in PPPs in education

54. Trends in general point to the continuous and increasing use of PPPs in the education sector. About 52 (or 80% of 65) foresee this trend in their countries. In terms of frequency of citations, respondents see:
  - Increasing use of infrastructure PPPs cited 13 times;
  - Use of education vouchers cited twice;
  - Outsourcing of training and courses for teachers and students cited twice;
  - Private management and maintenance of infrastructure cited twice;
  - Others cited: assessment and appraisal, development of innovative technology and catering.

#### Union position on PPPs in education

55. There is no common position on PPPs among respondents with an almost equal number opposing and conditionally accepting PPPs in education.
  56. Respondents out-rightly opposing PPPs in education outnumber those that conditionally accept PPPs (20 vs. 12). Six unions declare complete acceptance. Two unions want to see the outcomes first and the impact of PPPs before they could provide their position. Seven unions seem to hold more of a critical engagement approach. Four unions remain suspicious, sceptical or wary or between these positions on PPPs, although the general tendency of their position is pointing more towards opposition.
- 
-