



Report on the State of Labor Education in the United States

Barbara Byrd, University of Oregon and
Bruce Nissen, Florida International University

June 30, 2003

REPORT ON THE STATE OF LABOR EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

BARBARA BYRD
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

BRUCE NISSEN
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

for

Center for Labor Research and Education
Institute of Industrial Relations

University of California
2521 Channing Way
Berkeley, California 94720-5555
<http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu>

June 30, 2003

This research and report were conducted with support and funding from the UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education. Katie Quan of the Center was instrumental in the conceptualization of the overall project, its funding, and every aspect of the analysis and writing of the results of the research. We owe her an enormous debt of gratitude. We also thank Susan Washington of the AFL-CIO for her assistance in the design of the union survey and generous sharing of suggestions and information. Finally, thanks are due to the many respondents at national/international union education departments and university and college labor education programs who so graciously gave of their time to complete our survey and/or respond to interview questions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1: INTRODUCTION	8
I. Overview of Survey Results	9
• <i>Labor education activities are more extensive</i>	10
• <i>Union leaders are more likely to see value in labor education than in the past and are less mistrustful of university/college labor education</i>	11
• <i>Changing content of labor education programs</i>	12
II. A Time of Transition for Labor Education	12
III. Challenges and Survival Strategies in the University/College Side	15
 PART 2: NATIONAL UNION EDUCATION PROGRAMS	 16
I. Survey Participants	16
II. Size and Scope of Programs	17
• <i>Size</i>	17
• <i>Change in size of programs</i>	18
• <i>Range of topics and number of participants</i>	20
• <i>Training formats and pedagogy</i>	22
III. The Role of Education in the Union	24
• <i>Mission and goals</i>	24
• <i>Integration with other union functions</i>	25
• <i>Relationships with local and regional levels of the union</i>	27
• <i>Evaluation</i>	28
IV. Relationships with Other Providers of Labor Education and Research ..	28
• <i>Relationships with college and university labor education programs</i>	28
• <i>Interest in degree programs</i>	31
• <i>Relationships with community organizations and non-profits</i>	31
• <i>Relationships with AFL-CIO national, state and local bodies</i>	31

V. Trends	33
VI. Education at the Level of Regional, Local and Affiliate Bodies	34
VII. Conclusion	36

PART 3: UNIVERSITY- AND COLLEGE-BASED LABOR EDUCATION

I. Size and Scope of the Program	39
• <i>Size</i>	39
• <i>Non-credit certificate program</i>	42
• <i>“Open-enrollment” vs. “contract” programming</i>	42
• <i>Length of labor education classes offered</i>	44
• <i>Delivery site of classes</i>	45
• <i>Audience for non-credit labor education classes</i>	46
• <i>Relationships with state AFL-CIOs</i>	46
• <i>Relationships with central labor councils</i>	47
• <i>Relationships with national AFL-CIO</i>	47
• <i>Relationships with national unions</i>	48
• <i>Labor studies credit programs</i>	49
II. Orientation of the Programs	51
• <i>Orientation toward union, joint-management, or “other” interests</i>	51
• <i>“Tool” vs. “non-tool” courses</i>	52
• <i>Orientation of individual labor educators in institutions of higher education</i>	53
• <i>Orientation toward the actual and desired division of labor between higher education labor education programs and union labor education departments</i>	56
• <i>Areas of specialization</i>	59
III. Research (Funded and Unfunded) and Academic Credentials	60
• <i>Funded research</i>	61
• <i>Unfunded research</i>	61
• <i>Research credentials (Ph.D.s)</i>	62
• <i>Academic published research</i>	63
• <i>Research demand on university/college labor educators</i>	63
• <i>Areas of special research expertise</i>	64
• <i>Technology and consulting issues</i>	64

IV. Perceptions of Past and Future Trends	65
• <i>Trends in the past ten years</i>	65
• <i>Reasons for changes in the past decade</i>	67
• <i>Likely trends in the future</i>	68
• <i>How to position labor education programs for the future</i>	71

PART 4: CONCLUSION 82

I. The Expansion of Labor Education	84
II. The Content of Labor Education	84
III. Legitimacy, Status and Trust Issues	86
IV. The Background to the Present Relationship	88
V. Questions for Further Exploration	92
VI. Suggestions for the UALE Regarding Labor Education	93
VII. Final Thoughts on Labor Education Today	94

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Questionnaire Survey for Union Education Directors	95
Appendix B: Questionnaire Survey of University/College-Based Labor Education Centers	102
Appendix C: List of Responding Unions, Regional & Other Affiliates, and Interviews	110
Appendix D: List of Labor Education Centers and Programs Covered in the Survey	113
Appendix E: Labor Education Bibliography and Other Resources	117
Appendix F: University/College-Based Labor Education Centers Database	121

TABLES

Table 2.1	How many staff in the department?	18
Table 2.2	Ten-year education growth pattern compared to membership size	19
Table 2.3	Programs and participants	20
Table 2.4	What proportion of your programs are conducted using the following formats?	23
Table 2.5	Are education programs used in other campaigns?	25
Table 2.6	Over the past 10 years, have resources allocated to education increased?	26
Table 2.7	If you do not work with college and university programs is this because	30
Table 2.8	Have you used	32
Table 3.1	Comparisons of non-credit enrollments, last year and a decade ago	40
Table 3.2	Comparisons of non-credit classroom hours, last year and a decade ago	40
Table 3.3	Staffing 2002; breakdown by "hard" and "soft" money positions; growth in last decade	41
Table 3.4	Number of programs that grew, stayed the same, or shrank in the decade 1992-2002	42
Table 3.5	Percentage of open enrollment and contract programs, numbers of labor centers	43
Table 3.6	Perceived direction in shift between open enrollment and contract classes this past decade	44
Table 3.7	Average percentage of classes taught at different lengths of time	44
Table 3.8	Individual institutional percentages of shorter and longer classes	45
Table 3.9	Average percentage of classes offered in different locations, across all institutions	46

Table 3.10	Number of programs (out of 22 overall) offering different levels of credit credentials	49
Table 3.11	Basic orientation of university- and college-based labor education programs	51
Table 3.12	Number of programs offering selected percentages of total offerings that are union advocacy, joint labor-management facilitation, or neither	52
Table 3.13	Percentage breakdown between "tool" & "non-tool" classes . . .	53
Table 3.14	Degrees of agreement or disagreement with four perspectives on labor education	55
Table 3.15	Percentage of "hard money" university/college labor educators with a Ph.D., with extensive union experience, and with both	62

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

The field of labor education is at a turning point. Membership loss, globalization of industries, changing technology and union mergers have altered the make-up and the activities of union education departments. The same forces have left college and university labor education programs vulnerable and searching for new approaches as well as new sources of support.

The very changes that have led to upheaval in the field of labor education nationally have also enhanced its importance. Union members, officers and staff are turning to education and training for the knowledge and skills they need to meet new challenges, and as a result, there is more labor education activity now, not less.

In February 2002 the AFL-CIO eliminated its education department and began a process of studying how to carry out educational functions in the future. That event stimulated us to ask three major questions: (1) What is the state of labor education today? (2) What should it be? and (3) How do we get from here to there? This study primarily addresses the first question, and, we hope, lays some groundwork for answering the last two.

A study such as this is timely. No comprehensive assessment of the state of labor education in the United States has been undertaken since 1968. In that year, Lawrence Rogin and Marjorie Rachlin published their report entitled *Labor Education in the United States* under the auspices of the National Institute for Labor Education. While some studies have appeared since that time, they have focused on narrower topics—liberal education for labor, the development of labor studies programs, union leadership training, etc. (see Appendix E: Labor Education Bibliography and Other Resources). We use the results of Rogin and Rachlin's research as a benchmark in interpreting our own results.

In the summer of 2002, the authors developed separate survey instruments for AFL-CIO national/international union education department leaders and the directors of university- and college-based labor education programs. (Copies of the surveys are attached to this report as Appendix A and Appendix B). The surveys were used to gather information on the size and scope of labor education programs, types of educational offerings, methods of delivery, the purpose and orientation of the programs, relations between the union-based and university/college programs, role of the education programs within unions, university/college “credentialization” and research issues, levels of educational practice within unions, consulting issues, and thoughts on recent trends and future trends/prospects. As reported in Parts 2 and 3 on union and university/college labor education programs, the response rate for both surveys was high, and we are confident that the vast majority of national union and university/college labor education experiences have been captured by our research (see Appendices C and D for lists of responding organizations).

I. OVERVIEW OF SURVEY RESULTS

Three closely related themes emerge from our findings:

- 1) Labor education activities are more extensive now than they were in 1968 when Rogin and Rachlin wrote their report.
- 2) This growth was facilitated by the fact that union leaders are more likely to see value in labor education, within their own unions and in university/college programs, than was evident in the late 1960s.
- 3) The content of labor education programs has shifted somewhat in the last decade from what could be called “union maintenance” topics (negotiations, contract administration, etc.) to “union building” or “union growth” topics (rank-and-file involvement and mobilization, organizing, contract campaigns, etc.).

At the same time, we recognize that our “snapshot in time” of the state of labor education is just that, and not necessarily a predictor of the future. This study was undertaken in the midst of a major crisis for the labor movement—a crisis that has begun to have an impact on the stability of labor education programs in both unions and higher education institutions. Recent and ongoing transitions in the delivery of labor education at the national union level and at the AFL-CIO are of great concern. Moreover, and explored in more depth in Part 3, university- and college-based labor education programs have experienced a unique set of challenges and have had to develop a disparate set of survival strategies in the recent period.

1) LABOR EDUCATION ACTIVITIES ARE MORE EXTENSIVE

As both Parts 2 and 3 indicate, labor education programs are much more prevalent than they were in 1968 at the time of Rogin and Rachlin’s report. Rogin and Rachlin found that in 1968, most unions did *not* offer labor education programs to their members (only 26 of 128 affiliates did so). The results of our study demonstrate that today, in contrast, many of the larger unions in the AFL-CIO have a separate education department (29 of the 65 unions currently affiliated with the AFL-CIO, representing 89% of the total AFL-CIO membership). Staff size has grown, and course offerings now reach over 100,000 union members and almost 7,000 union staff each year, not counting apprenticeship and other occupational education. (Part 2 explores this growth in more detail.)

On the university/college side, as of 1965-1966 there were 26 labor education programs; by 2002 this had grown almost 70% to 44. Likewise, staffing had grown from 92.5 “hard money” positions in 1967 to 225 by 2002, a 143% increase. (See Part 3 for additional information.)

All of this growth has occurred at a time when union membership has actually shrunk in the United States: in 1966 union membership was 17.9 million; by 2002 it was just over 16 million. This expansion of educational activity during a time of shrinking membership suggests a change in attitude toward the value of labor education to the labor movement.

2) UNION LEADERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO SEE VALUE IN LABOR EDUCATION THAN IN THE PAST AND ARE LESS MISTRUSTFUL OF UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE LABOR EDUCATION

In 1968, Rogin and Rachlin noted a skeptical attitude by union leaders toward labor education:

. . . it is clear that acceptance of education as an institution-supporting function is still the exception rather than the rule among American unions . . . Many union leaders do not see any need for training or education. They feel that unionism is a practical matter and is best learned by doing . . . In some cases this attitude is combined with a suspicion of intellectuals, or of education itself, as distracting to the main goals of unions as they see them . . . There is another kind of suspicion of education, particularly among lower-ranking union leaders. Why, they say, should we train members to compete with us for our jobs? . . . Some leaders also regard the “educated” member as a potential troublemaker, even when not ambitious for office (55-56).

While there is no doubt that some of these attitudes still persist, we found evidence that a shift has occurred. The sheer growth in educational activity is one sign of this shift. Moreover, neither union nor university/college labor educators noted distrust of education and/or educators as a serious problem today.

Union education staff, for their part, reported a high level of acceptance of their activities by members and top leadership of their respective unions. Though few believed their programs to be of primary importance separate from the other work of the union, nevertheless they reported a healthy respect for their activities by union officials, and a degree of integration of labor education into organizing, bargaining and union administration programs. Neither union nor university/college labor educators reported problems with lack of trust. Union staff, asked directly about their attitudes toward their peers in higher education, described a number of areas of cooperation; reference to “bad experiences” with university/college programs were rare.

University/college labor educators reported general acceptance of their work by the labor movement, though many expressed the desire for closer working relationships. For the most part, discontent with union treatment was confined to

higher education-based labor educators being excluded from certain types of labor education topics (e.g., politics), rather than to generalized hostility or suspicion.

3) CHANGING CONTENT OF LABOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS

In the 1960s, with the exception of a handful of classes on social issues, labor education courses were focused on what Rogin and Rachlin refer to as “traditional union activities:” negotiating a union contract, enforcing that contract, and related administrative tasks necessary to maintain an organization centered on the collective bargaining process (228-229). We can designate such classes as “union maintenance” programs, aimed at preserving and enhancing the familiar union structure as it has existed in the post-World War II period. By 2002 there was a growing emphasis on programs concerning organizing the unorganized, membership mobilization, outreach, and developing internal union vitality. We can designate such courses as “union building” courses. While the traditional approach is still popular (and probably dominant), there has been a decided growth in the number of “union building” type classes in both unions and university/college labor education programs.

This is clearly a response to the changing environment, and the changing fortunes of the labor movement in the United States. Educational programs are following the shift in priorities within organized labor toward renewed emphasis on growth and organizing the unorganized.

II. A TIME OF TRANSITION FOR LABOR EDUCATION

As stated above, one purpose of this research is to situate labor education activities in their historic context. We have found that labor education has expanded within the labor movement and at institutions of higher education, even as union membership decreased from the mid-1960s to 2002. This would suggest an increase in the priority given to labor education by unions. However, a closer inspection shows that historically, growth has not been linear, and that official attitudes within the labor movement have displayed a more complex pattern.

Rogin and Rachlin referred to “three major periods in the development of U.S. labor education:”

- “Social reconstruction” oriented programs and independent workers education (within labor colleges and a handful of unions) that emerged prior to the 1930s. Interestingly, these programs grew as the labor movement at the time declined. Many AFL unions viewed them with suspicion, but their work laid the basis for the emergence of industrial unionism in the 1930s (Adam, 1940; Altenbaugh, 1990; Schwartztrauber, 1942).
- Federal government-funded workers’ education from the 1930s through World War II, an unfortunately short-lived idea which some at the time saw as the answer to stable funding for labor education programs (Cook and Douty, 1958).
- Programs within both unions and universities that featured “practical trade union training” that grew up following the war (15-24). During this period (the late 1940s to the late 1960s), state and land-grant universities established labor education programs and a number of national unions added education departments (Barbash, 1955; Cook & Douty, 1958; Kerrison, 1951; Mire, 1956).

In the 1970s, labor education expanded in institutions of higher education. Scholars identified the related trends of the “academization” of labor education (Lieberthal, 1977), the emergence of labor studies as a discipline (Boyle, 1976; Dwyer, Galvin & Larson, 1977), the growth of degree programs in labor studies (Gray, 1976 & 1977), and the emergence of labor education programs at the community college level (Stack & Hutton, 1980). At the same time, writers like Gus Tyler speculated on the “proletarianization of education” and the “professionalization of unions” that was driving labor and universities closer together (3). The changing needs of labor leadership, especially the demand for degrees among public sector and building trades unionists, and the need of colleges for increased student enrollment, were leading to increased union-higher education cooperation (Denker, 1981; Gray, 1980; Tyler, 1979). In the 1980s, as the “academization” of labor education proceeded, research activities began to play a greater role in university and college labor education programs, as

university programs sought to fit more comfortably into the academic environment while at the same time providing an important service to the labor movement (Clark & Gray, 1990). The 1970s and 1980s, in short, were an era of growth for labor education at the university and college level that fortunately coincided with the changing needs in the labor movement.

In the 1990s, new pressures on the labor movement, including the changing demographics of the U.S. workforce, ushered in a renewed call for “workers’ education” that would pay attention to issues like immigration, diversity, critical thinking, and the rights of non-union workers. Within union education departments, especially in unions that were engaging actively in organizing, the content and delivery of educational programs began to change to reflect these concerns. University and colleges, too, adapted their curriculum. Some of this education supported union organizing efforts; other parts of it aimed at internal change for unions—often changes needed to become more effective at organizing the unorganized.

As the pressures on national union finances continue to mount due to membership loss, the priority of labor education is increasingly called into question. Some unions have added education departments; others have eliminated or scaled them back. At the time of the survey, several national unions were in the process of major reorganizations of their educational delivery structure. And in 2002, many labor educators were shocked by the abolition of the AFL-CIO Education Department.

Part 2 of this report will expand on the way in which national union education departments are faring during this time of transition. It will offer additional information about the way in which education staff view their current activities, as well as their self-reports on the way in which the challenges facing their unions have affected their course offerings, staffing decisions, and interaction with other union departments. The report’s conclusion will offer additional analysis.

III. CHALLENGES AND SURVIVAL STRATEGIES IN THE UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE SIDE

The university- and college-based labor education programs have a unique set of challenges. Not only do they have to navigate relationships with unions and the overall labor movement, they also must deal with changing relationships with institutions of higher education. Part 3 will detail these issues in greater detail. Here we will only highlight some of the central challenges.

First, institutions of higher education are increasingly demanding “credentials” — usually a Ph.D. or its equivalent. This is part of a trend to pressure university- or college-based labor education centers to become more “academic.” The same trend is apparent in the drive to require academic “refereed” published research in scholarly journals from university- and college-based labor educators, and in a push to move more resources into college credit Labor Studies classes and less into non-credit “extension” labor education courses.

Second, university- and college-based labor education centers are being asked to fund an ever-increasing percentage of their own budgets, through “soft money” funded research. Coupled with that, university and state support for labor education centers is falling, putting further financial pressure on these programs. These trends are part of a larger drive to “marketize” all relationships and to cut the public sector, especially those parts of it serving working class interests.

Faced with these challenges, university- and college-based labor education programs have devised a number of survival strategies. The various strategies, and the debate over them, will be covered in more detail in Part 3.

Beyond these major themes, our research uncovered a wealth of information about the size, scope, functioning, goals, and operations of the various labor education programs around the country. Rather than attempting to summarize all such findings in this introductory session, we provide the findings in Parts 2 and 3. Part 4 summarizes and analyzes the survey results.

PART 2: NATIONAL UNION EDUCATION PROGRAMS

This part of the report describes the results of the survey of educational activities at the national union level (and in a few cases, at the regional level). It includes only education that is related to union leadership and involvement. Apprenticeship and vocational training was reported on by several of the unions, but a full analysis of these occupational-related programs was beyond the scope of the study.

The survey form is reprinted in Appendix A.

I. SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

During the Fall of 2002, written survey questionnaires were mailed (and e-mailed, where possible) to the 65 national and international unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO. Thirty-six (36) of these unions responded, for a response rate of 55%. **Responding unions account for 12,008,125 of the total 13,248,844 members of the AFL-CIO, or 90.6% of the total federation membership** (2002 membership figures). See Appendix C for a list of responding unions.

In addition, responses were received from 11 regional or sub-union organizations, including six AFSCME Councils (see Appendix C). All of these organizations operate relatively large and active educational programs. Their responses are considered separately below.

Follow-up telephone interviews were conducted with 12 national union education or research directors and assistant directors.

(For comparison purposes: The Rogin and Rachlin survey was sent to the 128 affiliates of the AFL-CIO at that time, and to 20 non-affiliates. Responses were received from 44 affiliates and four non-affiliates, representing 59% of the total national union membership at that time, though only 43 of the respondents reported sponsoring any educational activity (27, 32).)

II. SIZE AND SCOPE OF PROGRAMS

- SIZE

A large majority of the programs that responded to the survey have their own education department (28, in contrast to eight without a separate department). In six cases, the education function has been combined with research to form a single department. Five of the responding unions operate separate physical facilities devoted to education and training. Two national unions have created new education departments during the past year. Most important, **all of the unions but one report a significant amount of labor education activity.** In other words, 35 unions have an active education program, out of 65 unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO—54% of the unions, with 89% of the affiliated membership. In contrast, Rogin and Rachlin found that in 1968, “Most national unions in the United States do not initiate labor education programs for their staff or members.... Of the 43 that responded, only 26 have fairly consistent programs” (32-33). At the time, the AFL-CIO had 128 affiliates—therefore, only 20% of the affiliated unions operated education programs. It seems clear that access to ongoing education and training programs for union members at the national union level is the rule rather than the exception.

Staff size varies greatly from union to union, though **most unions have a very small staff** (three or fewer people). The 36 responding unions reported **a total of 120 part- and full-time headquarters staff whose duties are primarily educational.** In all but one case, where a union had no education department, it also had no staff performing strictly education duties—instead, staff did education

work on top of representation or related duties. In contrast, Rogin and Rachlin reported 86 full- and part-time headquarters staff with education duties.

Table 2.1
How many staff in the department?

Staff Size	No. of Unions
SMALL (1–3)	19
MEDIUM (4–7)	8
LARGE (8–22)	3

In a majority of cases, staff qualifications included both union and training experience. **Most hire from within the union organization**, although eight specifically mentioned hiring from outside. Only six cited formal academic preparation as a criterion, although many mentioned the necessity for staff to have or to acquire training skills.

• CHANGE IN SIZE OF PROGRAMS

One question on the survey asked respondents, “During the past 10 years, has your program grown, stayed about the same size, or gotten smaller?” In a few cases, respondents took this question to mean growth in staff size. More often, they referred to growth in the numbers and types of programs offered. Table 2.2 summarizes the responses to this question, sorted by the size of the union. The vast **majority of respondents report that their programs have grown**—26 of the 35 unions that answered the question.

Table 2.2
Ten-year education growth pattern compared to membership size

Membership Size	Education Has Grown	Stayed the Same	Gotten Smaller
FEWER THAN 10,000	1	1	1
10,000–50,000	4	0	0
50,000–150,000	8	0	2
150,000–400,000	7	0	1
400,000–1,000,000	5	0	1
OVER 1,000,000	1	2	1
TOTAL	26	3	6

This may seem a counter-intuitive result, given the shrinking size of the labor movement. One possible explanation is that education departments have grown as the result of union mergers, which have been plentiful during the past decade. Of the 26 unions that report growth in their educational programming, five have experienced major affiliations and mergers, and a number of others have absorbed smaller organizations. UNITE and PACE, for example, are two unions that emerged via the mergers of relatively large, separate unions, each with its own active education program. In addition, all five unions with separate educational facilities (UAW, IUOE, IAM, Seafarers and USWA) report that they have experienced growth. In other cases, education programming has grown even though the size of the department's staff has remained small; in 16 national unions, education departments with three or fewer staff report growth in programming activity. This may reflect new efficiencies or the use of staff outside the education departments to assist with training. Growth in programming has occurred even in unions that have no separate education department (three cases). It is tempting to speculate that the status and importance of education has increased in unions, resulting in more demand for educational activity. This issue is explored further in Section III below.

• RANGE OF TOPICS AND NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

Table 2.3 summarizes the types of programs and numbers of participants reached on an annual basis by 33 education programs. (Three respondents, ranging in size from 92,000 to 240,000 members, failed to provide figures.)

TABLE 2.3
Programs and participants

Type of Program	No. of Programs	No. of Participants	Percent of Participants
CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS & ADMINISTRATION	698	24,767	21.4%
UNION-BUILDING PROGRAMS	709	23,443	20.2%
ORGANIZING SKILLS	646	18,747	16.2%
POLITICAL EDUCATION	329	13,682	11.8%
LEADERSHIP SKILLS	333	10,801	9.3%
ESL, CITIZENSHIP, ETC.	362	9,589	8.3%
INCLUSION/DIVERSITY ISSUES	111	4,885	4.2%
ECONOMICS	176	4,403	3.8%
STAFF TRAINING	123	3,418	3.0%
TRAIN-THE-TRAINER	96	1,785	1.5%

Respondents reported reaching a total of 115,500 union members with training activities each year, and training approximately 6,400 union staff.

