



MALAGA 12-14 November 2007



VIth International
Higher Education
and Research
Conference

**CONFERENCE REPORT
BY PAUL BENNETT,
GENERAL RAPPORTEUR**



Education Internationale
Internationale de l'Éducation
Internacional de la Educación
Bildungsinternationale

www.ei-ie.org

CONFERENCE REPORT BY PAUL BENNETT, GENERAL RAPPORTEUR

Introduction: from Melbourne 2005 to Malaga 2007

The VIth International Higher Education and Research Conference of Education International has met in Malaga, Spain, from 12-14 November 2007, shaping its debates around the theme "The Status of Higher Education Personnel – 10 years after the 1997 UNESCO Recommendation"¹. Some 260 delegates, representing 56 member organisations from 39 countries met, the largest such conference in EI to date – reflecting the growing importance of the sector and its place within Education International, almost 10% of whose 31 million individual members work in higher education and research. The conference was warmly welcomed to a city and a region which proudly boasts a cultural continuity from the Phoenicians to Picasso. Our Spanish hosts pointed to the relevance of the conference theme for Spanish higher education, faced with legislative changes to the accreditation of access, the status of teaching personnel, the autonomy of universities and their relations with industry.

In his keynote address, EI General Secretary Fred Van Leeuwen welcomed the scope of the conference with representation from all EI's regions and increased numbers from the non-industrialised countries including new unions from Benin, Mexico and Nicaragua. He paid tribute to the UNESCO participation programme for its assistance, and thanked the EI higher education networks which had facilitated the organisation of the conference. Fred Van Leeuwen said that intergovernmental bodies recognised the value of higher education and research, but failed to support their key attributes which underpin that value, leading to ongoing conflict. EI had had to be active in defence of the sector and had ensured that "the voice of the men and women in the sector has been heard: we have made a real difference". He drew attention to three areas in which EI's campaigns have succeeded:

- The 1997 UNESCO recommendation itself, which might not have been promulgated but for years of intense and expert EI lobbying in which the Canadian AUT played a key role;
- The battle against GATS and the WTO, in which EI's advocacy and mobilisation, in concert with the Public Services International, alerted the public to the threat of commercialisation of higher education and research;
- The long campaign to get into the Pan-European "Bologna Process" to put higher education personnel in their rightful place alongside governments, University rectors and student organisations.

¹http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13144&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

The General Secretary referred to the close working between EI and the European Students Union, which was strengthened during the Conference by the launch of the International Mobility Campaign for staff and students.

He said that EI's key principles - peace, democracy, equality and social justice - were under threat or non-existent in many countries as a result of government actions, and the neo-liberal agenda. He drew attention to the approaching crisis in the next decade as the "baby boomer" generation of teachers retires, creating an 18 million shortfall in teacher supply worldwide, and he pledged to use EI as a vehicle to fill the training gap in countries where governments were failing to deliver teachers in the numbers needed or with sufficient training. However, he also called on the higher education affiliates to lend their teacher education expertise at the national level to help address the crisis of teacher shortage, and to sustain the quality of the profession.

Fred Van Leeuwen also welcomed the presence of climate change on the conference agenda, and pointed to the strengths of the university sector in addressing these key issues.

Taking up the themes of the Berlin World Congress, the General Secretary referred to the Task Force on Public Private Partnerships which is being set up. He acknowledged that the issue was controversial with many member organisations, but claimed that it was essential that EI developed its policy to deal with emerging partnerships between governments, the non-government sector and other stakeholders.

In conclusion he said that the higher education sector was in the forefront of many developing trends and should help other education sectors: in turn, the higher education and research sector could "count on EI".

The 1997 UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel – 10 years later: outcome and perspectives

The Conference received an analysis² from Bill Ratteree of ILO, of the 1997 Recommendation, in which he rehearsed its key themes: academic freedom, tenure or job security, institutional autonomy, the careers and conditions of service of higher education personnel, research, part-time and casual staff rights. He pointed out the role played in the development of the UNESCO recommendation both by the ILO and teachers' representatives, and the opportunities for continued teacher organisation involvement in relation to the work of the CEART³.

² <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5115&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

³ <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/dialogue/sector/techmeet/ceart/>

Bill Ratteree refuted suggestions either that the Recommendation was outdated by developments of the last decade or that it might need to be replaced by a Convention. He pointed to the range of political, collective bargaining and publicity uses to which the Recommendation could be put – but also to the fact that the first allegation of non-compliance was only now being taken through the system, after 10 years: the NTEU case against the Australian government.

Ilze Trapenciere (LIZDA; Latvia) and Carolyn Allport (NTEU, Australia) presented case studies of the potential for and the actual application of the Recommendation in Latvia and in Australia.

It is clear that there is substantial potential for use of the recommendation, but there are a range of technical issues to be addressed, as well as a serious challenge in view of the complex technical process which application of the recommendation may involve. However, as Carolyn Allport said, we need to make the Recommendation our own, and to promote it as the core international standard for higher education and research workers.

Protecting and Defending Academic Freedom

Kari Kjenndalen (NAR, Norway) reviewed the main findings from the EI report on academic freedom⁴, in the light of the key international reference points from the Magna Charta Universitatum onwards. She contrasted those positive assertions of academic freedom with the reality of the challenges from globalisation, “new public management”, growing dependence on external funding, privatisations, differentiation of staffing structures, and the sheer lack of time and money to support academic work and academic freedom.

The EI survey had revealed high levels of formal or de facto constraints on academic freedom, and these were growing in many countries, including some where academic freedom had seemed to be assured. The fight back must be multi-dimensional, including work with partner organisations at the international level, the fight for legal guarantees at the national level, and the vigorous defence against individual threats to academic freedom in the universities.

Leif Sondergaard (DM, Denmark) ⁵explored these themes further in the context of national terrorist legislation being passed or contemplated by many national governments in the wake of 9/11. He pointed to the ambiguities in the key UN Security Council resolution 1373 passed immediately after those events, and the parallels which followed in national legislation, imposing radical new regimes in regard to border control and freedom of movement, and the draconian new powers of detention which a number of governments had taken. This had led for example, to a significant fall in the number of foreign students entering the USA. As the “war on terror” continued, the impact on the academic community has widened, not only with restrictions on academics visiting the USA and other countries because of security or overtly ideological considerations, but a sinister

⁴ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5107&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

⁵ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5101&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

culture of constraint on areas of research no longer deemed acceptable across a wide range of disciplines. This in turn was promoting “self censorship” by academics, a step towards an Orwellian vision of a cowed and subservient academy. The stated reason for the arrest of a group of academics in Germany for alleged links to terror groups this summer would have been laughable if the implications of such unreasoning state power were not in fact, terrifying.

