

The Status of Labor Education in Higher Education in the United States

by Helena Worthen

**A Report Commissioned and Released by the Executive Board of the
United Association for Labor Education, Fall 2015**

UALE Executive Board Advisory Committee

Sarah Laslett, University Representative

Cheryl Teare, President, UALE

Tony Michael, Vice President, Universities

Al Davidoff, Vice President, Unions

Robert Bruno, Labor Studies Journal Liaison

1. Introduction	pg 1
2. Definition of labor education	pg 5
<u>Section One: The Study</u>	pg 5
3. Survey methods and data	
4. Overall findings	pg 7
a. Funding	
b. Staffing	
c. Politically motivated attacks	
Attacks from outside	
Attacks that are part of the changing mission of public higher education	
5. How the corporatization of higher education impacts labor education	pg 11
Examples of damaging administrative actions	
6. How labor education programs are responding	pg 14
Regularizing and institutionalizing programs	
Reaching out to new demographics	
Increasing revenue	
7. Multiple Constituencies, Multiple Messages	pg 18
See the toolkit released by the UALE Executive Board in conjunction with this report	
<u>Section Two: Higher Education as an Engine for Civic Engagement</u>	pg 19
8. The Importance of Labor Education within Higher Education to the General Public	
9. The Historic Public Mission of Higher Education	pg 20
10. Framing the Role of Labor Education in Higher Education	pg 23
11. Conclusion: A short timetable	pg 26
Bibliography and references	pg 28

1. Introduction

This report describes how the transformation of higher education has affected labor education programs in the United States and how labor education programs have responded. It is based on findings of a survey done for the United Association for Labor Education (UALE) in fall and winter 2014-2015. The purpose of this survey is to assess how university and college-based labor education programs are doing in the United States.

The United Association for Labor Education is the professional association for labor educators and labor education programs. This report is addressed to the UALE Executive Board, which is made up of union-based, community-based and college and university-based labor educators from the US and Canada. In the past 10 to 15 years, some college and university-based programs have reported problems including politically-motivated direct attacks. Many have moved to new locations in their institutions or out of that institution into a different one (specifically, from a university to a community college). Others have re-organized, undertaken new initiatives and reached out to new demographics. Some have ceased to exist. However, detailed information on the state of labor education with which UALE could make strategic decisions was lacking.

The need for a concerted strategy can be heard in some of the comments, made during interviews for this survey, from directors of college and university programs. Notably, all the quotes below came from labor educators (Directors) at institutions of public higher education.

- “We’re fighting for our lives.”
- “It’s death by a thousand cuts.”
- “Things are tending dark.”
- “If it weren’t for members of our Advisory Board providing political support, we’d be dead in the water. The University wouldn’t be interested in us because it’s mostly market-driven.”
- “We’re in an existential crisis.”
- “To fight cuts, you have to mobilize thousands of workers. If you want cuts, all it takes is one phone call.”
- “It’s dollar ship, not scholarship.”
- “I feel if I quit, Labor Studies might disappear. Labor Studies is something that I love, and I believe certain administrators want it to end.”

In the US, over a period starting in the early 1970s up through the present (2015), organized labor declined in numbers and changed in demographics, becoming more female, African American and Latino. As the constituency of organized labor changed, so has the constituency of labor education. Today, the 7% - 10% of workers who have union representation are viewed as the lucky middle class, not the oppressed working

class. So what about the other 90% of working people? They are a critical audience for labor education and a significant percentage of them are more likely to attend a public institution of higher education than to be union members.

There is a wide range of labor education programs that operate quite differently from one another and in very different kinds of Higher Ed institutions. There are community college programs, programs in land grant public university programs, and programs at elite private non-denominational or religious universities. Some do adult basic education with a worker advocacy perspective; some are associated with workforce development education; others grant MA degrees. Some are funded by federal grants, others run on endowments, fee-based extension revenue, shares of online tuition or direct support from the labor movement. In addition to these Higher Ed programs, and the education programs within unions themselves, it's important to recognize the emergence of small non-profit community-based programs, often housed in workers centers. While these kinds of programs, like their union counterparts, are outside of the scope of this report, they play an increasing and critical role in the broader world of labor education, especially for low-income and immigrant workers. What all these different kinds of programs have in common is a commitment to the welfare of the working class through education about work and workers' organizations.

Colleges and Universities are hierarchical, bureaucratic institutions with many layers. The layers act like levels in a waterfall. Decision-making authority and money flow down the waterfall, not up. Over the last 35 years and increasingly in the last 5 or 10 years, colleges and universities have been "streamlining" themselves (a term used by the current Director of a labor education program) to shake out some of the bureaucracy, but this is taking place along a corporate model of change rather than a democratic or bottom-up model. The corporate model is suited to the transformed mission of the institution. It is not unusual any more to read a mission statement like this one for the University of Alaska, which says that "Preparing a qualified workforce is one of the most important missions of the university," and that it is "in alignment" with the University of Alaska Statewide Office of Workforce Programs' role "to help facilitate developing industry-driven training and degree programs..." (www.alaska.edu/research/wp/)

From this perspective, unions are a hindrance to the free market, and learning about unions is as threatening as learning about organizing. But many other programs that have their roots in the days when public higher education served citizenship goals have also been cut or eliminated. In the corporate model, all these programs are vulnerable. The days of accessible liberal or humanist higher education for the broad public are limited. In this new context, labor education is seen as irrelevant to the mission of higher education.