The responses to this survey item are approximations only. In some cases, the subject categories used in the survey did not precisely match the class topics as offered in the union, or there was overlap of topics, so respondents had to make rough estimates. In other cases, educational activities varied widely from year to year, or took place primarily at union conferences and conventions where training was not the main focus. Some unions do not keep track in a systematic way of the number of participants they reach, while others offered extremely precise information. Some, especially those who are primarily responsible for curriculum development and rely on regional staff for delivery, do not have ready access to regional enrollment figures. An attempt was made by most, however, to at least estimate the number of members reached overall each year.

Note that the difference in the number of staff trained overall, and the number of staff participating in “Staff Training” as itemized above, is related to the fact that many union staff attend convention workshops and other training sessions designed for broader audiences that include elected leaders and members of the union. It should also be pointed out that the definition of “staff” varies from union to union: in some, it refers to individuals hired to perform full-time union jobs, while in others, it is used to refer to top elected officials who work full-time for the union.

The greatest amount of activity appears to be in the traditional areas of contract negotiations, contract administration (including steward training), and union-building (within which respondents included such diverse topics as internal organizing, strategic planning, and new member orientation). Each of these categories represented approximately one-fifth of overall programming. In the areas of political education and organizing skills training, the somewhat smaller figures may reflect the fact that in some unions, these programs are conducted by the Political Department and Organizing Departments rather than Education (though as explained below, there is frequently a close working relationship between Education and other union departments).

Only five national/international unions are involved in offering ESL, Citizenship and other similar classes, though apparently these classes reach a large number of union members and potential members. (In some of the others, this activity also occurs but is carried out at the regional or local level.)

Staff training is a growing priority, according to most education directors. Twenty-two unions had staff training programs, which reached 3,418 staff members. (Note that this figure does not include staff that attended other training programs with elected officers and members.) (In contrast, Rogin and Rachlin found that 26 unions offered staff training in 1968, reaching 2,511 staff—at a time when union membership, and presumably the number of union staff, was higher.) In interviews, three education directors specifically mentioned a stepped-up interest in advanced leadership and staff training. This trend of offering more training specifically designed for staff is also reflected in national union interest in credit programs leading to degrees for staff (see Section IV below).

Many unions have traditionally offered special classes for financial officers of local unions, sometimes through the education department and sometimes through the office of the international secretary-treasurer. One education director,

however, discussed a renewed interest in staff and advanced leadership training in terms of topics “borrowed” from management training curricula. She hypothesized that unions have been learning from management’s approach, offering leaders and staff training in strategic planning, time management, budgeting, organizational development, and similar topics. One of the national unions surveyed specifically mentioned a new curriculum developed especially for “local union managers” —that is, staff or officers whose duties include managing an office, budget and staff.

The number of train-the-trainer programs is relatively small, comprising only 2.7% of total programs and 1.5% of total participants. In a related question, respondents were asked whether they use members of the union to deliver educational programs (in addition to full-time or part-time staff). Twenty-six of the unions responded “yes” to this question. Follow-up interviews revealed a wide divergence in the extent to which members are actually supported to provide education at the national or local level of the union, at least insofar as they are trained and directed by national or international union staff. Only two union directors interviewed described a broad, systematic attempt to prepare rank-and-file members for teaching responsibilities, although over half the respondents have used programs like COMET, MEMO, and Common Sense Economics which feature train-the-trainer components and an emphasis on rank-and-file instructor preparation. Problems identified included lack of education staff to do follow-up with members who have completed a train-the-trainer program, and inconsistent opportunity at the local level to actually teach the classes for which they were trained.

• TRAINING FORMATS AND PEDAGOGY

The vast majority of unions rely on traditional classroom and hands-on activities (including mentoring) in delivering educational programs. Table 2.4 below summarizes responses to a question asking for estimates of the percentage of offerings in certain areas.

TABLE 2.4
What proportion of your programs are conducted using the following formats?

Format	No. of Programs	Average Usage
CLASSROOM	34	88%
HANDS-ON IN THE FIELD	16	8%
STUDY CIRCLES	5	1%
ON-LINE CLASSES ON THE INTERNET	9	2%
OTHER INDIVIDUALIZED OR SELF-PACED	9	1%

Five unions report some use of study circles. This technique, first used in the U.S. extensively by the Bricklayers union, is still used by that union to generate discussion on particular topics at union meetings. Nine unions have begun to offer classes on the Internet, and nine have introduced other forms of individualized instruction. On-line and other self-paced classes tend to be offered in the more technical areas—e.g., financial officer training, health and safety training and other technical areas. One union mentioned the Cornell University on-line steward training program. Three unions that also operate apprenticeship programs report that on-line classes are being introduced in that arena. **Several unions report that they are considering doing more in the area of on-line education.**

The survey did not ask specific questions about teaching approaches. Interviews suggest that most union education programs follow the traditional labor education model: informal classroom instruction featuring participatory exercises like role-playing and small group analysis of case studies. Two respondents specifically mentioned a growing interest in “popular education,” a form of worker education originally developed by Paolo Freire in Brazil for teaching literacy, and utilized over several decades by the instructors at the Highlander Center. One of these respondents talked about the importance of connections with labor educators in Canada, where popular education is more generally in use in union education departments.

III. THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN THE UNION

- MISSION AND GOALS

Nineteen of the respondents have formal mission statements for their activities, and most of the remaining 17 were able to articulate specific goals for their education programs. Though the goal statements varied widely in terms of specifics, most focused on three areas:

- 1) **Educating members** about the union (“raising consciousness,” “increasing activism,” “changing attitudes toward organizing,” “building loyalty to the union”);
- 2) **Training stewards, elected officers, and staff in the skills and responsibilities** of their union positions;
- 3) **Building the capacity of local unions** (via strategic planning, leadership recruitment and development, etc.).

In a few cases, the mission of the education program was explicitly tied to the union’s strategic agenda:

- “To contribute directly to the union’s growth agenda by giving staff and members the tools to build power in the shop and in the street.”
- “To include education as an integral part of all strategic plans for organizing, political action, and collective bargaining.”
- “To promote the union’s agenda at all levels through education and training opportunities.”

Though specifically mentioned by only a few respondents, a new goal for some programs seems to be providing opportunities for formal higher education credentials to staff and members.

• INTEGRATION WITH OTHER UNION FUNCTIONS

One aim of the survey was to assess the relationship between education and other activities of the union. According to survey respondents, **education programs are an accepted part of important union activities, and are fairly well integrated into organizing, contract, and political campaigns.** Table 2.5 shows the results.

TABLE 2.5
Are education programs used in other campaigns?

Type of Campaign	No. of "Yes" Responses
ORGANIZING	27
POLITICAL	25
CONTRACTS	21

These responses do not, of course, measure the depth or frequency of involvement. The interviews suggested that this varied considerably from union to union.

Respondents were asked follow-up questions about the extent to which they worked with other departments in the union to plan particular programs. In seven of the 36 unions, education planning is done by the staff of each union department independently. **In the majority of unions (29), however, education staff say they design programs themselves and/or work with staff from other departments to design programs.** Below are some specific examples that were offered of the wide variety of relationships between education and other departments of the union:

- Two respondents explained that their departments provided train-the-trainer programs for organizing staff, so that they could implement their own training in the field.
- "The Political Action and Health and Safety Departments conduct their own training programs using their own staff. We have at times assisted or consulted. We work very closely with the Organizing Department, developing training programs jointly and conducting many of them ourselves. We also work

collaboratively with other departments in the union to plan conferences.”

- The Organizing Department “has a life of its own,” reported one individual, though the Education Department helps support local organizing staff with training where they can.

It was difficult to assess the extent of integration of any particular education department into the rest of the life of the union, though there is definitely a sense among education directors themselves of the importance of this issue. Most believed that **the degree of integration is strongly related to continued adequate support and funding of their programs**. One interviewee summarized the challenge as trying to “keep education on the radar screens of staff in other departments.”

Telephone interviews added depth to this picture, and confirmed that respondents believe acceptance of education as an activity, and respect for the craft of teaching, is widespread. It was also suggested that support of education is in most cases dependent on support of top national union officers, though a strong grassroots backing can also be a deciding factor.

Perhaps in recognition of its acceptance, **educational activity has attracted more resources over the past 10 years**, in spite of declining union membership overall. Some respondents report that the increase in funding and support has been targeted at special programs rather than general skills and knowledge education (especially those related to organizing), but there is no evidence that more traditional labor education offerings have declined in importance.

TABLE 2.6
Over the past 10 years, have resources allocated to education increased?

Change in Resource Allocation	No. of Unions
INCREASED	26
STAYED THE SAME	5
DECREASED	3
NO ANSWER	2

No specific questions were asked about the nature of funding for educational programming, but a few respondents commented about this in interviews. Three mentioned that their programs had set-aside funding which insulates them from day-to-day internal politics of the union. Others, however, referred to the need to stay connected to top union leadership by carrying out special projects favored by the International President or Secretary-Treasurer.

• RELATIONSHIPS WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL LEVELS OF THE UNION

Thirty of the respondents indicated that some or all of the curriculum in use at the regional and local levels is developed by national/international education staff. In half of these cases, however, respondents mention that some locals, especially the large ones, do develop and deliver training on their own. In two instances, respondents emphasized the importance of regional union organizations and regional staff in initiating educational activity. In only five cases does it appear that the national union is not involved in providing curriculum and materials to local and regional bodies (see Section VI below).

There appears to be a spectrum of approaches to curriculum development and working with local unions. On one end of the spectrum is the education department that provides standardized curricula for members and staff at the local level, and uses its own staff to deliver it. Curriculum development at this end of the spectrum is informed by reactions of class participants to the material and by input from top union officers. At the other end is the education department that custom tailors programs on request from locals, facilitating training, planning and other activities as needed. Most unions fall somewhere in between. They develop some standardized curricula that are used extensively, especially by locals too small to have their own education function, and they tailor their services upon request to other locals. They work less with the larger local unions that have their own educational resources, especially in the area of contract administration.

- EVALUATION

Formal evaluation of union education is limited primarily to course evaluations delivered at the end of class sessions. Informal feedback from class participants, union staff and officers was also cited as useful. Four respondents specifically indicated they had looked for performance measures—e.g., a relationship between the number of participants in organizing training, and the degree of organizing activity; or an increase in the number of course participants in an arbitration class who go on to present cases in their locals. Six cited the value of presenting and discussing periodic reports with the union vice presidents, and receiving feedback from field staff and members one-on-one and at union conventions and other gatherings.

IV. RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER PROVIDERS OF LABOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

- RELATIONSHIPS WITH COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LABOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Only four unions have limited or no interaction with college and university labor education programs.

Nineteen unions (over half of the respondents) report relationships with the George Meany Center for Labor Studies–National Labor College. They cite the following specific connections:

- Using GMC–NLC facilities to offer own programs (nine responses)
- Drawing on GMC–NLC teaching staff for own programs (nine responses)
- Sending union staff to GMC–NLC classes (11 responses)
- Sending apprenticeship instructors through the GMC–NLC degree program (one response)
- Certifying own classes for credit via NLC (five responses)

Fifteen unions (42%) report specific work they have done with other university programs (or with particular university labor educators). Examples include:

- Using university educators to teach specific classes (four responses)
- Using university educators to mentor staff (one response)
- Sending staff to university labor education classes and conferences (five responses)
- Consultation (one response)
- Encouraging regional and local unions to utilize university programs & serve on their advisory boards (ten responses)
- Using university facilities for summer schools (one response)

Telephone interviews indicated that in some cases, connection with university labor educators was especially valuable in terms of stimulating new ideas and pedagogical approaches.

Specific university labor education programs mentioned in the surveys were University of Alabama, University of Arkansas, University of California–Berkeley, Cornell University, Georgia State University, the Harvard Trade Union Program, University of Illinois–Champagne, Los Angeles Trade & Technical College, University of Massachusetts, Michigan State University, University of Oregon, Pennsylvania State University, and University of Wisconsin School for Workers.

Seventeen respondents reported specific barriers to working with college and university labor education programs. Table 2.7 summarizes the responses to this survey item.

TABLE 2.7
If you do not work with college and university programs is this because. . .

Reason	No. of Responses
THEY ARE NOT CONVENIENTLY LOCATED	2
THEY DO NOT OFFER TRAINING THAT IS USEFUL	5
THEIR TRAINING DUPLICATES WHAT WE PREFER TO DO INTERNALLY	5
WE HAVE HAD BAD EXPERIENCES WITH ONE OR MORE OF THESE PROGRAMS	1
THEIR OFFERINGS ARE TOO EXPENSIVE	4
OTHER	8
"OTHER" RESPONSES WERE: • UNSURE OF OFFERINGS, STAFF EXPERTISE, ETC. • NOT ENOUGH TIME! QUALITY SO VARIABLE—TAKES A LOT OF RESEARCH TO FIGURE OUT IF IT WORKS OR NOT • HAVE OTHER SOURCES—USE CONSULTANTS • OUT OF TOUCH WITH WORKING CLASS PEOPLE; WOULD RATHER RELY ON RANK AND FILE • NOT TAILORED TO OUR NEEDS	

Clearly, only a minority of respondents had specific problems with university labor education centers. More of the responses fall into the category of lack of information and time to build relationships, or a simple preference to do their own internal training (especially of stewards).

It is also important to note that university and college labor education programs (excluding the George Meany Center–National Labor College) are less likely to have relationships with national unions than with local, state and regional labor bodies. This is not because, as this item demonstrates, there is ill will. Rather, university and college programs tend to build connections with the organizations closest to them geographically. Some national union education staff seemed well aware of this situation, and encouraged their members to take advantage of local opportunities; others seemed less knowledgeable about the extent to which their local union members participate in university and college labor education programs.

Twenty-one of the respondents indicate that they sometimes attend UALE/AFL-CIO joint meetings, and three said they plan to start attending soon. This represents a genuine opportunity to increase connections between national union education staff and university and college labor educators. If, indeed, some of the lack of connection is related to lack of familiarity with labor center offerings,

UALE conferences could be an ideal location to remedy that lack and to increase networking activities.

- INTEREST IN DEGREE PROGRAMS

Seventeen respondents indicated that they had relationships with the National Labor College or another institution of higher education to offer credit to their members or staff. Another three say they are in the process of developing this relationship. **This concern with college credit for labor education activities, while not a new development, has certainly taken on importance with the advent of the National Labor College's degree-granting operations.**

- RELATIONSHIP WITH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND NON-PROFITS

Only 12 respondents—about one-third—indicate that they utilize the services of outside groups besides university and college labor education. The few mentioned include the constituency groups of the AFL-CIO, Jobs with Justice, United for a Fair Economy, Economic Policy Institute (mentioned by two unions), Center for Working Capital (named by four unions), COSH groups, and other regional non-profits.

- RELATIONSHIPS WITH AFL-CIO NATIONAL, STATE AND LOCAL BODIES

Eighteen respondents—one-half of the respondents—use or encourage their regional and/or local unions to use the educational services of State AFL-CIO's and Central Labor Councils. Comments include: *for layoff and political activities, encourage involvement through Union Cities, encourage 100% affiliation; organizer trainings, political action/voter registration.* This relatively low level of interaction may reflect that fact that educational activity at these levels is not consistent.

While some state and local AFL-CIO bodies have active education programs, many do not.¹

Most of the unions responding to the survey have utilized the educational programs and services of the former AFL-CIO Education Department. Twenty-eight answered “yes” to this question. Table 2.8 below shows how many unions used the special curricula developed by the AFL-CIO over the past few years. Several respondents commented that they lacked the time and/or the special expertise to develop such programs themselves and that they appreciated the opportunity to use and adapt the AFL-CIO curricula to their own purposes.

TABLE 2.8
Have you used . . .

AFL-CIO Curriculum	No. of Unions
MEMO	13
TRAIN-THE-TRAINER	12
COMMON SENSE ECONOMICS	19
SOCIAL SECURITY	10

¹ This is an area that deserves additional investigation. Just as much union education takes place on the regional and local union level, anecdotal evidence tells us that innovative and useful work is also going on within state and local AFL-CIO organizations. As in the case of colleges and universities, national union education departments may simply lack information about the work going on across the country at this level.

Many of those who answered “yes” also mentioned using other services that were important to them:

- Consultation with staff on curricula and program delivery methods
- The Education Department’s role as a clearinghouse for information and materials (“so we don’t have to reinvent the wheel”)
- Identification of instructors
- Assistance with development of distance learning
- Meeting with other education directors to share ideas

Most national union education staff, then, have limited connection to community or other non-profit groups and to state or local AFL-CIO bodies. On the other hand, the majority imply that the national AFL-CIO education department has been successful in bringing them together to share materials and ideas, test

national curricula, and in other ways. It is justifiable, perhaps, to infer that without a national umbrella for their activity, national union education staff will experience increased isolation not only from each other, but also from other community and labor organizations with potentially useful programs and insights.

V. TRENDS

The final question of the survey asked respondents what changes in priority, content and/or delivery of labor education have been most significant over the past 10-20 years. It is difficult to categorize the responses. Many are related in changes to the particular union itself—large mergers and affiliations, major membership gains or losses, significant changes in technology, and so on. In some major unions, training has been somewhat decentralized, moving activities to the regional and local levels where possible. A number of respondents referred to the need to build self-sufficient local unions. New topics have arisen, related both to new technologies and the changing workforce. The following are other examples of trends or significant new developments cited in the surveys:

- Increased attention to external organizing, training organizing staff and member organizers
- Increased attention to developing the skills of members to organize internally
- Renewed attention to workforce development issues
- Increased attention to diversity issues (young workers, homophobia, racism, etc.)
- Increased attention to computers, on-line training, Internet research
- New attention to labor-management programs
- Increased attention to staff training
- Introduction of college degree opportunities

VI. EDUCATION AT THE LEVEL OF REGIONAL, LOCAL AND AFFILIATE BODIES

In some unions, a large proportion of the educational planning and delivery takes place at the regional or local level. In addition, due to widespread merger activity in recent years, some international unions have large affiliates that continue to operate their own education programs following mergers. A representative sampling of these organizations was sent the labor education survey, and five were returned. In addition, one international union education director offered to send the survey to regional affiliates most actively engaged in educational activity (some of these regional affiliates being larger than many of the international unions surveyed). Six responded.

The total number of members reached yearly by these 11 programs is 8,120, and the total staff, 340. Similar to the national/international unions, the majority of these programs are growing in terms of size and resources. Seven report growth, two are the same size, and one is experiencing a decrease in funding. (One did not answer this question.) Staff size of these education programs varied greatly—most had only one staff member, but one had five and one, seven.

The number of surveys in this subgroup is too small to allow firm conclusions, but the information contained in them does justify some general observations:

- 1) **Regional union organizations can play a major role in coordinating and/or delivering education at the local union level.** In some cases their physical proximity to the locals is key, in others, it is the tie of occupational/industrial similarity, or common cultural backgrounds. One indication of this is that seven of the 11 respondents make extensive use of rank-and-file members who have been trained to become trainers.
- 2) Some regional education staff act as liaisons between the international union and the locals. Others operate more autonomously, doing their own needs assessments and developing their own curricula and materials. Size is one, but not the only, determining factor here. Organizational history appears to be another.

- 3) **These organizations are likely to take advantage of the AFL-CIO's national curriculum projects.** Five have used the Common Sense Economics curriculum, three have used Social Security, two have used Train-the-Trainer, and one has used MEMO.
- 4) **With one exception, all of these organizations have relationships with university labor education programs** (two others did not answer the question). Their work with colleges and universities appears to be primarily in the non-credit or consultation arena—only three mention arrangements by which their members can receive college credit for labor studies. Over half of these organizations participate in AFL-CIO/UALE annual meetings.
- 5) When asked about trends, there tends to be a stronger consensus at this level of organization. Four cite **an increasing focus on internal organizing issues**, in contrast to grievance handling and negotiations. Three mention the **importance of educating and activating grassroots, rank-and-file members**. And two refer to specific efforts to **reach out to young and/or new members**.

It is clear, from survey responses and telephone interviews, that what happens at the national union level is far from the whole story when it comes to delivery of education. Much education is planned and implemented regionally, as the foregoing suggests, and additional education is provided at the local union level. On the other hand, in most cases, it is primarily at the national/international level of union organization where major curricular and campaign decisions are made. Much of the work at the regional and local level is informed, encouraged, and materially assisted by national education staff. Issues of educational priorities and approaches thus have major implications for activity at other levels of union organization.

VII. CONCLUSION

What stands out most in these results is the apparent acceptance of the important role of education at the national union level. Rogin and Rachlin wrote in 1968:

Many union leaders do not see any need for training or education. They feel that unionism is a practical matter and is best learned by doing. These unionists feel that the new generation of leaders will learn as they did, by participating in union activity, and what they learn this way will be tested by their successes and failures in day-to-day union work... (56)

Today, the acceptance of labor education in unions seems more widespread, given the growth in size of most education programs, increased resources assigned to them, and their integration into the strategic activities of unions. Connections with university and college labor education programs are limited, but stronger than in the past.

The fact that growth has occurred as the size of the labor movement has declined is both ironic and understandable. As the need for new approaches to external and internal organizing has grown, as the challenges of dealing with the new workforce have increased, and as new technology has changed the very essence of labor communications, union leaders and members have turned to education for assistance and sometimes even for answers. In the words of one union educator, "Our leadership is convinced that education is the only way for us to survive."

On the other hand, though resources have increased overall, most union education programs have very few staff, and all are required to carry out their work in the very difficult larger political and economic environment. Some programs have been forced to scale back drastically and are only now beginning to grow again. Moreover, as good a job as many of these programs are doing, the potential for collaboration with each other and with labor-friendly community groups and university labor education programs has not been fully realized.

Below are a few of the questions that cannot be definitively answered by the survey data, but that are worth further study:

- Train-the-trainer programs are used by a majority of programs, but phone interviews indicate that the ability of education departments to do sufficient follow-up with those who are trained is an issue. How can the use of member- and staff-trainers be promoted and organized to build capacity in union education programs?
- Time constraints and other pressures limit the ability of individual education programs to undertake the labor-intensive development of new pedagogies, like on-line classes. If these have potential use in reaching members, how can their development be facilitated?
- Little mention was made of teaching approaches and techniques in this survey. To what extent are education programs using popular education and other innovative forms of training and member empowerment?
- There is relatively little use of community-based organizations and other non-profits by unions responding to the survey—is there potential here for assistance and support from these organizations that is not being taken advantage of?
- The same question applies to connections with university and college labor education programs. What is the potential for greater collaboration, better dissemination of information about the programs, etc.?
- What is happening at the regional and local union levels? What is the amount and quality of education at those levels, and what can national education programs do to enhance it?
- What about state and local central labor bodies? Is there consistent educational activity in those organizations, or “promising practices” that can be identified?
- Education staff themselves report greater integration into the life and strategic goals of unions. How is education viewed by other national officers and staff—do they share the perspective that

education is central to solving the problems that face organized labor, or do some still see it as peripheral?

- What efficiencies in the generation of ideas and development of materials could arise from more collaborative work among union education departments? How will collaboration be encouraged in the absence of education staff housed at the national AFL-CIO? Is this a role for the National Labor College?

Rogin and Rachlin conclude their 1968 study with a call for a “breakthrough” for labor education that would be made possible by a major increase in financial support. That call seems a relic of history. The task of most labor education programs now is struggling just to keep up with the demand, and in more than a few cases, struggling to survive. If there is any “call” to be made, perhaps it is simply that labor education be fully supported in the national unions, so that it can make a full and fundamental contribution to solving the crisis that now confronts organized labor.

PART 3: UNIVERSITY- AND COLLEGE-BASED LABOR EDUCATION

As noted in Part 1, a separate survey was conducted of university- and college-based labor education programs in the United States. The survey itself is included as Appendix B. Surveys were sent to the Director or Acting Director of each campus labor center or program. Of the 44 centers receiving a survey, responses were obtained from 42. A list of all programs surveyed, including the two non-respondents, is included as Appendix C of this report.