James Rice (NEA, USA) described the campaign by the academic unions in the USA, to stem the tide of state legislation aimed at curbing academic freedom. The Free Exchange on Campus alliance between faculty unions and student organisations had met with a high level of success in fighting off neoconservative attempts to legislate away academic freedoms in more than half of the states of the US.

However, in discussion, it was indicated that the neo-con agenda was gaining ground in public opinion, with a wide public acceptance of the idea that “academic imbalance” (towards a liberal agenda) was a problem to be addressed. It was argued forcefully that academic freedom must be defended as the bedrock of higher education and research, and the key issues of private funding and casualised staff must also be fought on the grounds of academic freedom. In particular, EI and its affiliates must take up the fight against self censorship with their members, as a collective trade union issue. We must renew the commitment we made in Melbourne in December 2005, to campaign nationally on these issues. At present, in spite of great and often successful trade union work, still too often we are losing the battle.

Careers in Higher Education: Promoting the rights of fixed-term staff and early-stage researchers

Larry Gold (AFT, USA) outlined the dramatic decline in the proportion of tenured staff in universities and colleges in the United States, and the growing dependence on casualised staff or graduate students – a trend directly linked to the fall in the proportion of funding from public sources. He paid tribute to the quality and commitment of casual staff, but argued both that the system posed intolerable burdens on them, and that in the medium term a quality higher education system so overwhelmingly dependant on contract staff was unsustainable. However, there had been a 30 year ascendancy by right wing ideologues in the US, which had demonised the public sector and the taxes required to sustain it.

The unions’ response must offer protection to both tenured and contract staff, as well as graduate students. The FACE campaign aimed at building state-level coalitions to work for state legislation to protect tenure and limit the proportion of contract staff (in general a target of about 75% renewed staff, was the objective). It was recognised that this campaign would be a “long haul” which would require both alliance building with students and other bodies, and the renewal of the unions’ own organising base.

Bruno Carapinha (European Student's Union)⁶ gave a student perspective, based on the European Student Union publication "Bologna through student eyes", which identified the diversity of forms in which graduate and doctoral students worked across Europe. He set out a powerful case for common rights and status for all graduate students to eradicate disadvantage and to ensure rights of transition from the second (masters) cycle to doctoral studies, as well as addressing mobility and labour market issues.

Denis Jouan (SNCS, France)⁷ examined the recruitment and retention of early stage researchers, again pointing to the wide range and diversity of activities under the "research" rubric. He pointed out the growing crisis in research capacity generated by private and project-related funding and casual employment, and called for a shift from a "regulation by despair" for individual researchers to a collective and concerted campaign for researchers, based on clear employment rights. He pointed to the European Union's prescriptions for "contracts of indefinite duration" and the UK concordat for research workers as examples of what could be achieved, although the loopholes and weaknesses in these initiatives remained to be addressed, and in the final analysis, all researchers including at the early stage of their career need non fixed-term employment contracts, and this must be the trade union objective.

In discussion, it was argued that there need to be a balance between the pursuit of legislative protections and the more vigorous use of collective bargaining tools; which should include routes for contract staff into permanent employment.

Advancing Gender Equity

Vanja Ivosevic (Conducted the study)⁸ introduced the ongoing EI study on gender equity in higher education and research, urging more unions in the sector to broaden and deepen the analysis. She noted that the variation in the availability of official data weighted the study towards certain regions rather than others. She also noted that in global terms, while an increasing proportion of women now achieved entry to first degree courses and often had higher completion rates than males, a lower proportion of women than men continued into doctoral studies. This had clear implications for the supply of female academic staff. There were also marked differences in take-up in certain subjects, in particular low numbers of women in science and engineering. There were sharp variations in the proportion of female academics, from over 40% in central and eastern Europe and central Asia, to less than 20% in sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab world. Also, women represent 50% of junior, 30% of middle rank, and only 18% of high level posts in industrialised countries. As David Robinson reported in Melbourne, there was a substantially higher proportion of women in part-time or fixed-term employment, and the gender pay gap was a persistent feature, ranging from 13 to 24%. The increase of women in

⁶ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5091&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

⁷ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5097&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

⁸ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=4994&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

employment in the sector was ushering in an institutional attitude of "cheap labour".

The trade union response has focused on the gap in pay and conditions, bullying and harassment, and the career progression of women. Most unions have specific structures and mechanisms to address gender issues, but recognised that gender issues are both a women's and a men's responsibility, and must enter the policy and bargaining mainstream.

Carolyn Allport (NTEU, Australia)⁹ outlined the work of the NTEU in Australia, to put gender issues on the bargaining and political agenda. This work had its roots in major research commissioned by the union in the 1990's, and at that time led to some advances within the arbitration system which existed at that time. The NTEU is now planning further broad-based collaborative research, which would explore the impact of casualisation and privatisation on gender equality in higher education. It is to be hoped that the forthcoming Australian general election would lead to a restoration of rights and structures, the loss of which was reported to the 2005 Melbourne Conference. Carolyn Allport said that the majority of academic staff in Australia were women, as the profession becomes less attractive as a career. This raised issues of renewal which must be addressed. The fall of female earnings in proportion to those of men could be closely related to the key phases of deregulation by the Howard government. Australia also had a very high casualisation rate, with 50% of teaching done by hourly paid staff.

Gender inequity was also reflected in research funding and promotions where evidence showed that men were more likely to be successful even where there was strong evidence that female competitors were as good or better. The PhD represented a major obstacle, especially for those with family responsibilities.

The union response must include making gender inequity a bargaining issue; working closely with employers; pressing for institutional gender equality audits: the review and improvement of promotion systems, including the use of mentoring; and pursuit of legal protections.

Soledad Ruiz Seguin (Director of the Andalusia Woman Institute) described the range of work on gender issues being undertaken by the Andalusian regional government, in collaboration with Andalusia's 10 universities and the trade unions. Women gained a substantial majority of the degrees awarded; yet only 33% of women academics had tenure. The majority of research funds were allocated to large-scale research projects which favoured men. On the other hand, there were childcare centres for staff in the universities, equality programmes were being developed, together with the enhancement of the status of women's studies, work to promote employability of women, and to involve them more fully in university governance.