The survey collected information on the size and scope of each program, orientation of program, research capabilities and funding, technology and consulting issues, and the respondent's perception of trends: past and future. The following sections of this part of the report will cover each of these areas in turn.

I. SIZE AND SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM

- SIZE

There are a number of ways to measure the size of a labor education program. One obvious way to measure this is the number of students (participants) in labor education classes. The survey asked **how many students attended non-credit labor education classes in the past year**, and how this compared to ten years ago. Programs reported **57,884 students**. Of the 40 centers answering this question (2 left it blank because they do only credit), five did not give specific growth or shrinkage rates compared to a decade ago. But for the 35 giving comparisons, enrollments were **55,141** last year compared to **45,019** a decade ago. That means a **22.5%** increase in the past decade.

Broken down by programs, 17 reported that student count was up from ten years ago; 11 reported that it was the same; eight reported that it was down; and four either didn't know or had too new of a program. By this measure, non-credit labor education in institutions of higher education seems to have grown in the past decade. Table 3.1 shows the figures.

TABLE 3.1
Comparisons of non-credit enrollments, last year and a decade ago

No. OF STUDENTS LAST YEAR	57,884
% GROWTH FROM A DECADE AGO (WHERE KNOWN)	22.5%
No. OF PROGRAMS THAT GREW	17
No. OF PROGRAMS THAT STAYED THE SAME	11
No. OF PROGRAMS THAT SHRANK	8
No. OF PROGRAMS WHO EITHER DIDN'T ANSWER, DIDN'T KNOW, OR MARKED IT NOT APPLICABLE	6

Fewer centers were able to answer the **number of classroom hours** in non-credit programs offered in the past year. The 30 centers that gave usable answers for last year's enrollments reported **38,778** hours of instruction. Of these, ten saw an increase over ten years ago; five remained the same, nine saw a decrease; six didn't respond or didn't know; and 12 gave recent figures but no comparisons for a decade ago. Of the 23 programs able to give numbers for both the present and a decade ago, the numbers show a 29.4% increase. By this measure, labor education also seems to have grown, although the data are much less reliable and less definitive. Table 3.2 gives the relevant figures.

Table 3.2
Comparisons of non-credit classroom hours, last year and a decade ago

No. OF CLASSROOM HOURS LAST YEAR	38,778
% GROWTH FROM A DECADE AGO (WHERE KNOWN)	29.4%
No. OF PROGRAMS THAT GREW	10
No. OF PROGRAMS THAT STAYED THE SAME	5
No. OF PROGRAMS THAT SHRANK	9
No. OF PROGRAMS WHO EITHER DIDN'T ANSWER, DIDN'T KNOW, OR MARKED IT NOT APPLICABLE	18

A third way to measure growth or shrinkage is by number of labor educators. The numbers obtained in this research are far from precise—numbers in the initial answers to the survey do not match the numbers given later when programs were asked to approve (or modify) the information given in the database we compiled to put on the worldwide web (see Appendix F). Because the final numbers given in that database (after modification by directors) are the last ones obtained, they will be used here as the accurate numbers. Once again, by this measure, labor education seems to be growing, although aggregate figures may be deceptive. Table 3.3 shows the numbers and ten-year growth in staff positions.

TABLE 3.3
Staffing in 2002; breakdown by “hard” and “soft”
money positions; growth in last decade

STAFFING IN 2002	279 POSITIONS
“HARD” MONEY POSITIONS	225 POSITIONS
“SOFT” MONEY POSITIONS	54 POSITIONS
GROWTH IN LAST DECADE, <i>WHERE CENTERS KNOW*</i>	14 POSITIONS
*RESULTS IN THIS ROW ARE FROM THE ORIGINAL SURVEY, NOT THE FINAL DATABASE THAT WAS COMPILED AFTER CORRECTIONS WERE MADE BY THE DIRECTORS OF THE PROGRAMS.	

For those labor centers able to provide comparative figures, the overall number of labor education positions grew by 7.4% from 1992 to 2002. However, the growth was extremely uneven, and was in fact concentrated in a very few programs. **If one eliminates the one large “outlier” that grew enormously—the California system (up 16 positions)—the profession actually lost two positions** in the decade. Comparably large outliers on the down side do not exist. In general, employment was stagnant in the decade 1992 to 2002. As Table 3.4 shows, “losers” and “gainers” were roughly comparable.

Table 3.4
Number of programs that grew, stayed the same,
or shrank in the decade 1992-2002

NO. OF PROGRAMS THAT GREW	14
NO. OF PROGRAMS THAT STAYED THE SAME	9
NO. OF PROGRAMS THAT SHRANK	13
NO ANSWER OR DON'T KNOW	6

If the figures from the last three tables are accurate, programs have been doing more teaching without more staffing in the past decade. **If the number of students grew 22.5%, the number of teaching hours grew 29.4%, and the number of staff members grew only 7.4%, the teaching load per staff member has increased greatly.**

• NON-CREDIT CERTIFICATE PROGRAM

Beyond simple size, the scope of these programs is of interest. Some labor education programs in institutions of higher learning simply offer non-credit courses to trade unionists and other interested workers. Others combine a series of such courses into a package—those completing a certain number (or a certain sequence) of classes earn a certificate. (Of course, many programs also issue certificates for completion of individual courses, but a “series certificate” is usually a more elaborate and prestigious accomplishment, sometimes accompanied by an awards ceremony or dinner, etc.) **Of the 42 respondent institutions, 20 have a non-credit certificate program, and 22 do not.**

• “OPEN ENROLLMENT” VS. “CONTRACT” PROGRAMMING

Some courses are offered on an “open enrollment” basis, meaning that they are openly advertised, and anybody can sign up. Such classes usually have members of a number of different unions attending them. Other offerings are on a “contract” basis. These classes are paid for by a particular organization (usually a union or a central labor body) and are generally open only to members of that organization. Responding institutions showed a wide variation in the mix of

these two types of programming. Some offered virtually all of one type and not the other, at both ends of the spectrum. Table 3.5 shows the results.

TABLE 3.5
Percentage of open enrollment and contract programs, numbers of labor centers

0–10% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 90–100% CONTRACT	9 LABOR CENTERS (21.5%)
11–20% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 80–89% CONTRACT	4 LABOR CENTERS (9.5%)
21–30% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 70–79% CONTRACT	5 LABOR CENTERS (12%)
31–40% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 60–69% CONTRACT	7 LABOR CENTERS (16.5%)
41–49% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 51%–59% CONTRACT	1 LABOR CENTER (2.5%)
50% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 50% CONTRACT	4 LABOR CENTERS (9.5%)
51–59% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 41–49% CONTRACT	1 LABOR CENTER (2.5%)
60–69% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 31–40% CONTRACT	0 LABOR CENTERS (0%)
70–79% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 21–30% CONTRACT	1 LABOR CENTER (2.5%)
80–89% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 11–20% CONTRACT	3 LABOR CENTERS (7%)
90–100% OPEN ENROLLMENT; 0–10% CONTRACT	6 LABOR CENTERS (14.5%)
NOT APPLICABLE (HARVARD TRADE UNION PROGRAM)	1 LABOR CENTER (2.5%)

(PERCENTAGES ARE ROUNDED TO NEAREST .5%; HENCE THEY MAY NOT ADD UP EXACTLY TO 100%)

As Table 3.5 demonstrates, more labor centers are tilted toward contract classes than toward open enrollment classes. **Twenty-five of the 42 respondents had 60% or more of their classes done under contract.** That is almost 60% of the institutions included in the survey. In contrast, only **ten of the 42 had 60% or more of their classes offered through open enrollment.** That is only about 24% of the institutions surveyed.

This result corresponds with the perceived shift in the mix of course offerings in the last decade. **Almost half of the respondents stated there was a shift toward contract classes (20 of 42; 47.5%);** while **less than one fifth perceived a shift toward open enrollment classes (9 of 42; 21.5%).** Data are given in Table 3.6.

TABLE 3.6
Perceived direction in shift between open enrollment and
contract classes this past decade

TOWARD CONTRACT CLASSES	20 LABOR CENTERS (47.5%)
TOWARD OPEN ENROLLMENT CLASSES	9 LABOR CENTERS (21.5%)
THE SAME (NO SHIFT)	8 LABOR CENTERS (19%)
NO RESPONSE	5 LABOR CENTERS (12%)

• LENGTH OF LABOR EDUCATION CLASSES OFFERED

Respondents were asked what percentage of their non-credit classes were 4 or less, 5-8, 9-12, 13-20, or over 20 hours long. Across the entire sample, **the most frequent length was 5-8 hours, followed by 4 or less hours**. That would indicate that the most frequent offering was a one-day class, probably on a Saturday. The second most frequent would be a short, one-time class taught in one day or one evening. However, on average 45% of classes were at longer lengths of 9-12 hours, 13-20 hours, or over 20 hours. Table 3.7 shows the averages (unweighted across institutions) of percentages of classes offered at each length.

TABLE 3.7
Average percentage of classes taught at different lengths of time

Length of Class	Percent of Total Classes
0-4 HOURS	23%
5-8 HOURS	32%
9-12 HOURS	15%
13-20 HOURS	14%
OVER 20 HOURS	16%
(THESE ARE UNWEIGHTED AVERAGES, MEANING THAT LARGER PROGRAMS WITH MORE CLASSES OFFERED PER YEAR WERE GIVEN EQUAL WEIGHT WITH SMALL ONES OFFERING FEW CLASSES IN A YEAR.)	

There was a rather large variation between labor education programs in their percentages of shorter and longer classes. One offered 100% of their classes at over 20 hours length, while 15 offered no programs at this length. One offered

100% of its programs at the 13-20 hour length, while 13 offered no programs at this length. Two offered 100% of their classes in the 5-8 hour range, and seven offered none in the range. Table 3.8 shows the range of variation.

TABLE 3.8
Individual institutional percentages of shorter and longer classes

	Classes 4 or Less Hours	Classes 5–8 Hours	Classes 9–12 Hours	Classes 13–20 Hours	Classes Over 20 Hours
0%	9 INSTITUTIONS	7 INSTITUTIONS	12 INSTITUTIONS	13 INSTITUTIONS	15 INSTITUTIONS
1–9%	4 INSTITUTIONS	0 INSTITUTIONS	6 INSTITUTIONS	10 INSTITUTIONS	8 INSTITUTIONS
10–19%	6 INSTITUTIONS	6 INSTITUTIONS	7 INSTITUTIONS	6 INSTITUTIONS	8 INSTITUTIONS
20–29%	5 INSTITUTIONS	8 INSTITUTIONS	7 INSTITUTIONS	3 INSTITUTIONS	1 INSTITUTION
30–39%	3 INSTITUTIONS	4 INSTITUTIONS	2 INSTITUTIONS	2 INSTITUTIONS	0 INSTITUTIONS
40–49%	4 INSTITUTIONS	5 INSTITUTIONS	1 INSTITUTION	1 INSTITUTION	2 INSTITUTIONS
50–59%	5 INSTITUTIONS	2 INSTITUTIONS	0 INSTITUTIONS	0 INSTITUTIONS	1 INSTITUTION
60–69%	0 INSTITUTIONS	1 INSTITUTION	2 INSTITUTIONS	1 INSTITUTION	0 INSTITUTIONS
70–79%	1 INSTITUTION	1 INSTITUTION	0 INSTITUTIONS	1 INSTITUTION	1 INSTITUTION
80–89%	1 INSTITUTION	1 INSTITUTION	1 INSTITUTION	0 INSTITUTIONS	0 INSTITUTIONS
90–99%	0 INSTITUTIONS	1 INSTITUTION	0 INSTITUTIONS	0 INSTITUTIONS	1 INSTITUTION
100%	0 INSTITUTIONS	2 INSTITUTIONS	0 INSTITUTIONS	1 INSTITUTION	1 INSTITUTION
NOT APPLICABLE OR NO RESPONSE	4 INSTITUTIONS	4 INSTITUTIONS	4 INSTITUTIONS	4 INSTITUTIONS	4 INSTITUTIONS

Despite these variations, the overall picture remains the same: the most popular classes are 5-8 hours in length, followed by those 4 hours or less. Yet the longer classes are also relatively popular.

• DELIVERY SITE OF CLASSES

By far the **most popular delivery site** for university- and college-based labor education classes is in a **union hall or community site**, as shown by the figures presented in Table 3.9.

TABLE 3.9
Average percentage of classes offered in different locations,
across all institutions

DELIVERED ON CAMPUS	17%
DELIVERED IN A UNION HALL OR COMMUNITY SITE	75%
DELIVERED IN A WORKPLACE	7%
(THESE ARE UNWEIGHTED AVERAGES, MEANING THAT LARGER PROGRAMS WITH MORE CLASSES OFFERED PER YEAR WERE GIVEN EQUAL WEIGHT WITH SMALL ONES OFFERING FEW CLASSES IN A YEAR. THERE WERE 38 RESPONDENTS TO THIS QUESTION.)	

• AUDIENCE FOR NON-CREDIT LABOR EDUCATION CLASSES

On the whole, participants in these non-credit labor education classes tend to be local. Averaging responses across all institutions, respondents indicated that 31% of the participants were statewide or larger. Fully **69% of participants were of a local or workplace nature**. There is nothing surprising in these figures, since most university- and college-based labor education programs relate primarily to their own local labor movement. If it had not been for four programs that had 70% or more of their programming of a statewide or larger nature, the imbalance would have been even greater.

• RELATIONSHIPS WITH STATE AFL-CIOS

Only a minority of centers run programs paid for by their state federation of labor (36%, or 15 out of 42). Fourteen of the 15 doing such programs indicated how many paid programs they did last year, and 12 of these indicated for how many hours. The 14 who did such programming averaged 3.3 programs per year, ranging from one to ten. And the 12 reporting numbers of hours showed an average of 31 hours, in a range from two to 78.5 hours.

But a majority of university- and college-based labor education centers do run programs sponsored by, but not paid by, their state federation of labor (62%, or 26 out of 42). Of these 26, 18 gave the number of programs, and 16 gave the number of yearly hours taught in these programs. The average number of

programs among the 18 was five, in a range from one to 24. The average number of hours among the 16 giving such information was 54 hours, in a range from six to 226 hours.

These figures reveal an extreme variation in closeness of relationships with state federations of labor. One program runs 13 programs for its state federation, totaling 226 hours, while many run no programs of this nature at all—paid or unpaid.

• RELATIONSHIPS WITH CENTRAL LABOR COUNCILS

A minority of centers run programs paid for by a central labor council (43%, or 18 out of 42). Of the 18 indicating they do such programs, 13 indicated how many, and 12 indicated how many total hours of instruction took place. The 13 averaged 5.6 such programs, in a range from one to 20. The 12 averaged 44 hours of programming, in a range from two to 132.

A majority do run programs sponsored by, but not paid by, a central labor council (57%, or 24 out of 42). Of these 24, 17 indicated how many programs, and ten indicated total number of hours in such programming. The 17 averaged 7.7 programs per year, in a range from one to 35. The ten giving total hours of programming averaged 68 hours, in a range from one to 314.

Once again, the numbers reveal extreme variation. One center does 314 hours of programming for central labor councils, while a number of others do none.

• RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE NATIONAL AFL-CIO

Virtually all the university- and college-based labor centers have little direct relationship with the national AFL-CIO. Only four centers listed payments by the national AFL-CIO for a program within the past three years. Payments tended to be for things like AFL-CIO scholarship money for women's schools, credit classes taught locally for the National Labor College, or a CLC "train the trainer" program. The general picture is that the national AFL-CIO does not directly relate monetarily with university- and college-based labor education centers outside of the National Labor College. A few other non-monetary relationships were listed, but they were sparse and not ongoing.

• RELATIONSHIPS WITH NATIONAL UNIONS

Centers had considerably more extensive relationships with national unions. **Twenty-eight of the 42 respondents stated that a national union had paid them for an educational program within the past three years.** A number of these are ongoing, such as yearly summer schools. A wide variety of national unions were mentioned: American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME, mentioned five times); Glass, Molders, and Pottery Workers (GMP, mentioned three times); Communications Workers of America (CWA, mentioned three times); Transport Workers Unions (TWU, mentioned three times); Office and Professional Employees International Union (OPEIU, mentioned twice); American Federation of Teachers (AFT, mentioned twice); United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW, mentioned twice); the Boilermakers (mentioned twice); Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE, mentioned twice); International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT, mentioned twice); United Steelworkers of America (USWA, mentioned twice); United Electrical Workers (UE, mentioned twice); International Longshore and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU); Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union (OCAW; now merged into PACE); International Association of Theater and Stage Employees (IATSE); Graphic Communications International Union (GCIU); United Mineworkers of America (UMWA); Laborers International Union (LIUNA); Utility Workers (UWUA); International Federation of Professional and Technical Employees (IFPTE); United Brotherhood of Carpenters (UBC); Service Employees International Union (SEIU); Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees (HERE); United Auto Workers (UAW); and Professional Airline Safety Specialists (PASS).

The above listing of relationships with central labor councils, state federations, and national unions illustrates our contention that there has been a considerable "thaw" in the suspicious relationships that existed between university- and college-based labor educators 35 years ago, as documented in the Rogin and Rachlin report. The fairly large minority of higher education labor education programs without ongoing educational relationships shows that the suspicion is not completely overcome, but the even larger number of such relationships shows that relations are considerably better. Where they are working, such relationships are symbiotic. Unions get high quality labor education at a fraction of its real cost (the rest being paid for out of university budgets), while the university- and college-based labor education programs get to demonstrate to higher administrators their usefulness to an organized community constituency. Not so coincidentally, this is also a demonstration of a "political base" for advocacy for higher education at the state legislature and locally.

• LABOR STUDIES CREDIT PROGRAMS

A slight majority of labor centers (22 out of 42) have a credit labor studies program. These credit programs range all the way from short undergraduate certificate programs to graduate Ph.D. programs. By far the most widespread is an undergraduate certificate program (on 15 campuses), but undergraduate bachelor's degree programs are also available on nine campuses, and programs also exist for undergraduate minors, two-year associates degrees, graduate certificates, master's degrees, and the Ph.D. One program (not included in the table below) indicated that it had an arrangement with another school in the university that would convert their non-credit classes into a certain degree of credit for degrees with other majors, although there was not a labor studies degree at that university. Table 3.10 shows the numbers of centers offering certification at each level.

TABLE 3.10
Number of programs (out of 22 overall) offering
different levels of credit credentials

UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE	15
MINOR	4
ASSOCIATES DEGREE	5
BACHELOR'S DEGREE	9
GRADUATE CERTIFICATE	3
MASTER'S DEGREE	4
DOCTORATE	1

Eight of the 15 programs offering undergraduate certificate programs gave enrollment and/or graduation figures. These indicated an average enrollment of 223 students per year, with a range from eight to 1,146. Undergraduate certificate graduation figures averaged eight graduates per year, with a range from two to 83.

Calculation of numbers of minors is difficult; significant figures were not captured in this survey. But three of the five associates degree-granting programs reported on their enrollments and graduation numbers. Enrollments averaged 335, with a range from ten to 820. Eight of the nine bachelor's degree-granting

programs gave enrollment and/or graduation numbers. Average enrollments were 237, with a range from 15 to 900. Graduations averaged 45 with a range from one to 180.

At the graduate level, usable statistics were not obtained on graduate certificate programs, but all four master's degree programs reported on both enrollments and graduation numbers. The master's programs averaged 80 enrollments per year, with a range from 15 to 200. They also reported an average of 16 graduations per year, with a range from six to 30. The one doctoral program reported one graduate last year.

Eight centers have a formal agreement with the George Meany Center–National Labor College whereby their program acts as a “feeder” for the GMC–NLC bachelor's degree program. Several others indicated that they were considering this arrangement.

It is noteworthy that a fairly large majority of respondents indicated growth in credit programs in the past ten years. This was especially true for programs at the graduate level. Coupled with the number of responses indicating a program that is too new to compare to a decade ago, these results suggest that credit offerings are continuing their growth pattern of the past few decades. Further evidence of this is the hundreds of students who have taken classes and received degrees from the George Meany Center–National Labor College (figures not reflected in this survey), a relatively recent phenomenon. Relative to non-credit labor education, it would appear that credit labor studies offerings are taking an ever-growing share of the resources of university- and college-based labor education programs.

Reasons for this trend are probably multiple. More individuals within the labor movement, particularly those on staff, are demanding college credit and college credentials. Within universities, there is a growing push to “academize” all units, and to marginalize or eliminate those units that do not do so. As more academic and “credentialed” individuals with a Ph.D. are hired into university- and college-based labor education programs, they too can be expected to be interested in offering credit classes. Thus, both a “pull” and a “push” are likely operating to produce this result. Arguments over the desirability of this continued trend continue within the field, as will be noted later.

II. ORIENTATION OF THE PROGRAMS

• ORIENTATION TOWARD UNION, JOINT LABOR-MANAGEMENT, OR “OTHER” INTERESTS

Overwhelmingly, the **main** orientation of university- and college-based labor education programs is toward union advocacy. **When asked to characterize the main thrust of their program between union advocacy, joint labor-management facilitation, and neither of the above, 36 of the 42 answered “union advocacy.”** Table 3.11 shows results.

TABLE 3.11
Basic orientation of university- and college-based labor education programs

UNION ADVOCACY	36
JOINT LABOR-MANAGEMENT FACILITATION	1
NEITHER	4
BOTH UNION ADVOCACY <u>AND</u> JOINT LABOR-MANAGEMENT FACILITATION	1

Following this basic orientation, most educational programming is aimed at union advocacy. **Thirty-one of the 42 responding programs (74%) have over 80% of their classes union advocacy. Only ten programs (24%) make joint labor-management facilitation more than 10% of their offerings. And only six (14%) have more than 10% of their courses aimed at “neither.”** Table 3.12 gives numbers.

TABLE 3.12
Number of programs offering selected percentages of total offerings that are union advocacy, joint labor-management facilitation, or neither

	Union Advocacy	Joint Labor-Management Facilitation	Neither
0-10%	2 PROGRAMS	33 PROGRAMS	36 PROGRAMS
11-20%	1 PROGRAM	4 PROGRAMS	1 PROGRAM
21-30%	0 PROGRAMS	3 PROGRAMS	0 PROGRAMS
31-40%	0 PROGRAMS	2 PROGRAMS	2 PROGRAMS
41-50%	1 PROGRAM	0 PROGRAMS	1 PROGRAM
51-60%	2 PROGRAMS	0 PROGRAMS	0 PROGRAMS
61-70%	2 PROGRAMS	0 PROGRAMS	0 PROGRAMS
71-80%	3 PROGRAMS	1 PROGRAM	0 PROGRAMS
81-90%	8 PROGRAMS	0 PROGRAMS	0 PROGRAMS
91-100%	23 PROGRAMS	0 PROGRAMS	2 PROGRAMS

When asked to note trends in the mix of programming, seven note a decline in labor-management programming in the past decade, and four note an increase. One noted an increase in workplace skills training programming (in the “neither” category).

• “TOOL” VS. “NON-TOOL” COURSES

Some labor educators make a distinction between “tool” courses that teach people skills (e.g., grievance handling, arbitration, collective bargaining) and courses that go beyond skills to a broader understanding of the environment that unions and workers face (e.g., labor history, labor and political ideologies, labor and economic theories, etc.) Directors of labor programs were asked what percentage of their non-credit courses were primarily tool or non-tool. Results revealed that **most programs lean heavily toward tool courses**. Table 3.13 shows the results.

TABLE 3.13
Percentage breakdown between “tool” and “non-tool” classes

1–10% TOOL; 90–100% NON-TOOL	3 LABOR CENTERS (7%)
11–20% TOOL; 80–89% NON-TOOL	2 LABOR CENTERS (5%)
21–30% TOOL; 70–79% NON-TOOL	0 LABOR CENTERS (0%)
31–40% TOOL; 60–69% NON-TOOL	1 LABOR CENTER (2.5%)
41–49% TOOL; 51–59% NON-TOOL	1 LABOR CENTER (2.5%)
50% TOOL; 50% NON-TOOL	3 LABOR CENTERS (7%)
51–59% TOOL; 41–49% NON-TOOL	1 LABOR CENTER (2.5%)
60–69% TOOL; 31–40% NON-TOOL	6 LABOR CENTERS (14.5%)
70–79% TOOL; 21–30% NON-TOOL	7 LABOR CENTERS (16.5%)
80–89% TOOL; 11–20% NON-TOOL	10 LABOR CENTERS (24%)
90–100% TOOL; 0–10% NON-TOOL	6 LABOR CENTERS (14.5%)
NOT APPLICABLE	2 LABOR CENTERS (5%)
(BECAUSE OF ROUNDING TO THE NEAREST .5%, TOTAL PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD UP TO 100%)	

Thus, **33 of the 40** respondents considering this question applicable to their program offered **50% or more of their courses as “tool” courses**. Only **ten of the 40** had **50% or more of their courses as “non-tool” courses**.

Despite this tilt toward tool courses, of the 14 respondents noting a trend in the past decade, ten found a trend toward non-tool courses, and only four found a trend toward tool courses. This is fairly weak evidence of a small trend toward non-tool subjects, compared to past patterns of university- and college-based labor education.

• ORIENTATION OF INDIVIDUAL LABOR EDUCATORS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Respondents were asked to rate the attitudes of their staff labor educators using a five-point Likert scale of responses ("strongly agree," "agree," "neutral," "disagree," "strongly disagree") to the following attitudinal statements:

The main purpose of labor education is to:

- (A) train union leaders and activists in the skills needed to bargain and administer a contract, and to conduct a union's administrative and political affairs. (We label this the **PRAGMATIC TRAINING** perspective on labor education.)
- (B) train union leaders and activists in thinking strategically and critically in how to empower workers and their union. (We label this the **CRITICAL THINKING FOR EMPOWERMENT** perspective on labor education.)
- (C) promote a harmonious relationship between labor and management. (We label this the **COOPERATIONIST** perspective on labor education.)
- (D) develop a radical consciousness about capitalism and our class system, and to help union leaders and activists fight and overcome class oppression. (We label this the **LEFT RADICAL** perspective on labor education.)

By far the most popular attitude was the “critical thinking for empowerment” perspective. Over 90% of respondents rated their professional staff as either agreeing or strongly agreeing with this perspective. Positive attitudes were also seen toward the “pragmatic training” and “left radical” viewpoints. **Almost 70% were rated as either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the “pragmatic training” perspective. And 57% percent were found to either agree or strongly agree with the “left radical” perspective.** The “cooperationist” viewpoint was decidedly unpopular. **Only 7.5% were rated as agreeing or strongly agreeing with the “cooperationist” perspective, while 78.5% either disagreed or strongly disagreed.** Table 3.14 shows responses.

TABLE 3.14
Degrees of agreement or disagreement with
four perspectives on labor education

Perspective	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
CRITICAL THINKING FOR EMPOWERMENT	26 (62%)	12 (28.5%)	4 (9.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
PRAGMATIC TRAINING	6 (14.5%)	23 (55%)	7 (16.5%)	5 (12%)	1 (2.5%)
LEFT RADICAL	9 (21.5%)	15 (35.5%)	11 (26%)	6 (14.5%)	1 (2.5%)
COOPERATIONIST	1 (2.5%)	2 (5%)	6 (14.5%)	15 (35.5%)	18 (43%)

A second way to rate the relative appeal of the above perspectives is to convert the ratings into positive and negative numbers. Thus, converting “strongly agree” into a +2, “agree” into a +1, a “neutral” into a “0”, a “disagree” into a -1, and a “strongly disagree” into a -2, one can rate these four perspectives on a numerical scale. Because there were 42 responses, possible numerical values could range from a +84 to a -84, with a “0” showing absolute neutrality toward that particular perspective. The larger the positive number, the greater the agreement. The larger the negative number, the greater the disagreement. Responses on the four perspectives yield the following results:

Critical Thinking for Empowerment:	+64
Pragmatic Training:	+28
Left Radical:	+25
Cooperationist:	-47

- ORIENTATION TOWARD THE ACTUAL AND DESIRED DIVISION OF LABOR BETWEEN HIGHER EDUCATION LABOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND UNION LABOR EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS

Respondents were asked how unions divided up their education and training between university and college programs and their own education departments. They were also asked about their attitude toward the existing division of labor. When were institutions of higher education utilized, when weren't they, and how did the directors of these programs assess the division of labor?

As to the existing division of labor, responses were quite varied. Often this reflected the geographical location of the particular program. Those located far from either national union headquarters or larger district or regional structures of a union often reported that such unions tended to use them more because of the great cost or the inconvenience of doing the education themselves. This was also true for particular unions that had low union density in the area served by a particular university- or college-based program; in this case that program is turned to more frequently. **As a generalization, universities and colleges were relied upon more for small locals or geographically dispersed locals, or by unions with small or no education departments.**

But there were also patterns noted regarding subject matter. First, **university- and college-based programs were relied upon more for the specialized and diverse subject areas where union education departments were likely to have little expertise. As a generalization, they were not relied upon for subjects that would be politically sensitive within the union (such as internal union administration, organizational change, or union democracy), or on subjects regarding the union's political agenda. And finally, unions almost never turned to these programs for education and training on issues concerning organizing the unorganized.**

Given that organizing and politics are the top two priorities of the AFL-CIO right now, this is a telling example of the degree to which university- and college-based labor education is marginal to the concerns of labor unions in this country. Respondents in general would like a larger role, especially in education concerning organizing.

The following list catalogues the subjects most mentioned as being ones where a union was likely to use a university- or college-based labor education program (descending order in frequency of mention):

- 1) Steward Training/Grievance Representation (11 mentions)
- 2) Leadership Training (eight mentions)
- 3) “Tool” courses in general (eight mentions)
- 4) Collective Bargaining (six mentions)
- 5) Labor History (six mentions)
- 6) Safety and Health Training (five mentions)
- 7) The Family and Medical Leave Act (five mentions)
- 8) Labor and Employment Law (four mentions)
- 9) Common Sense Economics/Political Economy (four mentions)
- 10) Researching your company or your industry (four mentions)
- 11) Internal Organizing/Member Mobilization (four mentions)
- 12) Strategic Planning (three mentions)
- 13) Issues best approached on an inter-union basis (three mentions)
- 14) Globalization (three mentions)
- 15) Gender Issues (three mentions)
- 16) Ethnic Issues (three mentions)
- 17) Contract Campaigns (three mentions)

Numerous other topics were mentioned once, including classes in Spanish, technological change, immigration issues, theoretical topics, “small stuff,” union building skills, computer skills, etc.

While this list is in no way a scientific enumeration of the topics requested from university- and college-based labor education programs, or the frequency with which they teach these topics, it can serve as a very rough approximation of the general demand coming from unions. Looked at in this way, one immediately notes that the top four listings are all “tool” topics. **Second, it is apparent that unions are not looking to university or college labor education courses for guidance on the major strategic issues facing them in any of the three major arenas: (1) politics; (2) internal change/organizational change; and (3) organizing the unorganized.** (The same is not necessarily true for research or consulting on these topics.)

This second point is reinforced by looking at the topics respondents noted were not brought to university- or college-based programs for education or training. By far the #1 topic on this list was organizing the unorganized (13 mentions). Following that, beyond frequent mentions that particular unions sometimes kept steward training to themselves, the next most frequently mentioned topics were internal administrative issues (including organizational change) with six mentions, and “political agendas/politics” (four mentions). Several respondents also noted that the building trades seldom used their services.

These results are not surprising. They grow out of the fundamentally political nature of unions as organizations, coupled with the “outsider” status of most university- and college-based labor educators, even most of those well liked and respected by union leaders and activists. On politically sensitive issues, unions are unlikely to allow an “outsider” in to conduct education. On a broader canvass, they also demonstrate that labor education still does not have a central role in the strategic thinking of most union leaders, unless union education departments are taking up the slack and providing extensive educational programs in the areas of organizing, politics, and internal organizational change.

When asked if there should be a change in the division of labor as it currently stands, responses broke down into three general types. Some found the present arrangement quite proper. One respondent wrote “No need to change. They know their administrative systems. We don’t teach organizing.” Another wrote, “About right;” yet another “OK as is.” Six of the 42 respondents answered in this vein.

A second set of responses indicated clear dissatisfaction with the division of labor, and felt that university- and college-based labor education programs should be allowed in a broad array of topics. One wrote, “I think we could do all courses well. Should be no limits.” Another wrote, “University and college based programs are under utilized by union education departments.” Yet another wrote, “We should help do it all.” Another wrote, “I think we should be afforded more opportunities in the organizing and political areas. We can present political information and not be seen as an arm of the International, perhaps sidestepping internal politics.” Nine of the 42 respondents expressed views of this nature.

Finally, a number of responses reveal more ambivalent or specifically-targeted views on a change in the relationship. Not all of these responses can be repeated or summarized here, but a representative sampling can be included. One wrote

that the international union education department should be responsible for specific training for union financial officers, for training on a specific collective bargaining agreement (especially a master agreement), or for industry/sector analysis. However, this director argued that her program could do a much more efficient and cost-effective job in “non-specialized” training, both tool and non-tool. Another wrote, “I think we could do more. I don’t think it’s our call to say whether we should or not.” This director felt that his program could do excellent organizing training that was cross-union with a built-in advantage of cross-fertilization and learning from each other, but that unions did not want this—they wanted to keep their organizing strategies secret and apart from other unions. A third director felt that union education departments should handle the “cadre training” of staff, meaning the training on the specific roles and duties (and knowledge) expected from staff and leaders. However, university- and college-based labor education programs could offer “skills training more broadly,” and also could “stimulate critical thinking about broad economic, political and social strategies—something that many unions feel is beyond the scope of their educational mandate.” Other responses argued for a similar distinction between “specific role training” (union responsibility) and “broader critical understanding” training (university/college program responsibility), although not all felt it broke down that way.

In general, a majority view was that university- and college-based programs could do education and training cost effectively on a wider variety of topics, and that this would be desirable. A strong minority view expressed satisfaction with the status quo, however. For those dissatisfied, by far the strongest complaint was being cut out entirely from education and training on the topic of organizing the unorganized. There were also secondary complaints in the areas of politics and internal organizational administration and change.

• AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

Respondents were asked to list the areas where their labor program had a special area of teaching expertise. A few gave no response, or stated no special area of expertise. But the vast majority of programs listed one or more areas of specialization (38 out of 42). The areas of specialization are far too many to list in this report, but the overall list is an impressive array of expertise on a wide variety of subjects. The reader is referred to the database on university- and college-based

labor education programs that was developed as a result of this research project. This database lists the area(s) of specialization, as well as a number of other facts, about each individual program. It is available on the web at: <http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/laborstudiesdb/> and is also included as Appendix F.

While it is impractical to list all the topics of specialization, a sense of the broad array can be gleaned from this mostly random sample: strategic planning, FMLA, health and safety, international solidarity, living wage, privatization, diversity immigration, organizing model of unionism, immigrant workers, arbitration, employment law, strategic research, health care, pensions, building trades issues, contract campaigns, state and local politics, pension bargaining, media, web site development, health care, rank and file organizing, ergonomics, economic development, workers compensation, bargaining skills, labor history, women's leadership, team concept/high performance workplaces, one-on-one/internal organizing, technological change, labor in the schools, strategic planning, ESL classes, young worker organizing, public policy, computer applications for unions, Asian American workers, grievance handling, employee ownership, central labor council leadership development, minority issues, workers theater, and many more. This is an impressive list, if self-reporting is accurate. See the database for a more complete (and individualized) listing.

III. RESEARCH (FUNDED AND UNFUNDED) AND ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS

In the mid-1960s research was such a small part of labor education at institutions of higher learning that Rogin and Rachlin devote barely more than one page of their 275-page report to it. They report that most labor center directors consider research to be irrelevant to the education programs they conduct (187). They mention research at only a handful of institutions. By 2002 the picture had changed considerably. As the following sections report, research of a variety of types has become a greater part of university and college labor education programs. The following sections relate the different types of research, and research credentials and skills that are current.

• FUNDED RESEARCH

Nineteen of the 42 respondents report doing funded research for the labor movement within the past three years. Payments for the 21 projects for which payment amounts were given ranged from \$1,000 to \$420,000, with the majority being for amounts in the \$5,000 to \$10,000 range. At the high end, other than the \$420,000 grant, two were for \$100,000 and three were for \$30,000. At the low end, three were for \$3,000 and one was for \$1,000. With notable exceptions, it is apparent that most university- and college-based research funded by the labor movement is for relatively small amounts. Topics included membership surveys, state federation surveys of union locals, steward surveys, evaluating privatization decisions, local union histories, corporate research, computer use and training needs, union vs. non-union apprenticeship programs, collective bargaining survey, and political election survey.

Twenty-one of the 42 do funded research for some level of government or private foundation, with amounts for the 28 projects for which payment amounts were given ranging from \$1,200 to \$1 million per year. Five exceeded \$100,000 per year, and four were below \$10,000. Nine were in the \$15,000 to \$50,000 range, while eight were for \$10,000. In general, amounts from government or foundations sources were higher than those from union sources, although the “typical” amount was still only approximately \$25,000 per year. At the top funding end, grants tended to be from U.S. government sources, such as the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, the National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences, and the Environmental Protection Agency. Private foundations (such as the Joyce Foundation) also gave some of the middle-to-larger grants, as did state agencies occasionally. Medium and smaller grants tended to come from the U.S. Department of Labor, California’s Institute for Labor Education, and a variety of local, state, and small foundation sources.

• UNFUNDED RESEARCH

A large majority of higher education labor education programs do unfunded research for the labor movement: 30 out of 42. The large majority of topics listed for this type of research were either: (a) informal and “quick turnaround” types of applied research (such as for an organizing or contract campaign, for an upcoming arbitration, a collective bargaining preparation, etc.), or (b) policy-

based research, such as living wage, minimum wage, an annual state “Labor Report,” etc. Other topics noted were legal research, survey analysis, collective bargaining trends, work restructuring trends, a particular industry, etc. It is apparent that “applied research” (which shades off into unpaid consulting) is quite extensive between university- and college-based labor education programs and local unions.

• RESEARCH CREDENTIALS (PH.D.S)

Respondents were asked how many of their full time, “hard money” professionals had a Ph.D. **Forty-four percent (96.5) of the 220 positions initially noted** (later changed to 225 in corrections to the database) **were filled by someone with a Ph.D.** Further questions regarding numbers with union experience and numbers in tenure-track positions were not answered by one program with a staff of 27, leaving us with 193 respondents. Of these 193 remaining, **58.5% (113) were filled with someone who had substantial union experience.** However, only **25% (48.5)** of the 193 positions **were filled by someone with both a Ph.D and substantial union experience.** And **34.5% percent (66.5)** of these 193 positions **were tenure-track positions.** Results are given in Table 3.15.

TABLE 3.15
Percentage of “hard money” university/college labor educators with a Ph.D.,
with extensive union experience, and with both

PERCENTAGE WITH A PH.D.	44%
PERCENTAGE WITH EXTENSIVE UNION EXPERIENCE	58.5%
PERCENTAGE WITH BOTH A PH.D. AND EXTENSIVE UNION EXPERIENCE	25%
PERCENTAGE IN A TENURE-TRACK POSITION	34.5%

These numbers again emphasize the “academization” of the profession since the 1960s, when the Rogin and Rachlin report was released. Back at that time, very few university- and college-based labor educators had Ph.D.s. However, the relatively high number of present educators with a union background (58.5%) shows that labor education programs have to some extent been able to “bridge the gap” by keeping a substantial number of “home grown” labor educators in the profession on the campus.

• ACADEMIC PUBLISHED RESEARCH

Of the 220 full-time, hard money positions initially listed by respondents, **34% (74.5) were filled by someone who publishes at least one refereed academic journal article (or its equivalent) within a two-year period**, according to respondents. This again represents a major increase in traditional academic activity from labor educators in institutions of higher learning compared to the past. It is probably a response to demands from university and college administrations for such research.

• RESEARCH DEMAND ON UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE LABOR EDUCATORS

Respondents were asked for what types of research they saw the most demand. Interestingly, all answered regarding research demand from unions, not from other sources. **By far the most mentioned topic was research to support organizing activities (11 responses)**. Although they apparently do not want to involve university- and college-based labor education programs in training and education for organizing, unions seem to be looking to these programs for related research support. **The second most cited topic was corporate research and strategic corporate campaign research (seven responses)**. However, six respondents reported that there was no demand for research from their local labor movements, and the large number of non-responses (12) may indicate that this is the most frequent experience. Other topics mentioned more than once include translating academic research into practical terms or applying research, political power strategies, sectoral issues, policy issues, safety and health, and economic development.

These results, together with the results reported above on unpaid research for the labor movement, underscore the degree to which labor education programs in institutions of higher learning are engaging in practical research/consulting on issues of importance to local unions.

• AREAS OF SPECIAL RESEARCH EXPERTISE

Just as with areas of teaching specialization, a complete listing of areas of special research expertise, program by program, can be found on the database constructed from this research project (see Appendix F). The reader is referred to this database on the worldwide web at: <http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/laborstudiesdb/>.

However, a brief sampling includes the following areas: membership attitude surveys, healthcare research, health and safety, organizational development, gain sharing, work measurement, job evaluation, union budgeting and accounting, pensions, campaign and corporate research, immigrant workers, labor history, working class studies, quantitative, participatory, economics of employee-owned companies, globalization and NAFTA, economic research, living wage movement assessment, comparative labor relations, gender and Afro-American studies, outsourcing, privatization, arbitration, diversity, collective bargaining, political mobilization, young worker issues, global labor standards, and more.

• TECHNOLOGY AND CONSULTING ISSUES

Respondents were asked to relate any special technological capability or competence that their program might have that a “normal” university- or college-based labor education program would not be expected to have. A number mentioned videoconferencing facilities/capabilities; others noted special computer labs or distance learning. Two Midwestern programs stand out due to their Internet specialties: the University of Wisconsin produces an Internet radio program, and the University of Minnesota has a daily Internet labor news service. The University of Minnesota also has an extensive video program, including documentary and issue oriented video. The University of Missouri at Kansas City/Longview Community College program produces a weekly radio program. A majority of programs had a newsletter, a web page, or both. These are all listed individually in the database referenced above.

Twenty-six of the 42 programs indicate that they do consulting for unions (or occasionally for labor-management groups) on a more than nominal basis. Again, all consulting capabilities are listed in the database individually. Consulting topics tend to be similar to the areas of special research expertise enumerated above. The one big difference seems to be more consulting in the area of labor-manage-

ment committees or programs. One program in particular—Cornell University—seems to have consultative relationships well in excess of any other program.

IV. PERCEPTIONS OF PAST AND FUTURE TRENDS

The final section of the survey asked respondents to relate the changes their program has undergone in the past ten years (and also in the past 20 years, if they felt competent to comment). It also asked them to enumerate the environmental changes underlying the trends noted, to comment on any changes in relationship with their university/college administration, and to look into the future and predict likely changes in university/college-based labor education.

• TRENDS IN THE PAST TEN YEARS

Responses on trends in the past ten years can be broken down into (a) those having to do with the amount of resources available; (b) those having to do with relations with the host university or college; (c) those having to do with the content of labor education courses; (d) those having to do with types of unions or types of students utilizing the program; or (e) other issues, including the internal functioning of the program or new initiatives undertaken. Here we will briefly summarize the responses falling under categories (a) through (d).

Regarding resources, the overwhelming change for most programs was a loss of resource support, and/or more reliance on grants (“soft money”). Eleven responses noted this as a major change in the past decade. Only two programs, both in the California system, noted the opposite. This is one more indication that the apparent stability in personnel is deceptive, because the massive growth in the California system has masked at best stagnation and at worst a decline in support outside of California.

Regarding relationships with universities, a wide variety of relationships were revealed, all the way from strong support to open hostility. However, a few labor education programs related how they had engaged in a “survival strategy”

by moving from one university/college unit to another, or had taken protective cover under some umbrella organization within the institution of higher learning, or had solidified their usefulness to some university unit by performing tasks related to but not identical to labor education. In other words, they had been required to play the “politics of the institution” to survive as one or another force closed in on them.

A second university/college trend, noted earlier in this report, was **the “academization” of the profession. This takes the form of “credentialization,” whereby universities and colleges more frequently require the Ph.D. Related to that, some are requiring more and more traditional academic research as a price for legitimacy within the institution. Finally, there is often pressure to shift resources from non-credit labor education to credit Labor Studies offerings.** This pattern is not universal because some universities still value non-credit programs and/or “extension work,” but not as many as formerly.

Regarding content of labor education programs, by far the most noted trend was a **shift from “union maintenance” types of topics (bargaining, grievance handling, etc.) to “union building” topics (rank and file involvement, membership mobilization, union growth, strategic planning, etc.).** Some also noted a shift away from joint labor-management or High Performance Work Organization (HPWO) programming in the last decade. This shift to “union building” topics is not *identical* to the shift (noted earlier) from “tool” to “non-tool” courses. For example, a class on how to mobilize the membership may have a high percentage of its content being a “how-to” training. Nevertheless, there is a connection, because many more of the “union building” topics *require* a more broadly informed and historically strategic thinking than do most of those related to bargaining-related training and education. Thus the shift to “union building” topics has stimulated some of the shift from “tool” to “non-tool” course offerings.

Regarding changes in the types of unions or types of students utilizing the programs, several noted that the decline of industrial unions—traditional users of the programs—had hurt, and that in some cases the more prominent service and governmental unions had not made up the difference. (These responses tended to come from areas of the country where major traditional industrial manufacturing unions like the UAW or the USWA had been in steep decline, and no comparable surge had occurred in any other type of union.) A second change noted by some was a large increase in the number of immigrant workers in classes, especially of Spanish-speaking immigrants.

A number of other responses related changes in the way the labor program functioned internally, how its personnel had changed, what new initiatives had been undertaken recently, and the like. Since none of these represent broader changes in the profession, these individual responses will not be reported here.

• REASONS FOR CHANGES IN THE PAST DECADE

By far the most frequent reason given for many of the more negative or worrisome changes enumerated above was the obvious one: the decline of the labor movement. Those programs located in areas of traditional strength for manufacturing industrial unions noted this decline as especially painful.

A second frequently mentioned underlying cause of the changes noted was the **unfavorable political changes that have swept the country from the 1980s to the present.** The political spectrum has shifted far to the right, making unions and union-oriented entities targets for unfavorable political measures. The same political trend has resulted in a much broader attack on “all things public.” Public institutions, including public institutions of higher education, have received increasingly less support. Private institutions, and the private market, are supposed to fulfill all needs, or nearly all needs, according to the ascendant ideology. Government has been derided as part of the problem, not part of the solution to the populace’s problems. This change in the “political climate” within which corporations operate has furthered their drive to deunionize themselves and to ideologically reorient the nation’s public policies toward upward redistribution of wealth and deregulation of business operations. The same ideology is used to justify the “corporatization” of the universities, which are now expected to operate more like private businesses and to justify themselves solely or almost solely on the basis of their service to corporate interests. None of these changes are positive for university- and college-based labor education, and they received widespread notice in the responses to the survey.

Another factor mentioned by some is the globalization of the U.S. economy. This has been partially responsible for the decline of manufacturing unions as unionized jobs are exported abroad. It has also been related, in complex ways, to the changing demographics of the U.S. workforce, as immigrants become a larger part of the workforce who are potential union members.

Finally, changes within the labor movement itself were noted to cause some of the changes observed. The New Voice movement that resulted in new leadership of the AFL-CIO in 1995 was noted as responsible at least in part for the new turn toward “union building” education rather than simple “union maintenance.” These changes in union priorities, and strategies for survival in tough times, were seen to be responsible for a number of the changes in labor education course content areas.