Linda Newman (UCU, UK) outlined the provisions of the UK's legal Gender Equality Duty, which came into force in 2005. This included a requirement on

⁹ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5095&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

public bodies to conduct audits of current and future policies for their equality impact. The UCU was putting a major effort into training and mobilising its activists to push for the implementation of the Duty in universities and colleges.

Combatting Commercialisation and Privatisation

The Conference reviewed the wide ranging challenges from the commercialisation and privatisation of higher education from three aspects – international trade agreements, public/private partnerships and tuition fees.

David Robinson (CAUT, Canada)¹⁰ reminded the conference of the key aspects of the GATS, but pointed out that the challenge of international trade agreements was now multi-faceted, particularly in respect of regional and bilateral agreements which went beyond the requirements of GATS, but which might be even less transparent and open to challenge than the GATS. Through driven by commercial considerations, and by Trade ministers, they were drawing education closer into their net. GATS agreements in sectors other than education, like “recreation” (libraries) or research and development in the business sector, might enable GATS to encroach on the university sector. Both GATS and other agreements between industrialised and developing countries, reflected in an unobvious way the crude power relations between the supposed trade partners.

Regional and bilateral agreements which assumed areas of activity are included unless they are specifically excluded, are particularly pernicious. Another effect of these agreements is to prohibit procedures and structures which might protect quality, standards or local needs. The UN Committee on Trade and Development has expressed its concern about these unequal treaties.

EI needs to work in collaboration with its affiliates, and globally with the wider trade union movement and with NGOs, to raise public awareness and to fight these threats.

Marie Blais (FNEEQ, Canada) described the effect of Public Private Partnerships in Quebec, and the dubious rationale on which the policy was based. While the goal might be to shift public expenditure off the account books, the effects on services and jobs were dramatic and damaging. Claims about protection of quality or efficiency through PPP were particularly specious, the guiding motivation for the private partners being profit. Services decline, public sector management structures and expertise decay.

Koen Geven (European Student’s Union)¹¹ updated the Conference on the continued spread of tuition fees as a means of plugging the funding gap in higher education – and the fight against fees, summarised in the European Student Union’s publications¹². The substantial research undertaken by the GEW in Germany on the effects of tuition fees was also noted. The push towards fees as a means of funding higher education, like PPP and GATS are part of a global

¹⁰ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5113&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

¹¹ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5099&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

¹² <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5008&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

neoliberal paradigm. Fees are driving a vision of higher education which is in effect an attempt to undo the increased access which had been achieved and the democratisation of higher education – a return to higher education as a privilege for a socio-economic elite. The rationale for the policy of fees needs to be stripped away to reveal its true nature. Amelioration through forms of financial support for certain categories of student is only a thin disguise for a deeply retrograde policy.

The knock-on consequences for students forced to take jobs, to take “employment-related” courses, to defer major life choices and for institutions and for academics in terms of autonomy and academic freedom, are yet to be fully felt. Tuition fees clearly have a distorting affect on the university mission. Higher education must be asserted as a right, not a privilege.

OECD initiatives: Tertiary Review and Assessing Higher Education Learning Outcomes

David Robinson¹³ and Roland Schneider of TUAC¹⁴ presented the key issues in the OECD Thematic Review of Tertiary Education which is approaching completion. David Robinson (CAUT, Canada) contrasted the neo-liberal prescriptions in the draft recommendations with the positive approach of the 1997 UNESCO Recommendation in key areas such as autonomy versus accountability; private versus public funding; tenure versus “flexibility” in academic careers; academic freedom; peer review or external quality assessment; research policy; higher education for human development or for insertion in the labour market; a global higher education community or an international student marketplace. The dreary instrumentalism of the OECD model stands in sharp contrast to everything of value in higher education, and particularly those values iterated in the UNESCO Recommendation which support, academic freedom, autonomy and quality in higher education. The OECD approach must be resisted with all our strength. In the coming months, up to April 2008, when the report is finalised, we must choose the key issues on which to fight, gather evidence, and build alliances at national and global level. OECD must not be allowed to set national education policies.

Monique Fouilhoux (EI) urged affiliates in the countries studied to look at their national governments’ responses and comment to governments and to EI: in turn, EI must take up affiliates’ concerns as well as the unacceptability of the OECD philosophy of higher education. She went on to outline the proposals for a PISA for higher education, effectively the ranking of institutions by mechanistic but measurable indicators. This remains a highly controversial proposal across the academic community. Any ranking approach will find it difficult to take proper account of the diversity of institutions, their missions, student intakes and other qualitative characteristics. Yet the OECD ministers’ meeting in Japan in January will try to drive this agenda forward. It is only one of various models of

¹³ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5111&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

¹⁴ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=5105&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

ranking, from the Shanghai list, to work going on among the testing and assessment industries, who see rich dividends to be gained at the expense of institutional budgets. It was pointed out that the instrumental ranking processes worked against the whole agenda of academic freedom, equality and social justice. For example, use of a limited number of English language journals as peer review benchmarks discriminates against other languages and cultures and the diversity of academic literature. We need to demonstrate the falsity of the claim that there is a "social demand" for rankings. Students' organisations have spoken out against them. EI must again, defend higher education and research from narrowly conceived economic imperatives.

The Bologna Process: towards a European Higher Education Area by 2010?

Barbara Weitgruber (Austrian Federal Ministry for Science and Research, Chair of the Bologna working group on "European Higher Education Area in a global setting")¹⁵ gave a resumé of the Bologna Process to date: built around the two-yearly meetings of higher education ministers from 46 countries, but now crucially involving Education International as a consultative partner, since 2005. Now there is a pressing need to make "Bologna" a reality at the institutional level.

The key elements of Bologna are:

- Mobility: the promotion of incentives, the removal of obstacles between European countries but also between Europe and other regions.
- Portability of grants and loans
- The three level degree structure – which must allow academic progression and entry to the labour market.
- Recognition of qualifications, periods of study and prior learning
- The Qualifications Framework – transparency and comparability
- Lifelong learning – This must have higher priority
- Quality Assurance – including the building of the European Register of Quality Assurance Agencies
- Doctoral programmes – to build synergies between the European Higher Education and Research Areas Doctoral programmes must develop as part of institutional strategies, and work must also be done on post-doctoral career patterns

¹⁵ <http://www.bologna2009benelux.org/>

- The Social Dimension – it is especially important to defend and widen access to high education from the diverse populations of Europe including those experiencing social or economic disadvantage. A starting point to this “greatest challenge” must be improved data collection.