- **LIKELY TRENDS IN THE FUTURE**

Many respondents were not optimistic about the future of university- and college-based labor education programs. A few examples of written responses illustrate this viewpoint. One wrote:

I am not optimistic about the future. So much of it is out of our control. The continued decline in the labor movement will result in declining demand for our services. Add to the decline in enrollments, the decline in union political clout. Most labor centers are as much political creatures as anything else. Without a strong external constituency demanding service from the state and university, labor centers will be forced to look for friends elsewhere to survive. Without such pressure, cash starved university officials will not be able to resist the temptation to shift these funds elsewhere. No University that I know of has become a world leader on the basis of having a world class labor center . . . I hate to say this, but I fear that very few centers will survive to the year 2010—I hope I am wrong.

Another wrote, “Unless the labor movement becomes stronger (achieves greater density) I fear labor education programs are in danger of being severely cut or abolished.” A third wrote:

If union membership continues to decline as a % of workforce, I think we will either disappear or change focus. I see more pressure from state budget crisis, more pressure for credentials, credit courses coming from universities. You would think that with demise of AFL-CIO Education Dept. and stress on unions

that they would be sending people to us and promoting us but I don't see it.

Another wrote:

I am very concerned about the long-term viability of our field. With the crisis in state funding, the growing conservatism at university and labor's continued decline I am deeply worried. The disestablishment of the National [AFL-CIO] Education Department, and the lack of commitment by most national unions to organizing is equally troubling.

All views were not "gloom and doom," however. **Some linked the future of university- and college-based labor education programs to the future fate of the labor movement.** *If* the labor movement continues to decline, so will labor education, these respondents say. But if the labor movement can be turned around, so will our fortunes. An example from one respondent:

Labor education's future is tied directly to the labor movement's future. If labor's organizing efforts fail, labor education programs will be scaled-back, eliminated or forced to become something else (such as worker/immigrant rights centers, human resources and labor-management consulting programs, or job skill programs). On the other hand if the movement is revitalized, there is a potential for growth especially in relation to the labor movement's efforts to reach immigrant workers, promote international labor/worker solidarity, challenge corporate power, foster new political alliances . . .

Some took a less sweeping view and focused on the pragmatic relationships seen "on the ground." For example, one respondent wrote:

We have never ventured far from our original mission—non-credit bread & butter topics—and that has served us well. We've added many other topics as the times demanded, but folks still rely on us for the fundamentals. It will get harder and harder for programs to justify staff, however, as numbers of students drop.

Another wrote, “Our program will be enhanced should public sector collective bargaining become a reality in [name of state].”

A couple of respondents felt that the need for the Ph.D. credential was slowly killing labor education. For example, one wrote, “I believe that Universities are killing the efficacy of Labor Education programs by requiring Ph.D. tenurability and making experience in the movement unimportant.” Another wrote, “Another problem is the lack of new talent with significant trade union experience. Many of the new people are lefties or academics who lack much in the way of trade union experience. This is only likely to further separate labor educators from their key constituencies.”

One respondent saw the future of labor education as a function of whether both university-based labor educators and labor leaders will change present practices and attitudes:

Labor education is a critical component of the labor movement’s agenda. Without labor education, we will not have the capacity to envision a better future, nor the skills to strategize and mobilize to get us there.

The challenge is to reverse a disappointing trend in the labor movement: one that views labor education as marginal to the main agenda. Part of the fault for this lies with labor educators ourselves, who for all of our commitment to the labor movement have not been able to articulate our vision and relevance. The other part of the fault lies with the college-educated elite who have come to positions of prominence in the labor movement—who believe that they can run the labor movement themselves, without educated rank and file interference. . . If the labor movement doesn’t value labor education, it’s difficult to imagine that universities will.

• HOW TO POSITION LABOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR THE FUTURE

As a follow-up to the written survey, 13 of the 42 respondents were interviewed, either by telephone or in person at the spring 2003 meeting of the United Association for Labor Education (UALE), the national labor educator's association. In choosing which respondents to sample, an attempt was made to include both large and small, east and west, midwest and south, and both exclusively or primarily non-credit and exclusively or primarily credit. In short, a somewhat representative sample. However, it is not claimed that this sample is entirely representative of the directors of all programs; indeed, those interviewed at the UALE conference (five of the 13) were largely a "sample of convenience" of individuals with whom the author was able to schedule an interview.²

² Interviews were with survey respondents from the following institutions: University of Alabama, University of Arkansas, University of California at Los Angeles, Cornell University, University of Iowa, University of Kentucky, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, University of Missouri, University of Missouri-Kansas City/Longview Community College, University of Nebraska, University of Oregon, Rutgers University, and Youngstown State University.

Despite the fact that it is not random, the sample of interviewees is a large proportion of university- and college-based labor education directors (almost one third of the total), and it is notable that they spoke to a large number of common concerns. At the very least, their thoughts represent a good part of how labor education center directors view this field.

The interviews centered on perceptions of recent past and likely future trends, analysis of those trends, and views of how university- and college-based labor education programs should position themselves for the future. Regarding past trends, the interviews revealed similar results to those obtained in the written surveys. The most important and revealing information came from the various interviewees' views on *what to do to prepare for the future*.

Seven themes concerning future orientation emerged from these interviews. Two were related to how programs should position themselves within universities and colleges; two related to the specific types of education and relationships that higher education labor centers should undertake with U.S. unions; and three related to the degree to which programs should retain their (almost) exclusive focus on unions and education for union members.

THEME #1

The first theme has to do with internal relationships within the university or college. **Virtually all the directors noted the importance of developing strong and**

positive relationships with their host institutions. One director noted that his center had done a great deal of public policy research for the state on labor issues, and that the university found this to be a major benefit to its public profile:

I think the quality of some of the research and public policy things we have done. . . shows that we are a “value-adding-thing”. . . We are part of the public mission of the university. I think there is some recognition within the university that the labor movement helps the university.

One director noted that labor education is best justified as a “public service,” and that this works better when a university or college identifies its own mission more in terms of public service:

I do think that it has to do with what type of university you are. We are a metropolitan university, therefore the public service mission is . . . elevated over a traditional university that is more secluded. Public service is more built in. So I do think that that makes a difference.

A second way that centers have bolstered their relationships with the university or college is through developing ties with individual faculty in “academic” units and/or playing important roles in helping them accomplish their mission. One director gives examples:

We have made real deliberate attempts in the last ten or so years to strengthen our connection, very deliberately strengthen our connection to the school of business. Through offering to teach more courses for them or giving them something that they don’t have. We are also pretty religious about making sure that we are on the committee meetings, we serve on all the school’s committees. We are getting pretty good about going to all the social events that we can, so that people know who we are and we are now asking several of their faculty to teach at various conferences.

Another director noted his center’s growing formal ties with a campus Center for Human Rights, and to the university’s College of Public Health. He adds:

We felt it important to sort of strengthen our internal relationships because when people are fighting for money within an organization, we felt like we needed to have some friends that we could call upon on the academic side of the university.

And finally, one director argues for aggressively building alliances within institutions of higher learning, rather than attempting to conform to “mainstream” academic standards:

If our main activity is to try to look like the rest of the university and develop academic research and teaching programs that are embraced by the academy, we inevitably will lose the worker education/participatory research/social change agenda that makes us unique. We need to aggressively partner with allies among faculty, staff, and students, and build on the strengths and relationships that only labor centers have within the university.

Most of the above “survival strategies” are not controversial. Both survey responses and interviews showed that this type of “maneuvering” within the institution of higher learning is widespread and nearly universally understood as important.

THEME #2

A second theme is somewhat more controversial. A number of labor education centers go after “soft money” grants as a way to obtain more funding, and as a further “legitimizing” cover for labor education. One director explains that without such grants, legitimacy would be a hard thing to obtain: “We would have a more difficult time being accepted by the university. . . We’ve gotten some recognition for some of the programs that we have done with the workplace skills.” This director argues that the soft money grant work has not detracted from the basic labor education functions of her center, but on the contrary provides legitimacy and support so that labor education can be done.

Another director has a more ambivalent, but still positive, view of the grants his programs receives:

It's nice to have these grant people because it gives sort of a sense of vitality and growth to the university community if not also the labor community. . . We view these grants as special, an addition to, but not part of our base program. And we've got commitments from the university that we'll be able to maintain our four labor educator lines.

A third director feels that soft money grants have become essential for his program, but is concerned that it not slowly undermine the core mission of labor education:

On the one hand you have to diversify or not be completely relying on public sources, but my feeling is. . . we need some sort of agreed standards in terms of types of funding you're going to seek, what types of work you will or won't do. . . [In our program] generally a consensus has been built on what we need to do in order to protect the basic mission.

Reflecting criticisms of this trend, yet another director argues that it is a "slippery slope" that can be hard or impossible to reverse:

I have been arguing constantly that the ratio between hard money and other sources of income that funds our program is a commitment of our university to the labor movement. And any change of that ratio I see as a significant cut. I have *carte blanche*, if you will, to expand my program any time I go out to generate the revenue to do it. But I'd rather stay small and keep the proportional commitment of the university to labor studies than dilute it while the program grows into unrelated areas. I do see it as a survival strategy: unless forced into that survival mode, I think that is the only way I would ever even consider such a strategy.

While nobody is taking an absolutist position on the issue of soft money funding, it is apparent that there are differences of opinion, and that this is an important issue for university- and college-based labor educators to consider and debate.

THEME #3

Some respondents argued that university- and college-based labor education programs are in danger of stagnating and becoming irrelevant if they remain at the level of “traditional” labor education courses on topics like steward training, collective bargaining, and the like. They believe the unique role for higher education labor education programs—to use business jargon, where they “add the most value”—is to help unions grapple with higher-level, strategic topics.

One director puts this argument this way:

I am very concerned about the idea that we should stay with the bread and butter stuff. And I’ll tell you why. I think that’s a fairly short term strategy. . . Not that we should forget that function, but I think that in the long run we are not going to survive if we simply stay at that level. . . I think we have to sell labor education. I think we have to sell it these days indirectly. We have to sell it partly through our academic credentials, and also the ability to be more than simply steward trainers . . . with our capacity for education, with our capacity to do research, with our capacity to do other kinds of technical assistance, and so on.

This director argued that “credentialization” was not a bad thing, if the credential allowed labor educators to “interact with the labor movement in a different, more complex way.” The struggle against “academization” was “to make sure that the worker’s education agenda doesn’t get subjugated to the more academic one,” and that research (and consulting) went directly into helping the labor movement with strategic problems, rather than academically defined ones.

Another director, while much more critical of the “credentialization” process, agreed that university- and college-based labor education centers needed to “move up the food chain” from traditional service training to more strategic types of education:

If you look at what we are doing today, there is still some of that traditional union service, labor education service type of work. But there is an awful lot more emphasis on strategy, on working with unions on strategic planning, on working with unions on their priorities.

This director is critical of the “bread and butter” view of labor education:

I believe that if we lock ourselves into traditional union activity, then. . . especially if we are dealing in low-density areas, I think that it makes it very likely that university-based labor education programs will disappear. Because the labor movement will disappear. . . I sympathize with the reality that, “this is what they want; this is the way we’ve done it; this is what we’re good at.” But in low-density states the labor movement is in very serious trouble. And going down with the ship is not an attractive option. So, I know that it’s a little easier for me to say, because we are in a high-density state and there’s a big staff and this allows you a lot more flexibility. And also, in some of those low density states, it’s politically dangerous, not with the labor movement, but with the state university to be too aggressive on some of these things. . . And I know a lot of these centers were established to do traditional labor education. And so, what I am suggesting is not easy for some people to swallow. But I believe that it’s in the best interest of labor education to find ways to be creative. You may not be able to do some of the things folks can do in high-density states, but you can still do more than traditional stewards training.

A third director who shares this view states:

I still maintain that in any city or state, we need to do a thorough power analysis and evaluate where we can make the biggest breakthrough. In some areas, this may mean cultivating the next generation of leaders in key unions, or working with specific campaigns or projects that embrace a social change agenda (sweatshops, immigrant rights, globalization, workers of color, etc.), or working with student activists who could have a positive impact on labor and community struggles.

Labor Centers need to maintain good relations with CLC’s [central labor councils] and State Fed’s [state federations of labor], but again, if that is our main work, we are only perpetuating the status quo. And the status quo isn’t working—especially in states with low union density.

Those holding this view argue that higher education labor education centers need to engage with union leadership in education designed to increase strategic thinking, strategic planning, and organizational change and transformation activities. The rationale for this view is that this is the area where such labor centers can make the most difference, and it is also where the labor movement needs the most help.

THEME #4

Directly opposed to the arguments just made, other directors argue that the only salvation for university- and college-based labor education centers is by staying very close to the demand expressed by the labor movement, and that demand is still very much oriented toward “traditional” topics. Therefore, programs would do best to stay with the “bread and butter” topics as the foundation. One director states:

I keep going back to our core mission. I think some centers have gotten away from that. They got into sexier, more exciting, kind of topical stuff and maybe pulled away from those basic steward training and bargaining classes and labor law classes. I think what has happened with some of them is the labor movement doesn't go to those centers anymore. . . . No matter how many unions are left in ten years, the people who are still running these unions are going to need to know how to negotiate contracts and administer them. They are still going to need to know labor law; they're still going to need to know health and safety, and my sense is that there are fewer and fewer labor centers that could provide those absolutely basic skills for unions. Those that can't might be folded into sociology departments, or history departments, or other kinds of programs that can take a more abstract look, or more theoretical look. . . . I don't know how unions can think that they can use those folks.

Another director, from a relatively low union density state, argues that her particular program generally must stick with the “bread and butter” form of programming:

I think there's no "one size fits all". . . If you have high union density, therefore you have union structures in place that can provide education. You have large locals that will have their own education director. And therefore the universities have "the luxury" of being able to do research, and if you are looking at states with lower union density, you have all you can do to go out doing steward training, collective bargaining, and arbitration classes because there is no other source for these folks to get education. . . I really do think that perspectives are necessarily colored by what the labor movement looks like where you are, and that whole business of union density. I mean, I just observed for years and years that the folks from the areas that have a lot more union density deal with unions, they deal with the labor movement in a different way than we do. And at a different level than we do, and I am not sure that we can have, in that sense, a really unified vision because the needs of the labor movement are different in different parts of the country.

There are at least differences in emphasis in the positions quoted above, and in fact there are probably some pretty basic differences in vision in some cases. This debate is an absolutely fundamental one for the future direction of university- and college-based labor education centers. Would they do best by making a major transition to more "strategic" types of education and relationships with the labor movement, or would they do best by primarily concentrating on the "bread and butter" of traditional labor education topics? Those in the profession are far from unanimous on this issue.

THEME #5

A number of respondents to the survey, as well as the subset of interviewees, argued that university- and college-based labor education centers need to develop extremely close ties with those sections of the labor movement with which they interact. Many already do this, of course. But the emphasis on close and supportive ties with state labor federations, central labor councils, and local unions was a very strong refrain in the responses and interviews. Such views were not unanimous, but they were overwhelmingly present.

Beyond this simple close identification with organized labor, many argued that higher education labor education centers need to play a role in the revitalization of organized labor. As the arguments in Themes #3 and #4 above indicate, how to do so is contested. But a major theme running through the thinking of labor center directors is the argument, “As the labor movement goes, so go we. If the labor movement needs to be revitalized in order to grow and be relevant, it is our duty to do whatever is in our power to help accomplish that.”

THEME #6

Despite the near-hegemony of the perspective related in Theme #5, some programs are also exploring options of doing new types of education that fall outside of strictly-defined traditional union oriented labor education. As one director noted, some types of non-union education for workers may fall outside the modern view of “labor education,” but it would fit within an older view of “worker education.” And some are considering non-union programming of this nature. The close to 87% of the U.S. working class that is not in unions must somehow be considered and reached, these directors are saying.

One director notes that the state labor commissioner in his state is elected, and is currently a very pro-labor individual who is “interested in the idea of doing workers’ rights education for non-union workers.” A major problem would be getting access to those kinds of workers, but this particular center is considering the possibilities.

Another director who had flirted with a couple of ideas (such as a “human rights center”) to keep the program afloat as the labor movement continued to decline was worried that any attempts to experiment or innovate might provoke backlash:

I think that it is particularly important at this juncture that we experiment, with as many new approaches as we possibly can, and that we have some mechanism for sharing those experiments and the results among ourselves. . . Let’s be honest. That’s going to rankle feathers in our union brothers and sisters. To the extent that some of those experiments may reach out to non-union workers, for example, you know that may have some backlashes associated with this. Or to the extent that we have workshops on

how you get funding for certain kinds of things to help our program survive, that may not have a large union component to that. But that we think serves working people more generally. There is some risk associated with that.

Another director believes that the most likely way labor (or worker) education will extend beyond its usual recent boundaries is through expanding the definition of the types of organizations served, or even broadening the definition of “union.” He argues:

We have to reach beyond the unions that have been the traditional consumers of our products. And in some states all that means is doing something with the building trades, or doing something with the public sector. . . reach out to more unions. But in other places it’s going to be doing more work with the National Education Association. . . or the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers . . . in the process of trying to figure out how they can develop portable pensions for engineers. . . We might be working more with organizations like that. We are not doing that because we are rejecting our traditional base. It’s because our base is shrinking.

Another respondent mentioned working with immigrant rights organizations, or employee network groups (which often include managers). She noted that nervousness has always been about “abandonment of the traditional labor movement,” but stated, “We don’t look at it that way. I think increasingly the labor movement will not look at it that way because they also are opening minds and doors.”

This sample indicates some of the ways labor education centers are toying with expansion of their traditional constituency, which has often been considered solely unionized workers. It appears that few are thinking of any type of substitution or abandonment of unions and their members, only supplementation.

THEME #7

Closely related to the previous theme, one perspective proposed was that labor centers consider the newly emerging “Working Class Studies” field. This

relatively new field has seen the recent growth of working class studies programs or centers at the State University of New York at Stonybrook, Youngstown State University, the University of Illinois, the University of Minnesota, and elsewhere. As a field, working class studies examines the intersection of class, race, and gender. It also looks at all aspects of working class lives, including cultural and artistic aspects.

The argument in favor of working class studies is that it will increase internal university support from both academics and other gender/ethnic/racial constituencies. It is also argued that labor educators exploring this direction can ensure greater longevity for their programs by not tying their future entirely to the fate of unions as they now exist in the U.S. Those favoring this perspective argue that greater critical distance from the existing labor movement is necessary if a genuine revitalization of labor is to occur. Working class studies allows that in a way which traditional labor education frequently does not.

The reaction of many directors to the idea of working class studies was that it was a welcome academic discipline, but that it should only be seen as a complement to, or a related field to—not a substitute for—traditional labor education. Those holding this view would staunchly oppose any attempt to transition any resources or personnel from union-oriented labor education to working class studies. While generally sympathetic to working class studies, these directors stated that organized labor had to be the center of focus for university- and college-based labor education. Loyalty from these directors to the existing labor movement was too strong to consider a new, more diffuse focus on working class life as something to seriously consider as an alternative.

From the above summary of issues arising from interviews with labor center directors, it is clear that many controversial issues confront university- and college-based labor education programs. Perhaps the discussion will initiate a debate over the future direction that university- and college-based labor education programs should take.

PART 4: CONCLUSION

Our report carries the ambitious title, *The State of Labor Education in the U.S.* It is not entirely comprehensive: we have little information about the extensive educational activity initiated and conducted at the regional and local union level, by non-affiliates, nor within state and local AFL-CIO bodies and labor-friendly community organizations. Nevertheless, our findings do reflect the state of a large proportion of labor education taking place today.

What, then, *is* the current “state of labor education”? As explained in the introduction, in one sense it is healthy. Compared to the data presented by Rogin and Rachlin from the 1965-66 period, labor education today is more extensive. This is true in terms of the number of unions with education programs, the number of university and college labor education programs, the number of labor education staff, and the number of unionists taking advantage of all this programming.

Furthermore, the content of labor education, both within unions and within university/college programs, has become more sophisticated, encompassing both the traditional contract negotiations and administration subjects, and the newer “union building” and union management subjects. More demanding times have led to greater complexity in programming content.

Finally, the trust between university and union programs appears to have grown, so that today many more examples exist of cooperation and sharing of resources. Such trust is, of course, far from universal, but it is certainly more widespread than was the case in the 1960s.

The larger context of labor education, however, is vastly different from that reported by Rogin and Rachlin. For one thing, the size of the labor movement when they conducted their research was 16.9 million members, or 33.5% of the workforce. The labor movement was still growing, at least in absolute numbers, and declines in unionized blue-collar jobs were masked for the time being by the

upsurge of organizing in the public sector. Though labor education was limited in scope, its activities were increasing—unions were slowly adding education departments, and more university and college programs were emerging.

The situation today is dramatically changed. The number of organized workers has been declining steadily since the late 1970s, and stands in 2002 at 16.1 million workers, or 13.2% of the workforce. Some believe that the labor movement has fallen so low that it has become largely irrelevant to the future of American workers. Others are not so sweeping in their judgments, but do believe that the labor movement may fall below a “critical mass” in the not-so-distant future. What does this acknowledged crisis imply for the seemingly “healthy” state of labor education?

We believe it has led, on the one hand, to the marshalling of educational efforts to stem the tide of union decline. National union education staff as well as university and college labor educators, in many respects, do more with less, and do it with a greater spirit of cooperation. If labor education is still a relatively low priority in unions and universities, most labor leaders do accord it some value. Certainly the status of labor education today is higher than it was in the 1960s, when “learning by doing” was the accepted philosophy of most union officials. Unfortunately, at the same time, our surveys reveal that within national unions to some extent, but especially within university/college programs, serious concerns exist over the institutional survival of labor education.

In short, we find that labor education has entered a new era characterized by a recently won legitimacy and a temporarily healthy level of activity and innovation taking place in a time of crisis. We can characterize this period, which stems from the early- to mid-1990s, as one of “labor education to stem union crisis.” It is an era of instability and change, and the future direction of labor education is uncertain. Below we summarize our findings and conclude with questions for further research and discussion.

I. THE EXPANSION OF LABOR EDUCATION

Our findings, approximate though they are, make an interesting rough comparison with those of Rogin and Rachlin.³ They reported an annual average of 26,489 union members and 3,166 staff in the 2-year period 1965-66. Unfortunately, they were unable to get figures from two large unions, the UA (Plumbers and Pipefitters) and the Steelworkers, as well as a few others (57). They also reported 34,790 participants in university education classes.

Our survey found, by comparison, approximately 115,500 union members and 6,400 staff reached by national union education programs (with three not reporting), and 57,884 by college and university labor education programs (with two not reporting).

Rogin and Rachlin reported 86 full- and part-time education staff in 34 national union headquarters (64). Our survey found 120 full- and part-time education staff in 36 national union headquarters. They found 93 full- and part-time staff in regular positions in 27 university labor education centers (122-156); we found 225 on hard money in 42 centers.

Clearly, though the comparisons are not exact, the differences are significant. There is much more labor education going on today, in spite of the fact that there are fewer union members.

³ Their report as well as ours is limited in its ability to compare union and university programs, given the wide variety of ways in which education is described and quantified, as well as in how much record-keeping is conducted.

II. THE CONTENT OF LABOR EDUCATION

The content of labor education has broadened, along with its activity level. We have found that, as a group, today's labor educators have expanded their offerings to include a much wider range of topics, while still delivering the "nuts and bolts" of contract administration and negotiations, basic leadership skills, labor law, and labor history. Some of the new areas reflect changes in workforce demographics: diversity classes, workers rights classes for non-union workers and vocational ESL, for example. Some reflect the need for more sophisticated leadership in the labor movement: strategic planning, time management, and

organizational development issues. And, significantly, much of the new work concerns the need to organize both externally and internally—to build the union among current members as well as to organize new members. These last topics lead unions to contemplate the most difficult subject of all: how to change internally so that they are capable of undertaking the new organizing and internal development tasks. A small number of labor education programs address this thorniest of all topics.