We went on to consider Bologna in the global setting, reflecting that while its early phases had gone unnoticed by many countries, there is now growing world-wide interest. The Bologna Follow Up Group is working on improved information; the promotion of the attractiveness and competitiveness of European higher education; improved recognition worldwide; and the development of partnership and dialogue. In these processes, the unique place of Education International is acknowledged, as the only body in the Process with a truly global reach. EI has made significant steps to get the trade union agenda recognised, for example through the official “Bologna” seminar organised on mobility in London in February 2007, in collaboration with ESU and UCU (UK). One of the key messages from that seminar is that mobility should move from being an individual responsibility to an official and an institutional responsibility and that mobility is just as important for staff as for students. In general terms, it is also essential that our success in getting into the Bologna Process, is mirrored by national affiliates gaining entry to equivalent national structures, where they have not already done so. Concerns were expressed that staff and students from other countries, particularly in the south, might find it harder to access the Bologna area, and this was recognised as an issue EI might need to take up.

The Bologna Process has highlighted existing tensions between institutional cooperation and competition, higher education as a public good, and the market place, on which EI will need to be vigilant although ministers have recognised that higher education is a public good. It was recognised that “Bologna” is an ongoing Process in which all the goals will not necessarily be met by 2010. In fact, from country to country there has been a “pick and mix” approach reflecting national priorities. It was also noted that some governments have used “Bologna” as an excuse for their own unpopular policies.

For the time being, we can be assured that the Quality Register will not lead to a Ranking process.

Spanish colleagues described the implementation of the Bologna Process at the national level, including the struggle to ensure that the staff unions and student voices were adequately heard. While that has been achieved, there is a need to go further to have a real effect on policy by negotiation. There is widespread concern that the Process is being implemented too fast, and the legislation to give effect to the Process nationally is not likely to be completed as quickly as expected. An added factor is the devolved character of higher education in Spain, with responsibility shared between the national government and 17 regional governments. Changes to the degree system in Spain will upset established parities not only with other European degrees, but with those from other regions, for example Latin America. However, the new system was a great improvement on the former one. There is a recognised need for the government and universities to involve the unions, students and social partners more completely.

Jens Vraa Jensen (DM, Denmark), chairing the session, urged that the 1997 UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Higher Education Personnel, should form the basis for the implementation of "Bologna".

Monique Fouilhoux (EI) and Koen Geven (European Student's Union) announced the launch of the EI/ESU Mobility campaign, as an official campaign within the Bologna Process, it having recently been announced that the European Commission would give financial support. The campaign's official status would enable EI and ESU to hold ministers to account.

Workshops Reports: see full reports attached in appendix

The following points ,derived from the workshops, were discussed and agreed on:

Public Private Partnerships (PPPs)

Higher education and research is a public service that should be publicly funded: this is a core position of Education International. While private resources and relationships with non-public bodies are useful and often welcome additions to the means available to education, tightly drawn, long-lasting contractual agreements which effectively hand over substantial public assets to private decisionmaking and profit-taking, are unacceptable. For that reason, we oppose Public/Private Partnerships in higher education and research, just as we oppose tuition fees. Both distort and undermine the mission of higher education. Relations between the public sector and private funding sources or collaborators should be acceptable only if they meet tightly drawn criteria in which the public ethos prevails.

The EI Task Force on PPPs should respect the strong concerns expressed by higher education and research affiliates and ensure that the issues raised by PPPs in the sector are fully considered. The Task Force must be constituted in broad consultation with the membership, and the conference believes that the Executive Board should ensure that all affiliates have the direct opportunity to provide nominees for the Task Force before making decisions on its final composition.

The Task Force must be representative of the different sectors and regions and respect gender balance and a balance of developing and industrialised countries.

Careers in Higher Education: Promoting the rights of fixed-term staff and early-stage researchers

There are two kinds of casualisation (precarity): fixed-term contracts and so-called contingent (or casual) contracts, these with far less working rights, but we must fight for permanent (tenure) contracts or their functional equivalent, and

also for better working conditions. Our demands must include the replacement of existing short-term contracts.

In general, unions have increasing difficulties on affiliating people in Higher Education, but the situation is particularly serious on these "casual" teachers and researchers (that sometimes have their own associations): joint work is needed.

There is a lack of information about the different national realities and contexts, and about good (and bad) practices, and different union strategies to overcome the problem including successful results: EI should gather information and give it to our unions.

Even with important national differences, but with the solidarity generated by facing common problems, our reference point for collective bargaining should be the 1997 UNESCO Recommendation and the decisions of the EI Berlin Congress on this subject: the unions in each country should face the challenge of putting the Recommendation into effect.

Mobility of higher education personnel and researchers

We favour all forms of academic exchange and freely chosen immigration by individual researchers, university teachers and, of course, students.

We agree that the best way for developing countries to avoid "brain drain" is to offer acceptable working conditions at home for researchers and university teachers.

We agree that industrialized countries have responsibility to assist the developing countries in their effort of building non-commercial partnerships between institutions by designing various scholarships. But, above all, the most important for EI is to help our unions to sharpen the argument that mobility and exchange of ideas and knowledge, is crucial to the effective functioning of higher education institutions, which in turn is the key for the ongoing development of society.

Climate change : a trade union responsibility in higher education

It is timely for the unions in the tertiary sector to raise the profile of climate change and the contribution which the institutions and the trade unions in the sector can make to this most fundamental of questions. University research will play a key role in the search for sustainable development solutions. In the universities themselves, which have a massive "global carbon footprint", there is a need to draw on both professional practice and collective bargaining to identify and reduce or even eliminate the negative environmental impact of the sector. The unions and their members can and should take the lead on this issue, and the environment provides an effective area in which to develop the union organising agenda. Given the conservative influence of governments and corporations on environmental issues, it is a key issue of academic freedom that universities and their staff are able to freely explore environmental problems and solutions without constraint.

Education International must seize the initiative on this issue, and should, as soon as possible, organise a round table on sustainable development and the contribution of the universities and their trade unions. The round table and other work on this issue should be as 'carbon-neutral' as possible, including work by e-conferencing or attaching meetings on this issue to other appropriate meetings. In the meantime, affiliated organisations are urged to negotiate with national bodies and institutions to develop means of reducing their carbon footprint and work to raise member awareness of these issues.

Conclusion

In its final session, the conference amended and endorsed this report, including the EI statement on a "PISA for higher education".



Annex I

Assessing higher education learning outcomes: “PISA” for Higher Education?

Introduction

1. Following the meeting of education ministers in Athens in 2006, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) launched an investigation into the feasibility of developing a tool to assess how effectively higher education institutions are educating their students. The tool is to be modelled on the OECD’s Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), a standardized test given to 15 year-olds in OECD countries in order judge the effectiveness of the school system by assessing the learning outcomes of students. Applied to higher education, a similar measurement of learning outcomes of higher education students across the globe, an OECD discussion paper says, “could 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.”
2. The OECD has assembled a panel of experts to advise on the development and design of a PISA for higher education. The composition of the panel includes many advocates for standardized testing. The expert panel has met three times and, while noting some serious methodological and practical challenges, are nevertheless pushing forward with the project. A feasibility study will be presented to an informal meeting of ministers in January in Japan.

Key Issues and Challenges

3. PISA for schools has been extremely controversial in its own right. Applying a standardized test to higher education raises even more serious concerns. At a practical level, it would be extremely difficult to design one assessment tool that would produce any meaningful and comparable measure across the different cultures, languages, disciplines and institutions within OECD countries. How would such an assessment tool deal with the incredible variation in institution types, student bodies, and other factors affecting learning outcomes across OECD countries? In

short, it is difficult to imagine that a standardized assessment tool could realistically provide any meaningful comparisons of educational quality across diverse systems, let alone between institutions as is being considered.

4. More fundamentally, even if these methodological hurdles could be overcome, questions remain whether a standardized test is in fact an appropriate way to assess learning. A good deal of research indicates there are serious limitations with all standardized measures of learning. Standardized tests almost invariably result in oversimplified measurements of the “quality” of education.
5. Summaries provided of the expert meetings indicate that the panel has discussed some of these challenges faced in developing a PISA for higher education. It is noted, for instance, that the variety and diversity of countries and higher education systems to be included in the assessment make it exceedingly difficult to determine ‘what’ and ‘who’ to assess, as well as ‘what to compare’.
6. However, the concerns with a PISA for higher education are not just methodological in nature. The problems identified by the OECD are in fact compounded by a number of *political* considerations. For instance, internationally, and even within countries, there is a notable lack of consensus on what should be the appropriate practices and outcomes of higher education. Simply put, there is no widely accepted set of skills, competencies and attributes that are expected – or in fact arguably should be expected – of higher education students. Given this lack of consensus, a standardized international test of higher education outcomes makes little sense.
7. As with all standardized tests based on an assessment of outcomes, a PISA for higher education will only give at best an incomplete picture of the effectiveness of systems and institutions. Research shows that standardized test results alone are not particularly useful unless information is also provided on the educational context (type of community, socioeconomic status of students, institutional mandate, admissions policy, respect of academic freedom and collegial governance), resources (expenditure per student, student support services, teaching staff, building quality, library resources, support for research), and programs and pedagogical processes (class size, curriculum, instructional methods). The danger is that a PISA for higher education will lead to very simplistic conclusions about the quality of complex and highly differentiated systems, processes and institutions.
8. As has routinely been the case with PISA for schools, one of the most common problems with the use of standardized tests is the misuse and misinterpretation of results. These problems arise because of the belief that numbers are precise measurements of a student’s ability and, by extension, the effectiveness and quality of an education system or institution. However, no standardized test can or should claim to provide

a complete picture of student abilities or institutional quality. The quality of higher education is neither a measurable product nor an outcome subject to any simple assessment. Quality has to do with a range of factors, including the conditions and activities of teaching and free enquiry.

9. External standardized assessments raise important issues around professional autonomy for academic staff. Traditionally, the quality of higher education institutions has been assessed through rigorous and regular peer reviews. What constitutes quality teaching and research should be debated, established, and reassessed at the institutional level through effective academic senates or councils that have meaningful representation from staff and students.
10. Developing a standardized test for higher education is particularly difficult given it is at this level where a greater degree of *specialization* takes place both between and within institutions. Whereas all secondary students across all countries are exposed to a set of common subjects assessed in the PISA (i.e. mathematics, literacy and science), this is not the case in higher education. There is considerable variation between and within higher education institutions with respect to what specialized programs students pursue and even what is taught within specific subject areas.
11. As indicated in the notes from the meetings of experts, a further difficulty with a PISA for higher education is related to a fundamental difference between secondary and higher education. Unlike secondary education, attendance at a college or university is not universal but is based on selective standards that vary markedly between countries and even between institutions within countries. Consequently, nations and institutions that have highly competitive and selective admission requirements will likely perform better on a PISA-like test than countries and institutions that are more accessible to the broader population. For instance, a standardized test may show that public colleges in the United States produce poorer outcomes than elite, private universities. However, this would reflect the fact that elite universities are comparatively far less accessible, serve students that on the whole come from a more privileged socio-economic background, and have highly restrictive admission requirements. Test results would therefore not necessarily reflect the "quality" of education students receive at community colleges or elite institutions, but would rather be more indicative of differences in admission standards and the socio-economic status of students. Similarly, countries with more selective systems would likely perform far better than countries where participation rates are higher and near universal access is promoted.
12. One of the stated objectives of the proposed PISA for higher education is to provide OECD member countries with more information about the effectiveness, quality and international competitiveness of their higher education systems and institutions so that they, as needed, may look at ways of improving quality. Evidence from the standardized test-driven

school improvement efforts pursued by many OECD governments over the past two decades, however, demonstrates conclusively that this type of testing does not, in fact, lead to improvements in education. This is often because the test results do not adequately measure deficiencies in educational inputs or processes. In many cases, teachers have simply been encouraged to “teach to the test”, a practice which can have a detrimental impact on student learning and educational quality.

13. It is very unlikely that a meaningful assessment of higher education students can be performed in any standardized fashion. Currently, higher education teaching personnel use a variety of methods to assess and measure a student’s progress over time. In addition to performance assessments and examinations, these methods include: observing, documenting, analyzing, and commenting on student work; assessing projects and assignments conducted in and out of the classroom; and evaluating research abilities, initiative and originality. Standardized testing can and should never replace the central role that higher education teaching personnel play in assessing students.

14. A further concern is that a PISA for higher education could easily be transformed into a simplistic ranking or league table of institutions. Such rankings are already common and have encouraged many institutions to engage in a senseless competition to improve their standings. In many cases, this has led higher education institutions to inflate their reported statistics in order to move up the rank.

Conclusion

15. The proposed PISA for higher education faces a number of methodological hurdles. More importantly, however, there are important political considerations underlying the project. Standardized assessments of students, either internationally or within nations, cannot be seen on their own as a measure of the effectiveness and quality of higher education. The quality of the educational experience students receive simply cannot be quantified in a performance-based test. Quality is a function of the “lived experience” of higher education including the conditions and activities of teaching and free enquiry.