These changes are reflected in both union and university programs. The extent to which these curricular changes exist in particular unions and particular university/college programs varies greatly—some remain primarily oriented toward the more traditional subjects of labor law, negotiations, grievance handling and arbitration. But most do some “union building” education, and many do a great deal of this kind of work.

The data in Part 2 demonstrate that national union education departments still deliver training in the nuts and bolts of contract administration and negotiations. As a whole, however, they are offering a similar proportion of classes in the area of “union-building.” There is growing concern with leadership and advanced leadership topics, and there are large increases in the development of programs for union staff. Union education directors and staff are clearly moving to respond to the need to strengthen local union organizations by increasing the sophistication of elected leadership and staff. The amount of training in the area of external organizing remains relatively small, in large part because this training is seen as the prerogative of union organizing departments.

As Part 3 indicates, there is some disagreement about the need for all university programs to adapt their offerings to “help unions grapple with higher-level, strategic topics” and assist them in changing to organize. A strong argument is made by university labor educators in some states that it is crucial for university and college programs to offer *not* what they believe will save the labor movement, but what unions in their respective states legitimately need and want. Others argue just as strongly that this is a recipe for irrelevance. Because there are over 40 university- and college-based labor education centers in the country, each of which maintains its own relationships and connections with local and state labor movements, substantial variation between programs on this question will probably continue into the future.

On the university and college side, the growth of credit-based programs is significant. College credit labor studies programs have expanded, and roughly half of university- and college-based labor education programs now have credit programs. Add to this the hundreds of union members who have earned degrees from the George Meany Center–National Labor College, and it is apparent that Labor Studies credit programs and degrees have at least some role in the latest version of labor education.

In addition, university and college labor education programs are doing more research than was the case in the 1960s or 1970s. The research takes many forms, but the bulk of it appears less “academic” than pragmatic and action-oriented. Both the funded and unfunded research usually has a practical value, either to public policy makers or to the labor movement and/or pro-worker activists. This, too, is a type of “content” that has grown significantly in the last two decades of the twentieth century, especially in the 1990s. Closely tied to the growing research, some university- and college-based labor education programs engage in various types of support activities for pro-worker policy development and dissemination. Again, this is relatively new.

Finally, and closely related to research and policy work, a number of centers engage in consulting of at least a minimal nature. We were surprised to discover how much consulting is occurring, if self-reports are to be believed.

III. LEGITIMACY, STATUS AND TRUST ISSUES

We do not wish to overstate our contention that labor education has a greater legitimacy in the labor movement now than in the past, but we find some evidence to support this claim. The following points summarize the separate findings in Parts 2 and 3.

The sheer numbers argue that labor education is perceived more positively today. Though not all unions have education departments, as we have seen, more do today than at time of Rogin and Rachlin’s study. Further, these unions represent 90% of union members in the AFL-CIO. The same growth is evident on the university/college side. Because labor education is highly dependent on demand

for services by union leaders and members, growth is one indicator of increased acceptance.

A much higher number of union members today take labor education classes. Though these figures are, as we have stressed, approximate, they still represent a higher proportion of organized workers involved in classroom work. Because in most cases labor education is a voluntary activity, we can surmise that a higher proportion of union members find value in the activity to the extent that they are willing to take time from jobs and personal lives to pursue it.

On the other hand, the status of labor education, both within unions and within higher education, is arguably still problematic. In higher education, in particular, the marginality of labor education remains an issue. Similarly, though most union education staff report greater acceptance by the leadership of their respective unions, none argue that education takes priority over any of the core union functions of organizing, bargaining, and otherwise representing the members. It is true that within unions, the education function is better integrated than in the past. As pointed out in Part 2, most union education staff work cooperatively with staff in other departments, jointly designing training as well as sharing teaching opportunities and materials. Some university and college programs have also found methods of strengthening their positions within their institutions.

The trust issue is of great interest to us, and we find it reflected in the strong and growing relationships between union education departments and university/college labor education centers. In this new, unstable era, it is heartening to observe the increased willingness of union education staff to work with university and college labor educators. Twenty-eight of the 42 university and college programs in Part 3 report having done programs for national unions within the past three years. And as pointed out in Part 2, 19 of the 36 responding union educators are working actively with the George Meany Center-National Labor College, and 15 are working with other university and college programs. (This latter figure is impressive, since most university and college programs relate primarily to unions in their own states, not to national level organizations.) True, some union education departments continue to steer clear of work with university/college programs. As outlined in Part 2, it is still felt by a few that university labor educators “don’t understand our members” or “can’t relate to our industry.” On the other hand, few cite specific problems with their higher education counterparts. More common is a lack of knowledge about university/college offerings, and a shortage of time to investigate them.

The United Association for Labor Education (UALE) is playing a role in bringing union and higher education staff together. UALE is a merger of the older University and College Labor Education Association with the independent labor educators organization Workers Education Local 189 in 2001, reflecting a desire to better integrate union and higher education labor education activities. Significantly, only 11 of the unions that responded to the survey do *not* participate in UALE conferences, while 21 do, and three more intend to in the near future.

The degree of integration of university labor education with the work of local and regional union organizations, local and state labor councils, as well as national unions is a sign of increased trust. The roots of this change are analyzed in the following section.

IV. THE BACKGROUND TO THE PRESENT RELATIONSHIP

As noted earlier, union leaders historically had a rather strong mistrust of labor education. In the “social reconstruction” period of labor education that emerged prior to the 1930s, most of the activity was conducted by independent labor colleges and centers, and only a handful of unions. Most of these programs were viewed with suspicion by AFL leadership, but they trained labor intellectuals and leaders who would take active roles in organizing the CIO in the 1930s. The programs that grew up following World War II had a more practical bent and were better accepted by labor. As we have mentioned, state and land-grant universities established labor education programs and a number of national unions added education departments during this period and into the 1960s. Still, as reported by Rogin and Rachlin, most union leaders remained suspicious of labor education and universities in general.

During the 1960s, as Rogin and Rachlin also point out, the AFL-CIO education department’s role was beginning to change. For years its function had been “to promote educational activity among its affiliates in national unions and central bodies that had no programs; to urge those affiliates with programs to expand them; to coordinate the educational activity of the affiliates to the extent they desired and accepted coordination, and to assist the affiliates to the extent desired...” (72). In the late 1960s, a new pattern began to emerge, with new

programs designed by the education department for young workers and a new focus on staff training. This latter focus would eventually lead to the creation of the George Meany Center for Labor Studies (73).

During the 1970s and 1980s, more changes occurred. Labor education grew at the university and college level, especially in the area of credit labor studies, and degrees for unionists. The change was welcomed by many union staff members, who aspired to credentials that would acknowledge the value of their work and life experiences. The 1980s was a time of growing legitimacy for university and college labor education. Some programs disappeared and some new ones emerged, but most stabilized during this period. Their stability rested on improving relationships with organized labor in their particular regions as well as adjustments they made to maintain their status in the academy. Working relationships between some unions and some university labor educators were developed with increasing confidence, and labor education became a more accepted element of union life and culture.

Other trends in the 1980s reflect a search for new directions. University and college labor educators sought grant funding to supplement tight budgets. Safety and health funding led to the burgeoning of that field of study in labor centers and accounted in part for the growth in the number of labor education staff. A relatively short-lived (in most institutions) attention to labor-management cooperation also translated into funding and new training topics. And some labor centers explored (and continue to work on) grant-funded projects in the area of workforce development or other public policy concerns.

The continued decline of the labor movement in numbers and influence may have made union leaders more open to new ideas for change, and hence more open to suggestions that were “outside the box” of traditional thinking. At the same time, a generational change in union leaders at the local and regional level made for more openness to ideas propagated by labor educators. Thus the late 1980s and early 1990s were a time of fermentation within the labor movement. The decline was looking more and more like a crisis, and unions were looking for new approaches to stem it.

Thus, this period saw a number of changes and innovations. First, a few national unions created and supported the Organizing Institute (OI), a training program for potential organizers. The AFL-CIO, organized labor’s peak organization, created new committees such as the Strategic Approaches Committee and the

Evolution of Work Committee. Numerous other changes both before and after a 1995 changeover in AFL-CIO leadership indicate that this was a time of searching for new approaches.

Among other changes, the new leadership of the AFL-CIO put a renewed emphasis on labor education. Furthermore, the style and type of educational practice pursued internally became less service oriented and more oriented toward the highest priority items of the new agenda. Thus, the new AFL-CIO education department produced and helped disseminate educational programs such as Common Sense Economics, MEMO, and other materials promoting the understanding necessary to carry forward the new program centered on organizing and political power. Survey responses reported in Part 2 indicated a strong appreciation for the role of the AFL-CIO education department in bringing education directors together to share ideas and concerns, and in serving as a national clearinghouse for labor education materials and instructors. There was also widespread enthusiasm for new curricula (like Common Sense Economics), produced by the AFL-CIO education department for use by all affiliates.

However, continued decline may have led to a faltering in the commitment to a larger role for labor education. As noted earlier, in February 2002 the AFL-CIO abolished its education department. The federation is now rethinking its union education role through its Committee on Trade Union Membership Education and Training.

That committee reported to the February 2003 AFL-CIO Executive Council meeting in a brief two-page document, "AFL-CIO Union Education Strategy for the 21st Century." That document reaffirms the importance of labor education in general terms. Three conclusions are given:

- Labor education is important to re-building and growing the labor movement.
- Labor education is more than training and skill building and must have a "move to action" component.
- The labor movement, through the Federation, should play a leadership role in terms of labor education, including working with colleges and universities in delivering programs.

How these priorities will work out in practice is not entirely clear, but it is clear that the federation wishes the George Meany Center-National Labor College to take on many of the functions previously undertaken by its education department. Thus, the George Meany Center is asked to coordinate communication among labor educators, and to develop and maintain a clearinghouse of educational materials in an electronic format. If this is to be accomplished, the Meany Center will require additional resources. Otherwise, we may see a diminution of federation leadership in the educational arena.

For the university- and college-based labor education programs, the document cited above contains encouraging language. It calls for the support of such programs by:

- Promoting university research in support of organizing and political action;
- Co-sponsoring an annual joint education conference (the UALE conference, which is held annually and rotates from East to Midwest to West);
- Encouraging the active participation of state and local union leadership on labor center advisory boards;
- Promoting increased public funding for union-side research and education; and
- Utilizing the resources of university- and college-based labor education programs to address emerging issues and needs.

From this evidence, it is not clear how central the federation intends to make labor education to its plans for future strategic direction. It is clear that education is less central in priorities than other areas of operation, which were not cut, or were not cut as severely, as was education in the AFL-CIO budget. But education might well have an enhanced role compared to the decades of the 1960s or 1970s, as evidenced by the report cited above.

V. QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER EXPLORATION

Further research is needed into the “state of labor education” in areas we were unable to explore fully in this study. We see four areas deserving further research.

First, we need to know more about labor education carried out under the auspices of state labor federations, local central labor councils, and district/regional structures of unions. We ignored these levels of labor education for the most part because of time and resource limitations, but it is our impression from even the small sampling of regional responses we received that a fair amount of labor education occurs here. With a fuller understanding of these levels of programming, a more complete and integrated picture would be possible.

Second are issues of pedagogy. A few survey respondents mentioned pedagogy, but it was not the focus of our research. And the number of “pedagogy” comments given to us was too few to draw any conclusions. Particularly of interest is an emphasis on “popular education” techniques by some university programs and some union education staff. How does popular education relate to the “adult education” techniques traditionally used by labor educators? Are there any trends in the use of different educational techniques? Which pedagogy is most effective, and for what topics?

Third, given the high priority that AFL-CIO puts on organizing the unorganized, we are curious to know more about the types of education and training being done on this topic. Is much formal training, beyond short “how to” sessions, being provided? If so, by whom? (Our survey and interview results indicate that labor educators at the university level, and even those within union education departments to a certain extent, are playing a rather minor role.) What is the quality of the organizing training that does exist—how “user-friendly” are the materials, and how interactive the classroom sessions? Is it possible that professional labor educators might have something of value to offer? Finally, which types of organizing topics best lend themselves to structured educational programs, and which are best learned “in the field” without formal training? We know little about these topics; yet we believe that answers to these questions are needed, given the importance accorded organizing in the top ranks of organized labor.

Fourth, how integrated is labor education into union strategic priorities? In our view, virtually all of a union’s important strategic initiatives should have an

educational component. Yet, it appears that this is not always the case. Our research relies on reports by education staff themselves, who agree that educational priorities and programs ought to be conceived and designed in relationship to the union's strategic agenda. How do others within national unions see the role of education and its centrality to the union's ongoing activities?

On a related note, we would like to see additional research that would give us a more in-depth understanding of how labor education in general is valued by the labor movement. Again, our research is informed by the self-reports of labor educators who, though candid with us and generous with their time, speak from within the field. How could we better measure labor education's contribution? For example, how many of today's union leaders owe at least some of their knowledge and skills to either union or university/college labor education programs? How many now have degrees in labor studies, and what value have those degrees had in their work with and for their unions? How do others outside the education arena view the contributions of labor education—e.g., union staff from other departments, university faculty and administrators, and scholars of the labor movement? And most difficult to measure, perhaps: How has union activity been improved through education—do stewards handle grievances better, negotiators bargain better contracts, presidents provide more enlightened leadership, and organizers win more campaigns? We look forward to future attempts to provide more insight into these questions of evaluation.

VI. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE UALE REGARDING LABOR EDUCATION

We suggest that the UALE implement a few measures that will ensure continued structured self-examination and interchange within the field of labor education. First, we suggest that the UALE devote at least two sessions at each annual meeting on some major question concerning the "state of the field." This would be sessions beyond the usual workshops or demonstrations of a particular program that already occur. Specifically, they would focus on crucial questions facing the profession, a number of which we have raised in this report.

Second, we suggest that the UALE make a more concerted effort to get union education department leaders and staff involved in making presentations or running sessions at its annual meetings. While the involvement of union-based labor educators is good and is improving, the organization is still overly weighted toward the university/college side, perhaps reflecting the organization's genesis from the University and College Labor Education Association (UCLEA), a strictly higher education organization. It is our sense that more input from union-side labor educators would enrich the conferences.

Finally, we suggest that the UALE more prominently encourage the sharing and dissemination of labor education practices and programs in its publications and public products. This could be done through the UALE web site in a variety of ways, or perhaps by devoting a special issue of *Labor Studies Journal* to this purpose, or augmenting the journal's "Innovations" section on innovative labor education practices.

VII. FINAL THOUGHTS ON LABOR EDUCATION TODAY

We believe that labor education, while always necessary, is even more important today than it has been for some time. That is because the labor movement in the United States is in crisis. The last time the U.S. labor movement faced a similar set of challenges—the 1920s—labor education played a critical role by educating key individuals who would later help to organize the CIO upsurge of the 1930s. In the 1920s many conservative labor leaders distrusted labor education, and it was marginalized to a degree that we hope and trust would not be the case today. Yet, in many ways it provided the “fertilizer” out of which grew a number of individuals who later played a crucial role in transforming the labor movement.

We stand at a similar juncture today. Labor educators are located in that critical space between abstract ideas and practical reality. In times of crisis the two must be brought even more closely into contact with each other than usual, and that is why labor education must be central to all future endeavors of the U.S. labor movement.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY FOR UNION EDUCATION DIRECTORS

The following questionnaire will take 20–30 minutes to complete. Please skip questions that do not apply to your situation. We don't expect long answers to any of these questions, but feel free to add comments in the margins, at the end of the survey or on the back. When you are asked for numbers (e.g., questions 6 & 7 below), please simply make your best estimate.

Thank you for taking the time to help with this project. Please return your completed questionnaire in the envelope provided by OCTOBER 18, 2002. Thank you!

Your name: _____

Position in Union: _____

Name of Union: _____

I. SIZE AND SCOPE OF YOUR UNION'S LABOR EDUCATION PROGRAM

NOTE: The following questions apply to education conducted by the national/international level of the union, or substantially assisted by staff at the national/international level. Questions regarding local union activity follow in Section II.

1. Does your union maintain an education department with its own staff?
___ yes ___ no

If the answer to #1 is "yes"

- a) How many staff does the education department have, including yourself (and excluding clerical support)? _____

- b) Do you use members of the union as trainers?
___ yes ___ no

- c) What are the qualifications that are looked for when staff is hired (e.g., what work experience, formal education, training experience, etc.)?
2. If the answer to #1 is “no”, please explain where the education function of the union is housed (what other union department(s), other levels of the union, etc.)
3. Does your union have its own, separate residential facility for education?
- ___ yes; name and location: _____
- ___ no
4. Which of the following kinds of educational activities are conducted by your union for its members? (NOTE: Some of these categories may overlap; check all that apply.)
- ___ training for members and officers in contract negotiations and administration
- ___ training for members and officers in personal leadership skills (communications, problem-solving, public speaking, media skills, etc.)
- ___ political education (campaign work, lobbying, member education, etc.)
- ___ organizing skills
- ___ internal union-building programs (for example, new member orientation, internal organizing campaigns, mobilization)
- ___ economics
- ___ foreign languages, ESL, or other topics not specifically union-oriented (please give examples: _____)
- ___ train-the-trainer programs
- ___ higher-level training for elected, appointed, or hired union staff
- ___ apprenticeship and journey-level upgrade training (please note if this activity is carried out by a different department: _____)
- ___ inclusion issues (dealing with racism, sexism, homophobia; diversity training; new immigrants in the workplace; etc.)
- ___ other: _____

5. How many programs do you conduct, and how many members do you reach each year through these activities? (NOTE: We recognize that some of these categories overlap, and that they may not apply exactly to your activities. Please just make your best estimate.)

# programs	# attendees	
_____	_____	contract negotiations and administration
_____	_____	personal leadership skills
_____	_____	political education
_____	_____	organizing skills
_____	_____	union-building programs
_____	_____	economics
_____	_____	programs not specifically union-oriented
_____	_____	train-the-trainer
_____	_____	staff training
_____	_____	apprenticeship/journey upgrade training
_____	_____	inclusion/diversity issues

Total number of members reached each year: _____

Total number of staff reached each year: _____

6. Which of the following formats are used in delivering education to your members? Please indicate what percentage of your total educational offerings are represented by each category.

Used?	Percent of Total Offerings	
_____	_____	classroom training
_____	_____	hands-on training in the field
_____	_____	study circles
_____	_____	on-line courses on the internet (if so, please list topics: _____)
_____	_____	other individualized, self-paced instruction, including the use of CD's, videotapes or workbooks
_____	_____	other: _____

7. During the past 10 years, has the size of your education program

- ☐ grown
- ☐ stayed about the same size
- ☐ gotten smaller

II. THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN YOUR UNION

8. a) Does your education program have its own mission statement?

☐ yes ☐ no

(If so, please enclose with your survey. If the union has a broader mission statement that includes references to education, please enclose that as well.)

b) What do you see as the goal(s) of providing labor education to members of your union? Please be as specific as you can. (If you are enclosing your mission statement, there is no need to write out the answer to this question).

9. Which of the following statements best characterizes the relationship between education and other union functions (organizing, negotiations and contract administration, political work, etc.) in your own union?

☐ Educational offerings are planned and conducted by the staff of each union department.

☐ Education staff work with representatives from other union departments to design training needed by those departments.

☐ A combination of the two statements above.

☐ Other: _____

10. Has your union used education programs in

- ☐ Organizing campaigns?
- ☐ Contract campaigns?
- ☐ Political campaigns?

11. Over the past ten years, have resources allocated to educational activities in the union

- ☐ increased
- ☐ stayed about the same
- ☐ decreased

12. Please describe the relationship between your education program and the local unions which are part of your national/international organization, by answering the following questions:
- a) Are the local unions affiliated with your national organization involved in developing and delivering their own educational programs, or do they rely on curricula and trainers from the national union?
 - b) How would you describe your role in working with local unions to make sure that their educational needs are met?
13. What methods does the union use to evaluate the effectiveness of its educational offerings?

III. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN YOUR DEPARTMENT AND OTHER PROVIDERS OF LABOR EDUCATION & RESEARCH

14. Does your department work with or utilize the services of any college or university labor education programs, including the National Labor College (George Meany Center)?
___ yes ___ no
15. If the answer to the above question is "yes", please describe the ways in which you interact with these programs. Please give specific examples if possible.
16. Do you and/or your staff attend annual joint conferences of the United Association for Labor Education and the AFL-CIO?
___ yes ___ no
17. Do you have a relationship with any colleges or universities in order to be able to offer credit for labor education classes taken by your members?
___ yes ___ no
- If "yes", please explain:

18. If you do not work with college and university programs, is this because

- ☐ they are not conveniently located
- ☐ they do not offer training or other services that would be useful to your members
- ☐ their training and services duplicate what you prefer to do internally
- ☐ you have had bad experiences with one or more of these programs
- ☐ their offerings are too expensive
- ☐ other: _____

19. Do you use, or encourage your regional and/or local unions to use, the educational services of State AFL-CIO's or Central Labor Councils?

- ☐ yes ☐ no

If so, please give specific examples:

20. Are there other community-based organizations, non-profits, research institutes, etc. that you work with in the area of labor education?

- ☐ yes ☐ no

If so, please list:

21. Have you worked with education staff from the AFL-CIO on programs or other services for your union?

- ☐ yes ☐ no

If yes, have you used:

- ☐ MEMO
- ☐ Train-the-Trainer
- ☐ Common Sense Economics
- ☐ Social Security
- ☐ Other: _____

22. What educational assistance might you be asking for from AFL-CIO staff in the future, if any?

IV. PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

23. In light of your answers to the questions above, what changes in priority, content and/or delivery of labor education in your union have been most significant over the past 10-20 years?

24. Would you be willing to discuss your answers further in a telephone interview?

☐ yes ☐ no

Thank you very much for filling out this survey!

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE-BASED LABOR EDUCATION CENTERS

This questionnaire is being sent to all university-based labor education programs in the United States, as part of a comprehensive survey of the state of labor education being conducted by Barbara Byrd and Bruce Nissen. Please answer the following questions and return to:

Bruce Nissen
Center for Labor Research and Studies
Florida International University
University Park
Miami, FL 33199

Thank you!

I. SIZE AND SCOPE OF YOUR LABOR EDUCATION PROGRAM

1. Would you please attach a copy of your program's mission statement, if there is one. If none, check here _____
2. How many sites (campuses) does your labor education program operate out of?
____ 1 ____ 2 ____ 3 ____ 4 ____ 5 ____ 6 ____ 7 ____ 8
3. In your non-credit labor education programs, approximately how many students did you have attending classes last year? _____ students

How does this compare to 5 years ago?

Up by _____% Same _____ Down by _____%

How does this compare to 10 years ago?

Up by _____% Same _____ Down by _____%

How does this compare to 20 years ago?

Up by _____% Same _____ Down by _____%

4. In your non-credit labor education programs, how many hours of instruction were there last year? _____ hours of instruction

How does this compare to 5 years ago?

Up by _____% Same _____ Down by _____%

How does this compare to 10 years ago?

Up by _____% Same _____ Down by _____%

How does this compare to 20 years ago?

Up by _____% Same _____ Down by _____%

5. Do you have a non-credit certificate program? ___ yes ___ no

If yes, please attach a description, or descriptive brochure.

6. How many labor educators do you have on staff? (include all categories, and count half time positions as .5) _____ labor educators

How does this compare to 5 years ago?

Up by _____ people Same _____ Down by _____ people

How does this compare to 10 years ago?

Up by _____ people Same _____ Down by _____ people

How does this compare to 20 years ago?

Up by _____ people Same _____ Down by _____ people

7. What percentage of your programs last year were "open enrollment", and what percentage were on a contract basis with an individual labor organization, open only to its members?