16. A more adequate assessment of the quality and effectiveness of higher education would demand that governments and institutions understand teaching as a work of continuous transformation – the life-long education of critical thinkers, the preparation of able and self-sustaining professionals, and the creation of citizens who actively participate in civic institutions and processes. These practices depend on guarantees of academic freedom, collegial governance, the integration of teaching and research, and fair and equitable working conditions and terms of employment for staff.

Annex II – Workshop reports

Workshop 1

Achieving Gender Equity

The aim of the workshop was to identify the situation regarding gender equality in the academy, and discuss how EI and member trade unions in higher education can tackle the obstacles and challenges that women face. In the workshop there were very interesting discussions on how HE unions can achieve gender equality.

The starting point of the discussion was to recognise that women trade unionists are plural and diverse. The term women encompass a vast variety of identities related with national or ethnic origin, migration, different able capacities, and sexual orientation, among others. Then when women issues are analysed it is need to recognise the complexity of the problems, therefore also the solutions, women in HE as a diverse body face today.

The topics that were discussed were amongst other: pay equity, women in math and science, gender in collective bargaining, the difficulty encountered by researchers when trying to collect segregated data, the low number of women in academia or union leadership positions, the lack of share family responsibilities, and the diverse causes of discrimination against women that still remain in HE institutions and also in some unions.

Recommendations of the workshop on “Achieving gender equity”

- EI and member organisations should continue identifying and confronting procedures, mechanisms and barriers that could make the promotion criteria within the academic system discriminative.
- EI and member organisations should continue to promote reconciliation of family and work seen as an equal responsibility of both women and men.
- Considering the necessity of collect qualitative data to registered a more complete overview of the condition of women in HE and unions, EI should consider the possibility to start an oral history project on women trade-unionist.
- EI should continue its efforts to include in HE activities women colleagues from the developing countries were there is a very low enrolment rate of women in higher education unions.
- Encourage member organisations to undertake case studies on the condition of women in academia and HE union.
- EI should continue to include in the agenda of the International Conference on Higher Education and Research issues related with the condition of women in HE
- EI should also encourage member organisations to work with local and national machinery for women, such as the Andalusia women’s institute and with women organisations from the civil society in order to establish a stronger network and engage in collaborative work on issues of mutual interest.
- The Conference also recommends that in the future, discussions on gender equality at the plenary to involve all the participants, women and men.

Workshop 2

Careers in Higher Education: Promoting the rights of fixed term staff and early-stage researchers

Chair/Moderator: **Larry Gold (AFT-U.S.A.)**

Rapporteur: **Manuel Pereira Dos Santos (FENPROF-Portugal)**

Larry Gold remembered some of the main conclusions from the IE resolution in Berlin on this matter, and started the debate.

Contributors: Denis Jouan (SNCS-France), Checkou Issa Sylla (SUDES-Senegal), Greg Allain (CAUT-Canada), Marie Blais (FNEEQ/CSN-Canada), Joelle Casa (Italy), Xavier Gomez (STES-Spain), Enrique Ares (FETE/UGT-Spain), Fredy José Franco (FEPDES-Nicaragua), Grahah McCulloch (NTUE-Australia), João Cunha Serra (FENPROF-Portugal), Mike Jennings (IFUT-Ireland), Christiane Cornet (FGTB/CGSP-Belgium), José Azevedo (FNE-Portugal), Angel Ponce (FECCOO-Spain), Bruno Carapinha (ESU-Portugal).

Main ideas expressed by the participants:

- Two goals to achieve: improve the contract conditions of temporary teachers and researchers (who are precarious) but, at the same time, also increase the career and working conditions of the academic staff (teachers and researchers); these tasks are not contradictory, but complementary.
- There are huge differences between fixed-term contracts and contingent (casual) contracts, in terms of labour rights: we must fight to stop these ones, as their origin is the shortage of public funding in this sector, and because more qualified stable staff is needed... as stated in the 1997 UNESCO Recommendation. But sometimes the universities resist to this behaviour.
- Recently, the universities try to "slice" the teacher's functions in several separated pieces, to give them to these casual employees (very often, Ph.D. or Master "students")... sometimes with very different conditions from one university to another, without any rights... and this situation is presented as "natural" or "inevitable" (this is not correct).
- In some countries one finds big differences between similar jobs, with different labour rights, creating division between the staff; these badly paid and insecure jobs can also lead to brain drain, lack of maternal (and paternal rights), discriminating women, and can increase the difficulty unions face on affiliating this casual staff.
- The labour situation of the staff was found also to be quite different from one country to another, even if there is a common basis, and there is a huge lack of information about it; IE should get this information from their affiliated members, and share it with everyone; more than the statute in each country, it is the exchange of the unions experiences in this field that is needed. In general, universities do not give information about the

casual staff, data can only be obtained by questioning the unions, and IE should lead this search.

- An experience on having contracts on criteria based approach, many of them advertised and selected on a competitive basis ,was set, but lead to an increasing number of part-time contracts.
- The main reasons to fight casualisation (precarity) should be the defence of academic freedom, and collegiality and participation in the universities... even if now they seem to be taken only as just having an important role for a competitive economy. This reason is important for both teaching and research, two aspects that must always come together in Higher Education.
- The Doctoral-phase “students” was also referred, as well as the social dumping associated; and the collaboration between the trade-unions and the student unions or other Ph.D. students associations is strongly needed, even if trade-unions face some difficulties on affiliating this population. It is not a generation war, between those who are already stable and have rights, and the new-comers, almost without any rights, cooperation is needed!
- Unions should share, through the IE, their experiences of good (and also bad) practices in this fight against casualisation, and for tenure contracts.

At the end, Manuel Pereira dos Santos presented a quick summary of the conclusions of the workshop.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PLENARY

- There are two kinds of casualisation (precarity): fixed-term contracts and so-called contingent (or casual) contracts, these with far less working rights, but we must fight for permanent (tenure) contracts, and better working conditions.
- In general, unions have increasing difficulties on affiliating people in Higher Education, but the situation is particularly serious on these “casual” teachers and researchers (that sometimes have their own associations): **joint work is needed.**
- There is a lack of information about the different national realities and contexts, and about good (and bad) practices, and different unions strategies to overcome to successful results: **EI should gather information and give it to our unions.**
- Even with important national differences, but with the solidarity stream coming from facing common problems, **our references for collective bargaining should be the 1997 UNESCO Recommendation and the decisions of EI Berlin Congress on this subject: each country should be confronted with its accomplishment.**

Workshop 3

Combatting Commercialisation and Privatisation

Chair/Moderator: **David Robinson**, CAUT, Canada

Rapporteur: **Christine Scholz**, ESU

The workshop participants stressed first and foremost the public responsibility for higher education and research in all its diversity. They discussed what is encompassed in Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) and EI's position on PPP vis-à-vis the public responsibility for higher education and research. Are professorships or researchers funded by private entities also to be considered PPPs? A proposal for differentiation into Private Financed Education (PFE) and PPP was proposed, whereby the former would not involve the development of infrastructure, whereas the latter does. Also Public-Public Partnerships were mentioned as an example for the cooperation between different regions and sectors of higher education and research within and between countries for the purpose of fostering development.

Closely connected to this topic is the debate on privatisation of higher education. A differentiation between endogenous and exogenous privatisation was suggested. A report on the »Hidden privatization in public education« prepared for the 5th World Congress of Education International in July 2007 in Berlin defines these two main developments of privatization of (higher) education as:

In some instances, forms of privatisation are pursued explicitly as effective solutions to the perceived inadequacies of public service education [also called: 'exogenous' privatisation]. However, in many cases the stated goals of policy are articulated in terms of 'choice', 'accountability', 'school improvement', 'devolution', 'contestability' or 'effectiveness' [also called: 'endogenous' privatisation]. (Education International 2007: 8-10)

Critical points raised on PPPs included the example pointed out by the teacher trade union in the Philippines that such partnerships as well as alternative methods of financing for higher education are not necessarily connected to the core functions of education. The example of renting out university property of the University of Manila to private entities was mentioned, which used the land for building property used to house for example call-centres, thus totally unrelated to education. Another participant pointed out, that governments also introduce privatisation into higher education by renting out property, which is publicly owned, to the university. The participants felt and criticised that PPP are increasing private benefits on the expense of the public purse. One example of that was put forward by FE.CC.OO, one of the teacher trade unions in Spain, which reported about privately funded limited term contract researchers, which were granted access to publicly funded higher education and research infrastructure not paid by the private entities. The teacher trade union from Quebec pointed out that one has to also consider how money is spent in higher education institutions with PPPs. They have noted, that with an increase in PPP in

higher education and research more public funding also has to be allocated to these projects, e.g. has also been suggested by the Spanish teacher trade union, driving away money from other areas in higher education and research institutions. They also pointed out, that there are different concepts and regulations of PPP and one should also critically reflect on how PPP agreements are negotiated between higher education and research institutions and private entities. Problematic power relations and democratic deficit in higher education and research institutions need to be addressed in this respect. The special impact on less developed countries has been stressed by the teacher trade union of the Philippines. While these countries tend to be more pressed in finding alternative sources of funding, they also tend to be more vulnerable to regulate the impact of private influence in higher education and research.

However participants also noted several positive aspects of PFE and PPPs. The Portuguese teacher trade union mentioned the stronger interlinkage of higher education institutions and research with society also as one of them, which might increase the relevance of higher education and research to society as well as provide fruitful exchange on new technologies and procedures. What they consider important is the way PFE and PPP are regulated and the relationship of PFE and PPP to other core functions of the higher education institution. The Danish teacher trade union also considered PFE to be a positive option for raising funding for higher education and research as long as academic freedom is not compromised.

Apart from the debate on privatisation, PFE and PPP, participants discussed tuition fees as a specific example of PFE with the aim to fill the funding gap of higher education. Participants were sharing their experiences with tuition fees and the impact they had on the access to and the equality in higher education. Ireland abolished tuition fees about 10 years ago and they have noted that this step has resulted in an increase in take up rates from students from lower socio-economic backgrounds. In Croatia the debate on tuition fees has gained increasing momentum. Free entrance is linked to merit and limited to very few places. The other students have to pay very high fees. Due to the funding gap higher education institutions are pressuring trade unions and students to agree to an overall increase of fees. The government puts a blind eye to the issue in the hope that the academic community will be solving the fight in favour of implementing and raising fees amongst themselves and supporting the development by keeping the funding of higher education institutions low. The German teacher trade union reported that they brought forward a complaint based on the UN Covenant on Economic, Cultural and Social Rights, because of the implementation of tuition fees in a number of federal states in Germany before the UN court of justice in close cooperation with the German national union of students. The Spanish teacher trade union reported that tuition fees in Spain are differentiated by the level of higher education, making participation in the master more difficult for students from lower socio-economic backgrounds than participation in the bachelor level. This is creating a glass-ceiling effect based on socio-economic criteria. Currently there seems to be also a very intense increase in tuition fees in the Philippines.. They reported a »long-overdue« increase of fees by 600%. A new social debate has been introduced as

well by asking well off students to pay higher fees than poor students to improve social justice. This social argument disguised the fact, that it was used simply as a pretext for raising the level of fees. Insolidarity campaigns were also reported not only between higher education institutions, teachers and students, but also new entering students and students already enrolled and paying fees. Older students were pacified by promising them that higher fees would only be charged to the »newcomers.« A similar development of de-solidarisation can be witnessed in the Netherlands between mature students and students entering directly after secondary education or nationals and non-national students. The French teacher trade union also mentioned pressures to implement fees due to different fee regimes between universities and private institutions. There are however also some positive developments for example in Quebec, where tuition fees were frozen about 10 years ago. However a study from June 2006 indicating that tuition free education would be costing Quebec only 150 million dollars was hidden by the government, since they did not want to face a possible trend to not only maintain the tuition freeze, but maybe even face up to campaigns to drop tuition fees altogether. Canada is also a good example that tuition fees have not provided funding for an increase in teacher salaries. The fees have either been pocketed as general revenue by higher education institutions or by the government. For this reason students and teachers should stand together for appropriate funding of higher education and research to ensure proper remuneration of teachers and high quality education. The Phillipines also pointed out the effect of rankings on privatisation, marketisation and fees. The trade union of Serbia pointed out that the example of private higher education institutions going to Jamaica and charging high fees are a good example how high fee education does not necessarily guarantee high quality education.