_____ % open enrollment _____ % contract courses

How has this changed since 10 years ago?

_____ shifted toward open enrollment _____ shifted toward contract

How has this changed since 20 years ago?

_____ shifted toward open enrollment _____ shifted toward contract

8. What percentage of your non-credit labor education programs in the last year were:

4 hrs. or less ____ % 5-8 hrs. long? ____ % 9-12 hrs. long? ____ %
 13-20 hrs. long? ____ % over 20 hrs. long? ____ %

9. What percentage of your non-credit labor education programs last year were delivered:

- a) on campus ____ %
 b) in a union hall or community site ____ %
 (In computing percentages, use number of programs, not contact hours)
 c) with a statewide (or larger) audience? ____ %
 d) with a local audience? ____ %
 (In computing percentages, use number of programs, not contact hours)r

10. Do you run any programs paid for, in part or full, by the state AFL-CIO?
 ____ yes ____ no

If yes, how many, yearly? _____ programs
 For how many hours, yearly? _____ hours

11. Do you run any programs which the state AFL-CIO sponsors, but does not help pay for?
 ____ yes ____ no

If yes, how many, yearly? _____ programs
 For how many hours, yearly? _____ hours

12. Do you run any programs paid for, in part or full, by a central labor council?
 ____ yes ____ no

If yes, how many, yearly? _____ programs
 For how many hours, yearly? _____ hours

13. Do you run any programs which a central labor council sponsors, but does not help pay for?
 ____ yes ____ no

If yes, how many, yearly? _____ programs
 For how many hours, yearly? _____ hours

14. Has the national AFL-CIO ever paid you for any type of educational work in the past five years?

___ yes ___ no If yes, please describe what you were paid for.

15. Has any national union ever paid you for any type of educational work in the past five years?

___ yes ___ no If yes, please describe what you were paid for.

16. Does your university-based labor program have a credit program?

___ yes ___ no If yes, what certificates and/or degrees do you offer?

If you have an undergraduate program, how many undergraduate enrollments and graduates do you have per year?

_____ enrollments
 _____ graduates of certificate programs
 _____ graduates with associate (2 yr.) degrees
 _____ graduates with Bachelors degrees

Do these numbers show any trend (growth or decline) in the past 10 years?
 If so, please explain.

If you have a graduate program, how many graduate enrollments per year do you have? _____ enrollments

How many per year earn a graduate certificate? _____

How many per year earn a Masters? _____

How many per year earn a Doctorate? _____

Do these numbers show any trend (growth or decline) in the past 10 year?
 If so, please explain.

17. Do you have a formal agreement with the George Meany Center/National Labor College, wherein your program acts as a "feeder" for their Bachelors degree program?

___ yes ___ no

18. Would you please attach an annual report, or at least a set of brochures describing last year's offerings (credit and non-credit) from your program?

II. ORIENTATION OF YOUR PROGRAM

19. Overall, how would you characterize the main orientation of your labor education program? Is it aimed at union advocacy, neutrality between union and management, or joint labor-management facilitation?

___ union advocacy ___ neutral ___ joint labor-management

20. What percentage of your non-credit educational programs are:
- a) union advocacy programs _____ %
 - b) neutral between labor and management _____ %
 - c) joint labor-management programs _____ %
 - d) none of the above (not related to institutional concerns of unions or of employer managements) _____ %

Over the past 10 years, are there any trends in these percentages? If so, please explain.

21. Some labor educators make a distinction between “tool” courses that teach people skills (e.g., grievance handling, arbitration, collective bargaining) and courses that go beyond skills to a broader understanding of the environment that unions and workers face (e.g., labor history, labor and political ideologies, labor and economic theories, etc.). If you had to categorize all of your non-credit labor education programs as primarily one or the other, what percentage of your center’s programs are

“tool” courses _____ % non-tool courses _____ %

Over the past 10 years, are there any trends in these percentages? If so, please explain.

22. If you were to do a “composite” of the attitudes of the labor educators on your staff, and represent their opinions, would you please rate their overall agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

- a. The main purpose of labor education is to train union leaders and activists in the skills needed to bargain and administer a contract, and to conduct a union’s administrative and political affairs.

___ strongly disagree ___ disagree ___ neutral
 ___ agree ___ strongly agree

- b. The main purpose of labor education is to train union leaders and activists in thinking strategically and critically in how to empower workers and their unions.

___ strongly disagree ___ disagree ___ neutral
 ___ agree ___ strongly agree

- c. The main purpose of labor education is to promote a harmonious relationship between labor and management.

___ strongly disagree ___ disagree ___ neutral
 ___ agree ___ strongly agree

- d. The main purpose of labor education is to develop a radical consciousness about capitalism and our class system, and to help union leaders and activists fight and overcome class oppression.

___ strongly disagree ___ disagree ___ neutral
 ___ agree ___ strongly agree

23. Unions usually have their own education departments, and they run their own educational programs as well as using university-based labor ed. programs. For your university-based program, would you please state in general what kinds of programs they are most likely to rely on you to supply, and what kinds of programs they are most likely to want to do themselves.

Kinds of programs where they rely on your university-based program:

Kinds of programs where they almost never use your university-based program, but want to do themselves:

24. Regarding your answer to question #23, how do you think the work should be divided between the two? Should it be any different than it is now, or is it divided up about right as is?
25. Looking at the broad spectrum of labor education in the United States, do you think there is any particular area, or areas, where your program specializes? Please state any areas where you think your program has special expertise, compared to an "average" university-based labor program. (Do not list everything you do—list only those areas where you claim special expertise).

III. RESEARCH CAPABILITIES AND FUNDING

26. In an average year, does your labor program do any research funded by a union or the AFL-CIO? ☐ yes ☐ no

If yes, would you briefly describe the types of topics researched, and the general amount of funding you get for it?

27. In an average year, does your labor program do any research funded by federal/state government, or by private foundations?
☐ yes ☐ no

If yes, would you briefly describe the types of topics researched, and the general amount of funding you get?

28. Does your labor education program engage in unfunded research of some type for unions or for the labor movement? ☐ yes ☐ no

If yes, would you briefly describe the nature of this research, and how frequently unions request it?

29. How many of the professionals on your staff (not counting clerical employees) have a PhD? _____ out of _____

How many have substantial union experience? _____ out of _____

How many have both substantial union experience and a PhD?
 _____ out of _____

How many are on a tenure track? _____ out of _____

30. How many of the professionals on your staff publish at least one refereed academic journal article (or its equivalent) within a two year period?
 _____ out of _____

31. What types of research do you see the greatest demand for, that university-based labor education programs could fill? Who is the demand coming from?

32. Does your labor education program have any areas of special research expertise? Both in terms of types of research (qualitative, quantitative, applied, action, etc.) and in terms of areas of subject matter, please explain any specialized areas of research where you stand out.

IV. TECHNOLOGY AND CONSULTING ISSUES

33. Does your labor education program have any special areas of technological capability or competence not widely utilized by all such programs (e.g., TAGS computer lab, audio visual or media competence/facilities, etc.)?
 ___ yes ___ no

If yes, please explain:

34. Does your labor education program carry out consulting and facilitating tasks for unions, for labor-management groups, for employers, for governments, or for others? ___ yes ___ no

If yes, please explain the type, and amount, of such activity carried out on a yearly basis.

V. TRENDS: PAST AND FUTURE

35. How has your labor education program changed from 10 years ago? from 20 years ago? (Please be as specific as you can in citing how you are now different than you were in the past).
36. What changes in the U.S. society, in industrial relations practices, in politics, in economics, in culture, etc. do you believe have driven the changes you cite in your answer to question #35?
37. How has your relationship with your university/college administration changed in the past 10 years? 20 years? What trends do you see?
38. How do you see labor education evolving in the future? And specifically, how do you see university/college-based labor education evolving in the future? Why do you foresee the changes you predict?

Thank you very much for filling out this survey! Will you please give us a name and phone number to call for any follow-up questions we might have?

Name _____
 Phone number _____

We will share results that we have not promised confidentiality on (see cover letter) with you.

APPENDIX C: LIST OF RESPONDING UNIONS, REGIONAL & OTHER AFFILIATES, AND INTERVIEWS

RESPONDING NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL UNIONS

Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural (UAW)
Bakery, Confectionery (BCTGM)
Boilermakers
Bricklayers
Communications Workers
Electrical Workers (IBEW)
Engineers, Operating (IUOE)
Fire Fighters
Flight Attendants
Food & Commercial (UFCW)
Government Employees (AFGE)
Graphic Communications
Hotel & Restaurant (HERE)
Ironworkers
Laborers
Letter Carriers
Locomotive Engineers
Longshore & Warehouse (ILWU)
Machinists (IAMAW)
Needletrades (UNITE)
Nurses (UAN)
Paper, Allied Industrial, Chemical & Energy (PACE)
Postal Workers
Professional Athletes (NFL Players Assn)
Radio Association
School Employees Assn. (CSEA)
Seafarers
Service Employees (SEIU)
Signalmen, Railroad
State, County, Municipal (AFSCME)
Steelworkers
Teachers
Teamsters

Transit Union (ATU)
Transport Workers (TWU)
Transportation Communications (TCU)

REGIONAL AND OTHER AFFILIATES

Affiliates

ILWU #142
Chemical Workers, UFCW
IUE, CWA
Actors Equity Association
Health Professionals and Allied/AFT

AFSCME Affiliates

Council 31
Council 4
CSEA, Local 1000, AFSCME
District Council 37
Ohio Assn of Public School Employees, AFSCME #4
Servidores Publicos Unidos de Puerto Rico

INTERVIEWS

Constance Lambert, Education Director, International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers, March 5, 2003

Martha Letsinger, Education Director, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, March 21, 2003

Mary Jean Piraino, Director, Leadership Development Department, United Food and Commercial Workers Union, March 4, 2003

Virginia L. duRivage, Director, Education and Leadership Development, American Federation of Government Employees, May 20, 2003

Lee Strieb, Research Director, Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees Union, March 20, 2003

Kathleen Conlan, Assistant Director of Education, Laborers International Union of North America, May 21, 2003

Charlie Micallef, Assistant Director, William W. Winpisinger Education and Technology Center, March 11, 2003

Joan G. Hill, Director, Research and Education, Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union, March 24, 2003

Jevne Diaz, Assistant Director, Education Department, Service Employees International Union, March 27, 2003

Melena Barkman, Education Director, United Steelworkers of America, March 11, 2003

Sally Payne, Associate Director of Education, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, April 11, 2003

Robert Wechler, Director of Education and Research, Transport Workers Union of America, March 20, 2003

APPENDIX D: LIST OF LABOR EDUCATION CENTERS AND PROGRAMS COVERED IN THE SURVEY

List of university- and college-based labor education programs surveyed and reported on in Part 3, alphabetically by state. Note that the survey was conducted with programs listed in the UALE directory, and thus a few programs were not included—however, we have reached all but a few of such programs in the country.

Institutions surveyed, listed in alphabetical order by state, are as follows:

ALABAMA

- (1) University of Alabama at Birmingham Center for Labor Education and Research

ARKANSAS

- (2) University of Arkansas at Little Rock Labor Education Program

CALIFORNIA

- (3) California State University at Dominguez Hills Labor Studies Program
- (4) City College of San Francisco Labor Studies Department
- (5) University of California at Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education
- (6) University of California at Berkeley Labor Occupational Health Program
- (7) Los Angeles Trade Technical College Labor Center
- (8) University of California at Los Angeles Center for Labor Research & Education

CONNECTICUT

- (9) University of Connecticut Labor Education Center

FLORIDA

- (10) Florida International University Center for Labor Research and Studies

GEORGIA

- (11) Georgia State University W.J. Usery, Jr. Center for the Workplace Labor Studies Program

ILLINOIS

- (12) The DePaul University Center for New Learning Labor Education Program
- (13) University of Illinois Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations

INDIANA

- (14) Indiana University Division of Labor Studies

IOWA

- (15) University of Iowa Labor Center

KENTUCKY

- (16) University of Kentucky Center for Labor Education & Research

MARYLAND

- (17) The Community College of Baltimore County Labor Studies Program
- (18) George Meany Center–National Labor College (did not return the survey)

MASSACHUSETTS

- (19) Harvard University Trade Union Program
- (20) University of Massachusetts at Amherst Labor Relations and Research Center
- (21) University of Massachusetts at Boston Labor Resource Center
- (22) University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth Arnold M. Dubin Labor Education Center
- (23) University of Massachusetts at Lowell Labor Extension Program

MICHIGAN

- (24) Michigan State University School of Labor and Industrial Relations Labor Education Program
- (25) Northern Michigan University Labor Education Program
- (26) University of Michigan Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations Labor Studies Center
- (27) Wayne State University Labor Studies Center

MINNESOTA

- (28) University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center Labor Education Service

MISSOURI

- (29) University of Missouri at Columbia Labor Education Program
- (30) University of Missouri at Kansas City and Longview Community College: The Institute of Labor Studies

NEBRASKA

- (31) University of Nebraska at Omaha William Brennan Institute for Labor Studies

NEW JERSEY

- (32) Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey Labor Studies and Employment Relations Labor Education Center

NEW YORK

- (33) Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations
- (34) Empire State Labor College (refused to answer the survey)
- (35) Queens College, City University of New York Worker Education Center

OHIO

- (36) Youngstown State University Labor Studies Program and Center for Working Class Studies

OREGON

- (37) University of Oregon Labor Education and Research Center

PENNSYLVANIA

- (38) Indiana University of Pennsylvania Center for the Study of Labor Relations
- (39) The Pennsylvania State University Labor Studies and Industrial Relations Program

TENNESSEE

- (40) Middle Tennessee State University Center for Labor Management Relations

WASHINGTON

- (41) Evergreen State College Labor Education and Research Center

WISCONSIN

- (42) University of Wisconsin School for Workers

WEST VIRGINIA

- (43) Southern Appalachian Labor Center
- (44) West Virginia University Institute for Labor Studies and Research

(Further information on these programs is available on a computer data base, available on the web at: <http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu/laborstudiesdb/>. This data base is also attached to the end of this report as Appendix F.)

APPENDIX E: LABOR EDUCATION BIBLIOGRAPHY AND OTHER RESOURCES

Abbott, W.L. 1977. "College/Labor Union Cooperation." *Community and Junior College Journal*, v. 47: 48-51.

Adam, T.R. 1940. *The Workers' Road to Learning*. New York: American Association for Adult Education.

Altenbaugh, Richard. 1990. *Education for Struggle: The American Labor Colleges of the 1920's and 1930's*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Barbash, Jack. 1955. *Universities and Unions in Workers' Education*. New York: Harpers.

Boyle, George V. 1976. "Goals of Unions and Universities in Labor Education." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 1, no. 2: 157-161.

Carlson, Kenneth D. (1971). "Labor Education in America." *Review of Educational Research*, v. 41, no. 2: 115-130.

Clark, Paul F. and Lois S. Gray. 1990. "Broadening the Mission: Research Activity Among University Labor Education/Labor Studies Professionals." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 15, no. 2: 3-19.

Cook, Alice H. 1981. "Labor Education in the U.S.: Marriage of Convenience?" In *Trade Unionism in the United States*. J.L. Stern and B.O. Dennis, eds. Madison, WI: Industrial Relations Research Institute, University of Wisconsin: 105-120.

Cook, Alice H. and Agnes M. Douty. 1958. *Labor Education Outside the Unions: A Review of Postwar Programs in Western Europe and the United States*. Ithaca, NY: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.

Delp, Linda, Miranda Outman-Kramer, Susan J. Schurman, Kent Wong, eds. 2002. *Teaching for Change: Popular Education and the Labor Movement*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Center for Labor Research and Education.

Denker, Joel. 1981. *Unions and Universities: The Rise of the New Labor Leader*. Ottawa, NJ: Allenheld, Osmun and Co.

Dwyer, R.E. 1977. *Labor Education in the U.S.: An Annotated Bibliography*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.

Dwyer, R.E., Galvin, Myles E., and Larson, S. 1977. "Labor Studies: In Quest of Industrial Justice." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 2, no. 2: 94-131.

Eiger, Norman. 1979. "Labor Education in Hostile Environment." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 4, no. 1: 25-38.

Fernbach, A. 1945. *University Extension and Workers' Education*. Bloomington, IN: National University Extension Association.

Golatz, H.J. 1977. "Labor Studies: New Kid On Campus." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 2, no. 1: 15-22.

Goldman, Frieda H., ed. 1962. *Reorientation in Labor Education: A Symposium on Liberal Education for Labor in the University*. Illinois: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

Good, W.E. 1974. *Labor Studies in the Community College*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 097 089).

Gray, Lois S. 1977. "Academic Degrees for Labor Studies—A New Goal for Unions." *Monthly Labor Review*, v.100, no. 6: 1-20.

Gray, Lois S. 1966. "The American Way in Labor Education." *Industrial Relations*, v. 5, no. 2: 3-6.

Gray, Lois S. 1976. "A Report of a Survey: Labor Studies Credit and Degree Programs: A Growth Sector of Higher Education." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 1, no. 1: 34-51.

Gray, Lois S. 1980. "Trends in the Training and Selection of Union Staff: Implications for University and College Labor Education." *Labor Studies Journal*, vol. 5, no. 1: 13-24.

Hoffman, Alice M. 1982. *An Analysis of the George Meany Labor Studies Center's Tripartite Program for Apprenticeship and Associate Degree in Labor Studies* (Doctoral Dissertation, Temple University, 1982). University Microfilms.

Howard, Robert. 1983. "Worker Education Comes of Age: Reviving an Old Tradition." *Working Papers*, January-February.

Johnson, Ralph A. 1995. "Joint Labor Management Classes: A New Role for Labor Education." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 19, no. 4: 24-34.

Kerrison, I. 1951. *Workers Education at the University Level*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Kerrison, I. And Levine, H.A. 1960. *Labor Leadership Education*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Lieberthal, Mel. 1977. "On the Academization of Labor Education." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 1, no. 3: 235-245.

Liveright, A.A. 1954. *A Long Look at Labor Education*. Adult Education: 101-108.

London, Steven H. 1990. *The Re-Education of the American Working Class*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Mire, J. 1956. *Labor Education: A Study Report on Needs, Programs, and Approaches*. Madison, WI: IULEC.

Morrison, Walbert. 1980. *Community College—Labor Union Cooperation: Programs in Labor Studies* (Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1980). University Microfilms No. DDJ80-22136.

Nash, Al. 1978. "The University Labor Educator." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, v. 32: 40-55.

Nash, Al. 1978. "Labor Education, Labor Studies and the Knowledge Factor." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 3, no. 1: 5-17.

Parsons, Michael D. 1990. "Labor Studies in Decline." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 15, no. 1: 66-81.

Rogin, Lawrence and Marjorie Rachlin. 1968. *Labor Education in the United States: Final Report of a Study Financed by a Grant from the Office of Education, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Labor Education.

Schachhuber, Dieter. 1979. "The Missing Link in Labor Education." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 4, no. 2: 148-156.

Schwartztrauber, E.E. 1942. *Workers' Education*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Spencer, Bruce. 2002. *Unions and Learning in the Global Economy: International and Comparative Perspectives*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.

Stack, Hal and Carole Hutton, eds. 1980. *Building New Alliances: Labor Unions and Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Towers, Brian. 1987. "Labor Education in Depression: A British Perspective." *Labor Studies Journal*, v. 12, no.1: 3-28.

Tyler, Gus 1979. "The University and the Labor Union: Educating the Proletariat." *Change*, v. 11: 1-8.

Ware, C.F. 1946. *Labor Education in the Universities*. New York: American Labor Education Service.

Wertheimer, Barbara M. 1981. *Labor Education for Women Workers*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

APPENDIX F: UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE-BASED LABOR EDUCATION CENTERS DATABASE

University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB)
Center for Labor Education and Research (CLEAR)

Address	University Station 1044 11th St., S. Birmingham, AL 35294-4500
Telephone	205-934-2101
Fax	205-975-5087
Web Site	http://www.uab.edu/clear
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	4 labor educators, 4 safety & health project staff (on soft money).
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	10%
Contract course	90%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	95% union advocacy, 5% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Grievance Handling and Arbitration, Internal Organizing, Safety & Health, Employment Law, Strategic Research, Health Care, Pensions, and Immigrant Workers.
Area of special research expertise	Labor History, Labor Movement & Civil Rights, International Campaigns, Political Action, and Race and Gender.
Consulting	In areas of strategic planning and goal setting for unions and joint committees.

University of Arkansas at Little Rock Labor Education Program

Address	UALR/ Library 513 2801 South University Little Rock, AR 72204-1099
Telephone	501-569-8483
Fax	501-569-8538
Web Site	http://www.iea.ualr.edu/lep
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	4 labor educators; 3 project staff (on soft money).
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	7%
Contract course	93%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	85% union advocacy, 15% workplace skills programs.
Area of specialization	Workplace skills programming.
Area of special research expertise	None
Consulting	Strategic planning for Health & Safety committees.

California State University, Dominguez Hills
Labor Studies

Address	1000 E Victoria Street Carson, CA 90747
Telephone	310-243-3468
Fax	310-243-3468
Web Site	No
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	3 labor educators; 4 project staff (on soft money).
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes. (Note: the courses may count as credit towards a degree.)
Open enrollment	100%
Contract course	0%
Credit program?	Bachelor of Arts, Minor, Certificate.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	Pro-worker and pro-union.
Area of specialization	U.S. Labor History, Labor Law, and Contracts and Negotiation.
Area of special research expertise	Gender issues, longshore worker issues, history of poverty and employment.
Consulting	No

City College of San Francisco
Labor Studies Department

Address	1400 Evans Avenue San Francisco, CA 94124
Telephone	415-550-4380
Fax	415-267-6536
Web Site	No
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	1 full-time labor educator; 15 part-time labor educators (on hard money); 4 safety and health project staff (on soft money).
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	5%
Contract course	95%
Credit program?	Associate of Arts degree and Labor and Community Studies Certificate.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	85% union advocacy, 15% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Labor History, Immigrant Workers' Rights, and English as a Second Language.
Area of special research expertise	No
Consulting	No

Center for Labor Research and Education
Institute of Industrial Relations

Address	University of California, Berkeley 2521 Channing Way Berkeley, CA 94720-5555
Telephone	510-642-0323
Fax	510-642-6432
Web Site	http://laborcenter.berkeley.edu
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	7 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	30%
Contract course	70%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Senior level union leadership development, immigrant workers organizing, global trade and labor organizing, young workers organizing, and general labor education in Spanish and Chinese.
Area of special research expertise	Applied and participatory action research on living wage, global labor standards, young worker issues, and immigrant worker issues.
Consulting	Facilitation of meetings for unions and labor-community coalitions. Consulting in strategic planning for unions and labor-community coalitions.

Los Angeles Trade Technical Center Labor Center

Address	400 W Washington Blvd Labor Center A 141 Los Angeles, CA 90015
Telephone	213-763-7129
Fax	213-763-5393
Web Site	Under construction.
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	20 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	No
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	55%
Contract course	45%
Credit program?	Certificate of Completion in Labor Studies, Associate of Arts Degree in Labor Studies.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	Union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Union leadership, organizing, and filming.
Area of special research expertise	N/A
Consulting	No

University of California
Labor Occupational Health Program

Address	2223 Fulton Street Berkeley, CA 94720-5120
Telephone	510-642-5507
Fax	
Web Site	http://www.lohp.org
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	12 labor educators on staff; 9 project staff (on soft money).
Non-credit program?	No
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	40%
Contract course	60%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	95% union advocacy, 5% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Occupational Safety & Health.
Area of special research expertise	Occupational safety & health, and participatory research.
Consulting	Yes

UCLA
Center for Labor Research & Education

Address	Hershey Hall 2nd Floor Box 951478 Los Angeles, CA 90095-1478
Telephone	310-794-5981 or 310-794-5983
Fax	310-794-6410
Web Site	http://www.labor.ucla.edu
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	8 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	75%
Contract course	25%
Credit program?	Bachelor of Arts minor.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	90% union advocacy, 10% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Immigrant Workers, Spanish Language Resources, Pacific Rim Global Solidarity, Asian American Workers, Labor Community Alliances, Popular Education, and Occupational Safety & Health.
Area of special research expertise	Campaign and corporate research, immigrant workers, popular education, health and safety, and organizing research.
Consulting	Campaign and corporate research, immigrant workers, collective bargaining, health and safety, union leadership programs, and strategic planning.