In conclusion participants stressed the public responsibility for the regulation and funding of higher education and research. Participants also stressed that already the consideration of the economic benefits of higher education and research is losing the sight of the general social values of higher education and research. Overall participants were rather concerned about Public-Private Partnerships in higher education and research as well as endogenous and exogenous privatisation of education. They pointed out, that at the heart of this debate is the funding gap for higher education and research. Adequate funding is needed to ensure adequate salaries of teachers, proper infrastructure and high quality education. For this reason they argued, that EI must focus on possible alternative methods of financing and should foster cost-benefit analysis of PPPs for higher education and research. Tuition fees as a method of funding higher education were rejected by participants based on the negative impacts these have on access to and equality in higher education. Student unions and teachers must stand together in fighting against fees and also withstand tendencies to decrease solidarity between the academic community on this matter. As core criteria for alternative funding it was agreed, that they must not negatively affect academic freedom and the diversity of disciplines. Adequate regulations on PPPs and PFE should be put in place by governments. Participants suggested that EI's taskforce on PPP should include members, which can reflect the different and complex developments in PPPs in higher education and research on international level. For this reason members from all sectors and all regions should be equally included in the taskforce. While they felt the urgency of developing a stand on

this topic within EI, they also stressed, that decisions should not be made hasty and the process, relevance and consultation of members should be made clear.

References:

Education International (2007): Hidden privatisation in public education. Preliminary Report prepared by Stephen J Ball and Deborah Youdell. Institute of Education, University of London. Brussels, July 2007¹⁶.

¹⁶<http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=4974&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

Workshop 4

Mobility of higher education personnel and researchers

Chair: Ann Fritzell (helped by Jens Vraa-Jensen)

Expert: Conor Craden

Rapporteur: Razvan Bobulescu

Conor Craden presented a background paper¹⁷ on ***Towards Sustainable Academic Mobility: Higher Education Development and Freely Chosen Migration***. This paper outlines some of the issues likely to arise for EI in its policy development work in response to the Berlin resolutions¹⁸. It focusses on the possibilities for developing a positive policy on higher education staff mobility based around a system of international regulation that has as one of its principal aims the protection of the interests of developing countries within the international academic labour market.

The paper attempt to assess the trend towards increased competition in the international academic labour market, examining the political, economic and demographic factors involved. It will consider the relationship between increased competition for labour, staff terms and conditions, research and teaching resources, and academic freedom. A particular focus will be the possibility that developing countries will suffer a 'drain' of academic staff towards the education systems of the developed world. The political and practical implications of a system of international labour market regulation, possibly including some form of compensation to 'sending' countries, will briefly be assessed.

On the basis of the paper participants discussed lively around the following issues:

- different kinds of mobility
- measures taken by Governments to stop "brain drain"
- mobility as a part of academic freedom
- international trade unions solidarity
- the lack of high skilled personnel
- "brain gain", the new policy of Governments
- in all countries

Conclusions

- We favor all forms of academic exchange and free chosen immigration by individual researchers, university teachers and, of course, students.
- We agree that the best way for developing countries to avoid "brain drain" is to offer acceptable working conditions at home for researchers and university teachers.

¹⁷ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=4998&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

¹⁸ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=4806&pdf=on&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

- We agree that industrialized countries have responsibility to assist the developing countries in their effort of building noncommercial partnership between institutions by designing various scholarships.
- but, above all, most important for EI is to help our unions to sharpen the argument that good functioning of HEI's is the key for durable development of their society.

Workshop 5

Union Renewal/Climate Change a Trade Union Responsibility in Higher Education

Chair: Dominique Lassarre, UNSA-Education, France

Presentation: Brian Everett, UCU, UK

Rapporteur: Rob Copeland, UCU, UK

A discussion paper¹⁹ prepared jointly by Brian Everett and Rob Copeland was introduced to serve as a basis for the discussion

The paper was sparked by a resolution²⁰ passed at the 5th World Congress which mandated Education International to inform members and to take action "on the urgent issue of environmental awareness and global warming, such action to be undertaken at the individual community, national member organisation and international organisation level."

The workshop dealt with the current concern being felt by trade unionists worldwide about climate change and discussed ways in which education trade unions could become involved in helping create a sustainable environment for all. Information was provided showing that Universities and Colleges are major sources of carbon emissions. A lot of this comes from the use of buildings for teaching and research but also ironically from all forms of travel because there is increasing movement of staff and students around the world. Whilst this mobility is welcomed as a means of providing opportunity and diversity in the academic world it nonetheless is damaging to the environment.

The Working Group recognised the sensitivity of these issues but also reflected on the urgency of the situation given the serious humanitarian effects of climate change. The consensus was that education unions had a double role to play in dealing with carbon emissions. First as unions representing researchers and teachers we have a role in encouraging research into environmental sustainability and protecting the academic freedom of those who engage in this and there is an important part to play in teaching it to all young people. In Higher Education this becomes particularly pertinent as we teach the world leaders of tomorrow. Secondly as trade unionists in Universities and Colleges with negotiating rights we have a duty to negotiate with the employers to find ways of reducing carbon emissions in the workplace and through changes in University policy for example in relation to overseas students. Such negotiations could be led by Environmental Representatives for the union branch but the Group recognised that they would need support from their members and their national organisations as reduction in carbon emissions will impact on jobs and terms and conditions."

The participants discussed a range of issues

¹⁹ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=4990&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

²⁰ <http://data.ei-ie.org/Common/GetFile.asp?ID=4839&pdf=on&mfd=off&LogonName=Guest>

- Excellent time to prioritise this issue
- Sustainable development is the goal
- Collective bargaining and professional practice
- A union/practitioner - led agenda
- Research agenda + academic freedom
- Organising tool

And adopted the following key recommendation to EI

- Roundtable on sustainable development

Annex III – Presentation by Dr. Hideki Shibaïke to the conference regarding the situation in Japan

After the legislation of National Universities Corporatization laws in 2004

Hideki Shibaïke, Dr. (Eng.), General Secretary
JAPAN Association of Staffs' Unions in Public University Corporations, An Affiliate of JTU

Enhanced market mechanism and excessive competitions

- unincreasing spending of the Government for HER decreasing by 0.5% of GDP,
- Competitions on Research Budgets, partial costs on infrastructures for research, and education as well,
- Competitions between regions, universities, faculties, faculty members,

Selections and Concentrations

- Universities with established foundations and resources are selected to get more funding,
- Difficulties for universities located in local cities and smaller foundations,
- M&A of national universities from 99 to 70,
- More expensive access to HEI in local cities,
- Possibilities on offers of higher wages for young scientists and less expensive tuition fees for graduate students in technological fields by major universities.

Future activities

- Favorable results of the upper house election in July 2007,
- Supplementary resolutions, 10 issues at the Lower House and 23 issues at the Upper House,
- A Project Committee in JTU for the amendment of national university corporation laws toward the explicit endorsement on academic freedom and autonomy.