University of Connecticut Labor Education Center

Address	U-4056, One Bishop Circle Room 220 Storrs, CT 06269-4013
Telephone	860-486-3417
Fax	860-486-5221
Web Site	http://www.continuingstudies.uconn.edu/centers/labor/index/htm
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	1 labor educator on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	5%
Contract course	95%
Credit program?	Undergraduate and graduate certificate in Health & Safety, undergraduate labor studies classes in Contemporary Issues, Collective Bargaining, Labor Law, and Dispute Resolution.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No (entering negotiations on this issue).
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Occupational Safety & Health, on-line courses, and Alternative Dispute Resolution.
Area of special research expertise	Occupational Safety & Health and Environmental Research.
Consulting	Health & Safety, Environmental Reviews, Labor/Management Relations, and Mediation.

Florida International University
Center for Labor Research & Studies

Address	University Park Miami, FL 33199
Telephone	305-348-2371
Fax	305-348-2241
Web Site	http://www.fiu.edu/~clrs
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	4 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	30%
Contract course	70%
Credit program?	Undergraduate concentration in Labor Studies, Graduate Certificate in Conflict Resolution.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	Yes
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	International Labor Movements and Issues, Living Wage, Privatization, Diversity, Immigration, and Worker's Culture.
Area of special research expertise	International Labor Issues, Diversity, Labor Community Coalitions, Labor Movement Revitalization, Labor Report on the State of Florida.
Consulting	On a wide range of issues, especially union revitaliza- tion, strategic planning, internal organizing, and com- munity relationships.

Georgia State University
The W. J. Usery, Jr. Center for the Workplace
Labor Studies Program

Address	120 Courtland Street, Suite 400 Atlanta, GA 30303-3083
Telephone	404-651-3653
Fax	404-651-3651
Web Site	http://www.userycenter.org
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	2 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	5%
Contract course	95%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	Yes
Orientation of the program	85% union advocacy, 15% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	None
Area of special research expertise	None
Consulting	Labor arbitrator, arbitrator for Joint Apprenticeship Appeal Committee, mediator, scholarship judge. Facilitator for various labor-management and community groups, Board of Directors, and Georgia Labor Management Conference.

The DePaul Labor Education Program
DePaul University–Center for New Learning

Address	25 E. Jackson Floor 3, Room 317 Chicago, IL 60604
Telephone	312-362-5832
Fax	312-362-5988
Web Site	http://www.sn1.depaul.edu/lep
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	1 full-time and 1 part-time labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	80%
Contract course	20%
Credit program?	The School of New Learning grants credit for courses towards a Bachelor's degree.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	The School of New Learning grants credit for courses towards a Bachelor's degree.
Area of specialization	Comprehensive labor leadership education, high school labor in the schools program, writing skills and speaking skills programs, and one-on-one/internal organizing.
Area of special research expertise	None
Consulting	No

University of Illinois
Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations

Address	Labor Education Program 504 East Armory Champaign, IL 61820
Telephone	217-333-0980
Fax	217-244-4091
Web Site	http://www.ilir.uiuc.edu/labor
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	4 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	80%
Contract course	20%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	Yes
Orientation of the program	95% union advocacy, 5% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Arbitration and union technology use.
Area of special research expertise	Arbitration and union technology use.
Consulting	Yes

Indiana University
Division of Labor Studies

Address	Poplars 628 400 E. 7th Street Bloomington, IN 47405-3085
Telephone	812-855-9082
Fax	812-855-1563
Web Site	http://www.labor.iu.edu
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	22 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	20%
Contract course	80%
Credit program?	Certificate in Labor Studies, Associate of Science degree in Labor Studies, Bachelor of Science degree in Labor Studies.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy
Area of specialization	Gender and minority studies; building and construction trades labor education, globalization and web-based labor studies instruction.
Area of special research expertise	Applied research supporting the organizing and bargaining activities of labor unions, particularly with the building trades; US Labor History; Political Economy and its application to labor studies; and Gender and Afro-American Studies. History and Pedagogy of Labor Education.
Consulting	Yes

University of Iowa Labor Center

Address	100 Oakdale Campus M210 OH Iowa City, IA 52242-5000
Telephone	319-335-4144
Fax	319-335-4464
Web Site	http://www.uiowa.edu/~laborctr
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	5 labor educators on staff, 2 project staff (on soft money).
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	9%
Contract course	91%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Child Labor; Common Sense Economics; Ergonomics; Law-FMLA; Workers Compensation; Iowa Public Sector Rights; Disability Rights; Privatization; New Model Bargaining; Public Policy: Immigration, International Trade, Health Policy, and Economic Development; and Team Concept/High Performance.
Area of special research expertise	Applied research.
Consulting	Program development and design in labor history, strategic planning, and train-the-trainer.

University of Kentucky
Center for Labor Education & Research

Address	235 Business and Economics Bldg. Lexington, KY 40506-0034
Telephone	859-257-4811
Fax	859-257-4822
Web Site	http://www.clearuk.org
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	2 full-time and 1 part-time labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	20%
Contract course	80%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	Yes
Orientation of the program	95% union advocacy, 5% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Customized research and research-based education.
Area of special research expertise	Quantitative research, survey research, organizational development, and change work.
Consulting	Large scale strategic planning efforts.

George Meany Center for Labor Studies –
National Labor College*

Address	10000 New Hampshire Avenue Silver Spring, MD 20903
Telephone	301-431-6400
Fax	301-431-0371
Web Site	
Newsletter?	
Faculty	
Non-credit program?	
Non-credit certificate?	
Open enrollment	
Contract course	
Credit program?	
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	
Orientation of the program	
Area of specialization	
Area of special research expertise	
Consulting	
*Did not respond to the survey	

Harvard University Trade Union Program

Address	1350 Massachusetts Avenue #731 Cambridge, MA 02138
Telephone	617-495-9265
Fax	617-495-7359
Web Site	http://www.htup.harvard.edu
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	2 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	N/A
Contract course	N/A
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No. (Note: the program can count toward credit in BA and MA programs at GMC/NLC.)
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Senior labor leadership, international labor issues, case method, strategic choice, and emerging labor institutions.
Area of special research expertise	None
Consulting	Yes

University of Massachusetts–Amherst
Labor Relations and Research Center

Address	125 Draper Hall 40 Campus Center Way Amherst, MA 01003
Telephone	413-545-4875
Fax	413-545-0110
Web Site	http://www.umass.edu/lrrc
Newsletter?	Yes (the extension program at Lowell has a newsletter).
Faculty	4 labor educators on full-time staff (3 full-time faculty, 1 labor extension coordinator), 4 part-time faculty and 20 associated faculty.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	25%
Contract course	75%
Credit program?	Master's in Labor Studies residential program and Union Leadership and Administration limited-residency Master's in Labor Studies program.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Strategic Research, Popular Education, Living Wage Issues, Labor and Community, and Workers' Rights.
Area of special research expertise	Strategic corporate research, general economic assessment, Living Wage movement assessment, and quantitative research on workers and unions.
Consulting	Yes

University of Massachusetts–Boston
Labor Resource Center

Address	100 Morrissey Boulevard Boston, MA 02125-3393
Telephone	617-287-7426
Fax	617-287-7404
Web Site	http://www.lrc.umb.edu
Newsletter?	Yes (the statewide extension program has a newsletter).
Faculty	2 labor educators, 2 project staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	Yes
Contract course	No
Credit program?	Bachelor's degree in Labor Studies, Certificate in Labor Studies.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	In discussion.
Orientation of the program	60% union advocacy, 40% other: problem framing and problem solving to promote critical thinking and strategic action.
Area of specialization	Strategic problem solving and critical analysis.
Area of special research expertise	Corporate disclosure, workforce education and job creation, social inclusion and exclusion in the labor movement, labor history, work and family, and pedagogy of adult education.
Consulting	Yes

University of Massachusetts–Dartmouth
Arnold M. Dubin Labor Education Center

Address	285 Old Westport Road North Dartmouth, MA 02747-2300
Telephone	508-999-8007
Fax	508-999-9168
Web Site	No
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	2 labor educators on staff, 2.5 project staff on soft money.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	40%
Contract course	60%
Credit program?	Labor Studies Certificate and a minor in Labor Studies.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	90% union advocacy, 2% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Worker development: ESOL, GED, computer literacy; historical role of workers of color in the U.S. labor movement (especially Latino/a, and Puerto Rican labor movement).
Area of special research expertise	Worker development, ABE teaching methods.
Consulting	No

University of Massachusetts–Lowell Labor Extension Program

Address	One University Avenue Lowell, MA 02138
Telephone	978-934-3256
Fax	978-934-4033
Web Site	http://www.uml.edu/laborextension
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	3 labor educators on staff, 1 labor educator on soft money.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	50%
Contract course	50%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No response
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy
Area of specialization	Work Restructuring, Technological Change, Midterm Bargaining, Avoiding the Traps of Joint Labor-Management, and CLC Leadership Development.
Area of special research expertise	Work Restructuring, Technological Change, Midterm Bargaining, Avoiding the Traps of Joint Labor Management, and CLC Leadership Development.
Consulting	Consulting on technology, work restructuring and joint programs.

The Community College of Baltimore County
Labor Studies

Address	7200 Sollers Point Road Dundalk, MD 21222-4694
Telephone	410-285-9563
Fax	410-285-9440
Web Site	http://www.ccbc.cc.md.us/academics/dundalk/home.html
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	1 labor educator on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	100%
Contract course	0%
Credit program?	Associate of Arts degree in Labor Studies.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	Yes
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Providing skills for the Organizing Model of Unions and creating extensive class debate topics. Created a new series of courses called Labor in the Movies.
Area of special research expertise	None
Consulting	Yes

Michigan State University
Labor Education Program
School of Labor and Industrial Relations

Address	432 South Kedzie Hall East Lansing, MI 48824-1032
Telephone	517-355-5070
Fax	517-355-7656
Web Site	http://www.lir.msu.edu/lep
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	6 labor educators on staff, 2 labor educators on soft money.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	33%
Contract course	67%
Credit program?	Undergraduate Certificate in Labor Studies.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	95% union advocacy, 5% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Auto Industry, Health Care Workers, Women's Leadership, Labor History, and Joint Labor-Management Consulting.
Area of special research expertise	Survey Research, Qualitative Research, Health & Safety, and Labor History.
Consulting	Yes

Northern Michigan University Labor Education Program

Address	1401 Presque Isle Avenue Marquette, MI 49855
Telephone	906-227-2104
Fax	906-227-1449
Web Site	http://www.nmu.edu (LEP web site is under construction)
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	1 labor educator on staff, 2 project staff on soft money.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	95%
Contract course	5%
Credit program?	Labor Leadership Certification and Labor Studies minor.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	75% union advocacy, 25% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Contract administration and preparation for collective bargaining. High school collective bargaining series, provided through the Upper Peninsula Labor-Management Council (http://www.mlma.org/~upeninsula/). Customized training.
Area of special research expertise	History of local labor leaders, activists, and organizers.
Consulting	Yes

University of Michigan
The Labor Studies Center
Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations

Address	305 Victor Vaughan Bldg. 1111 E. Catherine Avenue Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2054
Telephone	734-764-0492
Fax	734-763-0913
Web Site	http://www.ilir.umich.edu/lsc
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	3 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	85%
Contract course	15%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	75% union advocacy, 25% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Minorities and Women's Labor Education, Training Peer Educators, Leadership Training, Popular Education Training/Methods, and Worker Theater Educational and Performance Opportunities.
Area of special research expertise	Outsourcing, privatization, political mobilization, collective bargaining, worker health, diversity, and arbitration.
Consulting	Yes.

Wayne State University
Labor Studies Center

Address	656 W. Kerby 3178 FAB Detroit, MI 48202
Telephone	313-577-2191
Fax	313-577-7726
Web Site	http://www.laborstudies.wayne.edu
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	4 labor educators on staff, 1 labor educator on soft money.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	40%
Contract course	60%
Credit program?	Bachelor of Arts degree in Labor Studies.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	85% union advocacy, 15% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Living Wage, FMLA, Lean Production, Strategic Planning, and Organizational Effectiveness, Labor-Management Relations, and Negotiation Skills.
Area of special research expertise	Living Wage, FMLA, Lean Production, Strategic Planning and Organizational Effectiveness.
Consulting	Strategic planning for unions, contract and political campaigns, and labor-management committees.

University of Minnesota
Labor Education Service, IRC

Address	321 19th Avenue, So. #3-300 Minneapolis, MN 55455
Telephone	612-624-5020
Fax	612-624-1585
Web Site	http://www.irc.csom.umn.edu/LES
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	9 labor educators on staff, 1 project staff on soft money.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	8%
Contract course	92%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	90% union advocacy, 10% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Unique in communications and media, video, computers and computer communications, web site development, and theater.
Area of special research expertise	No
Consulting	Yes

University of Missouri–Columbia Labor Education Program

Address	Heinkel Building, Room 212 Columbia, MO 65211-1341
Telephone	573-882-8358
Fax	573-884-5423
Web Site	http://www.missouri.edu/~labored
Newsletter?	No response.
Faculty	3 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	10%
Contract course	90%
Credit program?	Certificate (in collaboration with the other campuses).
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	65% union advocacy, 35% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Sectional trends and issues in the auto and state and local sectors, arbitration, and advocacy.
Area of special research expertise	Labor History, Labor and Employment Law, and Motor Vehicle Industrial Relations.
Consulting	Minimal

Longview Community College
The Institute of Labor Studies

Address	UMKC Economics Dept., 211 Haag Hall 5100 Rockhill Road Kansas City, MO 64110
Telephone	816-235-1470
Fax	816-235-2834
Web Site	http://www.umkc.edu/labor-ed
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	1 labor educator on staff, 1 part-time research associate.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	50%
Contract course	50%
Credit program?	Certificate in Labor Studies (certificate courses count for graduate credit).
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	50% union advocacy, 50% union education and credit courses for regular students, much presence in the community.
Area of specialization	General Labor Education and Labor in Schools, Radio and Media, Global Economy, Immigrant Workers.
Area of special research expertise	Globalization and effects of NAFTA on Mexico.
Consulting	Minimal consulting on bargaining.

University of Nebraska at Omaha
William Brennan Institute for Labor Studies

Address	Per Kiewit Conference Center 1313 Farnam Street Omaha, NE 68182
Telephone	402-595-2344
Fax	402-595-2321
Web Site	http://www.unomaha.edu/~wbils
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	2 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	26%
Contract course	74%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	63% union advocacy, 37% invited presentations to union and non-union audiences.
Area of specialization	Management Rights Clause & Union Power, Strategic Planning, and FMLA.
Area of special research expertise	No
Consulting	No

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Labor Studies and Employment Relations
School of Management and Labor Relations
Labor Education Center

Address	50 Labor Center Way New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8553
Telephone	732-932-9502
Fax	732-932-8677
Web Site	http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~smlr/
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	14 faculty including 2.5 extension specialists on soft money
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	50%
Contract course	50%
Credit program?	Bachelor of Arts, Master of Labor Education Relations, Doctor of Philosophy, and Certificate.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	Yes
Orientation of the program	60% union advocacy, 40% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Joint Labor-Management Programming, including preparing unions separately for joint interactions, research, occupational safety and health, and union leadership.
Area of special research expertise	Survey research and economic research.
Consulting	Labor-Management Partnerships—joint and union only consulting, strategic planning for locals, bargaining preparation, bargaining to organize, card check for contractors, curriculum development.

Cornell University
School of Industrial and Labor Relations

Address	Ithaca, NY 14853-3901
Telephone	607-255-2765
Fax	607-255-3274
Web Site	http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	27 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	15%
Contract course	85%
Credit program?	Certificate in Labor Studies.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	Yes
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Strategic issues.
Area of special research expertise	Organizing, organizational change.
Consulting	Yes

Harry Van Arsdale Jr. Center for Labor Studies
Empire State College
State University of NY*

Address	225 Varick Street, 2nd Floor New York, NY 10014-4382
Telephone	212-647-7801
Fax	212-647-7829
Web Site	http://www.esc.edu
Newsletter?	
Faculty	
Non-credit program?	
Non-credit certificate?	
Open enrollment	
Contract course	
Credit program?	
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	
Orientation of the program	
Area of specialization	
Area of special research expertise	
Consulting	

*Refused to respond to the survey

Queens College, City University of New York
Worker Education

Address	25 West 43rd Street New York, NY 10036
Telephone	212-827-0200
Fax	212-827-5955
Web Site	http://www.qc.edu/workered
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	8 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	95%
Contract course	5%
Credit program?	Bachelor of Arts degree in Labor Studies, Bachelor of Arts degree in Urban Studies, and Master of Arts degree in Urban Studies.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Labor and Public Policy.
Area of special research expertise	Public policy and labor movement.
Consulting	Yes

Youngstown State University
Labor Studies Program (LSP)
Center for Working Class Studies (CWCS)

Address	One University Plaza Youngstown, OH 44555-3701
Telephone	330-742-1783 (LSP); 330-742-1783 (CWCS)
Fax	330-742-1459
Web Site	http://www.as.ysu.edu/~cwcs (CWCS)
Newsletter?	Yes (CWCS)
Faculty	1 labor educator on staff.
Non-credit program?	No
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	99%
Contract course	1%
Credit program?	Certificate in Labor Studies, Associate's degree in Labor Studies, Bachelor's degree in Management.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No.
Orientation of the program	Basic labor relations skills and working-class life and culture.
Area of specialization	Working Class Studies, Organizing Model of Unionism.
Area of special research expertise	Corporate Research, Training on the Organizing Model, Working Class Studies.
Consulting	Strategic Campaigns, Organizing Model, and Non-Board Strategies.

University of Oregon
Labor Education and Research Center

Address	1289 University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403-1289
Telephone	541-346-5054
Fax	541-346-2790
Web Site	http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~lerc
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	10 labor educators on staff, 3.5 project staff (on soft money).
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	36%
Contract course	64%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	95% union advocacy, 5% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Strategic planning, internal organizing & solidarity building, grievance-handling, contract campaigns, staff & leadership development, arbitration training, & curriculum development.
Area of special research expertise	Strategic campaigns, labor & working-class history, safety & health, union density (quantitative), job training & workforce-related issues, building trades apprenticeship programs, and organizer & union staff training.
Consulting	Joint labor-management consultation, primarily with Kaiser Permanente Partnership, involving program evaluation & curriculum development. Free consultation to unions on safety & health matters. Facilitation of strategic analysis & planning for unions & the state AFL-CIO. Consultation with unions on staff & leadership development & internal organizing campaigns.

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania Center for the Study of Labor Relations

Address	390 Pratt Drive 9 Keith Hall Indiana, PA 15705
Telephone	724-357-2645; Toll Free: 1-877-314-0581
Fax	724-357-2564
Web Site	http://www.hhs.iup.edu/laborcenter
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	1 part-time labor educator on staff, 1 full-time labor educator on staff, 1 labor educator on soft money.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	20%
Contract course	80%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Labor History, Safety and Health, Negotiations, Steward Training, Women's Issues, and Child Labor.
Area of special research expertise	Labor History, International/Comparative Labor Relations.
Consulting	International, Safety and Health, and Labor and Regional History.

The Pennsylvania State University
Labor Studies and Industrial Relations

Address	133 Willard Building University Park, PA 16802-1600
Telephone	814-865-5425
Fax	814-865-9545
Web Site	http://lsir.la.psu.edu/labored/about.html
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	2 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	40%
Contract course	60%
Credit program?	Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts, and Master of Science.
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	90% union advocacy, 10% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	None
Area of special research expertise	Membership attitude surveys and healthcare research.
Consulting	Union education programs.

Middle Tennessee State University
Tennessee Center for Labor Management Relations

Address	132 Heritage Park Drive, Suite 2 Murfreesboro, TN 37129
Telephone	615-895-4166
Fax	615-895-9389
Web Site	http://www.mtsu.edu/~tnclmr
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	1.5 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	30%
Contract course	70%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	Joint labor-management.
Area of specialization	Workplace issues programs, labor-management cooperative programs, and union programs.
Area of special research expertise	Legal research.
Consulting	Facilitation of conferences.

The Evergreen State College
Labor Education and Research Center

Address	2700 Evergreen Parkway NW Olympia, WA 98505
Telephone	360-866-6000
Fax	360-866-6798
Web Site	http://www.evergreen.edu/laborcenter
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	3 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	40%
Contract course	60%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	100% union advocacy.
Area of specialization	Rank and file organizing, women organizing women, basic union skills development, unions and employee ownership, and international solidarity.
Area of special research expertise	Impact of organizing schools on rank and file participants; economic performance of employee-owned companies (quantitative and qualitative research).
Consulting	Consulting and facilitation for organizations, sympathetic to unions.

University of Wisconsin Extension
School for Workers

Address	610 Langdon Street Madison, WI 53703
Telephone	608-262-2112
Fax	608-265-2391
Web Site	http://schoolforworkers.uwex.edu
Newsletter?	No
Faculty	7.5 labor educators on hard money, 1.5 project staff on soft money.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	42%
Contract course	58%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	79% union advocacy, 16 % joint labor-management programs, and 5% different orientation.
Area of specialization	Ergonomics/Occupational Health & Safety, Industrial Engineering, Computer Applications for Unions, Pension Bargaining, New Compensation Systems, and Local Union Budgeting and Accounting.
Area of special research expertise	Compensation issues, gain sharing, skill-based pay, ergonomics, industrial engineering, job evaluation, work measurement, technology, union budgeting and accounting, and pensions.
Consulting	Provide extensive consulting in the areas of expertise and in bargaining and contract administration. Serve as expert witnesses and facilitate union strategic planning and labor management groups.

Southern Appalachian Labor Center

Address	P.O. Box 127 Kincaid, WV 25119
Telephone	304-442-3157; 304-779-2280
Fax	304-442-3285; 304-779-2772
Web Site	http://www.sals.info
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	7 labor educators on soft money.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	Yes
Open enrollment	100%
Contract course	0%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	Community oriented.
Area of specialization	Social Issues and Civil Responsibilities.
Area of special research expertise	None
Consulting	No

West Virginia University
Institute for Labor Studies and Research

Address	714 Knapp Hall P.O. Box 6031 Morgantown, WV 26506-6031
Telephone	304-293-3323
Fax	304-293-3395
Web Site	http://www.wvu.edu
Newsletter?	Yes
Faculty	6 labor educators on staff.
Non-credit program?	Yes
Non-credit certificate?	No
Open enrollment	50%
Contract course	50%
Credit program?	No
Feeder of George Meany Center - National Labor College Bachelor's Program	No
Orientation of the program	90% union advocacy, 10% joint labor-management programs.
Area of specialization	Arbitration, West Virginia State and Local Politics, Safety & Health, Collective Bargaining, and Building Trade Issues.
Area of special research expertise	Quantitative and survey research.
Consulting	Yes

Additional copies of the
Report on the State of Labor Education in the United States
can be ordered for **\$12.00 each** (including shipping).

*Please make check or money order payable to **U.C. Regents**
and send with completed order form (below)*

to:

Center for Labor Research and Education
Institute of Industrial Relations
University of California
2521 Channing Way #5555
Berkeley, CA 94720

For credit card purchases, please call 510-643-7089

Order Form

Report on the State of Labor Education in the United States

of copies _____ (\$12.00 each, including shipping)

name: _____

organization: _____

address: _____

city, state, zip: _____

phone number: _____

email: _____