In other words, it seems that the primary motive behind what appear to be attacks on labor education programs is not anti-unionism, although that certainly plays a role, especially when it comes to unions within higher education itself or other public sector

unions. Instead, what lies behind the “death by a thousand cuts” is a re-positioning of higher education generally, especially public higher education, to serve business and industry through workforce development. “Workforce development” here means training sufficient numbers of workers in field where labor is in demand so that scarcity of labor does not drive up wages. This contrasts with citizenship goals. This re-positioning enables the extraction of cash value that can be captured for private purposes from the accumulated social capital of public higher education. Adding fuel to this fire are opportunistic media-savvy attacks originating in Chamber of Commerce-funded think tanks. These are often the same organizations that push anti-union legislation like right-to-work laws and fight pro-worker legislation like increases in the minimum wage.

2. Definition of Labor Education

In the US, we use the term “labor education” to mean four different things. These concepts are *labor studies*, *worker education*, *union education* and *labor extension*. A *labor studies* course is an academic, usually for-credit course in which students learn about labor, but do not necessarily apply what they learn. Labor history is a typical labor studies course. *Worker education*, which has a long history going back to the industrial revolution, deals with whatever workers need and can mean anything from basic literacy to, for example, organizing to get better public transit or healthcare for retired miners. *Union education* is education that takes place in, and is usually designed by or with, unions. In Canada, most of what many in the US call labor education takes place in unions, while what takes place in colleges and universities is really labor studies. Finally, *labor extension* is the kind of outreach-to-the-labor movement education that most of us associate with labor education, and that many labor educators think is one of the primary missions of institutions of public higher education. It is “extension” in the sense that it extends the resources of the institution to the public, as do agricultural extension, small business and public health programs, for example.

All of these share a common mission of worker advocacy and service to the working class and its organizations. This distinguishes them from human resource management programs, to which they are often closely linked institutionally.

SECTION ONE: THE STUDY

3. The Survey: Data and Method

This project was begun in September 2014. In addition to a set of college and university based programs in Canada, which are not included in this report, I gathered a list of 72 programs at colleges and universities in the United States. Some institutions had multiple distinct sites and these were treated as separate programs. Of these, 2 were at community-based organizations, 5 were at private non-profit institutions. 15 were at

community college and 50 were at public state colleges or universities. Not surprisingly, no labor education programs were found in the for-profit higher education sector.

Of the 72 programs I identified, 19 or 20 (one was in transition) or 27% were gone. Among these were 1 housed at a private non-profit institution, 6 community college programs, and 12 public state university programs.

Fifty-two or 53 were thus still in existence. I did 47 interviews with these programs. Because some had multiple sites that house substantially different ways of delivering labor education and had had different experiences, I sometimes did more than one interview, talking with people at different sites that are all part of one institution. I was also able to get firsthand information about several programs that had closed or moved, and I have included those in the interviews. Overall, the 47 interviews cover 41 institutions.

All interviewees were asked about trends in staffing and funding, whether they had been the target of politically-motivated attacks, and what new areas of expansion or development they may have explored. Many interviewees explained that while political attacks had taken place, what was really going on had more to do with the corporatization of public higher education. Labor education was not specifically a target; it was just one among many vulnerable small programs. Target or not, the administrative actions that have taken place have weakened and even eliminated some programs. However, other programs have found ways to strengthen and regularize their place in their institutions, reach new populations and bring in new revenue, especially from online programs.

The interviews were nearly all phone interviews (one or two respondents wrote out their responses to those general issues and sent me what they had written). I took notes, and subsequently wrote up the notes to organize them, and put them into the same general order of topics as other interviews. Once the notes were re-organized, I sent them back to the subject for corrections and editing. If months had elapsed between the original interview (some were done in October) and my approaching deadline, I sent the corrected version back a second time to see if anything important had changed.

The core set of programs that I began with were those first investigated by Bruce Nissen in 2001-2002. To these I added programs from a set of interviews I did in 2010, a set by Bob Bussel in 2014, and some sent to me by other labor educators, including John Revette from Michigan State. I was able to track some trends in staffing from 2002 to 2010 and 2014 using the surveys done by Bruce Nissen, Bob Bussel (2014) and myself (2010-revised14). Where historical data on staffing was lacking, I could not see a trend. Finally, I did web searches, which revealed a number of community college programs.

4. Overall Findings

The findings are presented here in four general categories. First is funding, followed by staffing. Money and people are the resources that enable a program to do its work. The third category is political attacks. In the 2002 Nissen survey, attacks were not an issue. At that time, the demise of some programs had come about because of internal issues, not because of deliberate attacks. By the 2010s, however, the country had become polarized. Attacks on unions and the public sector generally had become familiar. By 2015 some state legislatures had changed from Democrat to Republican, some governors had made attacking unions a signature cause, more states had become right-to-work states, and many labor education programs based in public colleges and universities were vulnerable. However, the findings in the fourth category show that the range of strategies being employed to keep labor education programs alive is enormous. In some cases, even in this hostile political environment, programs are expanding.

Funding

Some programs were able to name a figure that represents their budgets. When this was possible, I recorded the amount. In some cases this is public information, where a program has an annual appropriation from the state legislature. But funding comes in varying amounts from state legislatures and passes in different ways through the university or sometimes directly to the program. These appropriations are subject to political decisions at the legislative level. Dedicated appropriations can also be changed in the budget process of the university, although not eliminated there without an act by the legislature. Other programs have funding that is bundled into the general university budget. In recent years, this is the funding most likely to be cut.

Some programs (7) have a separate stream of revenue that comes from an online program although what the program can do with that revenue varies. In addition, most programs collect fees for putting on extension classes and conferences or doing applied research. This money appears to be the most discretionary part of a program's budget. Among the outliers is a program that gets no money from its institution at all (i.e., it has to make a separate application to their administration do things like print brochures), and a program that is entirely funded by gifts and donations from the labor movement.

Many programs were not able to identify a dollar number representing their total budget. Instead, their university or college administrators tell them what they can expect in terms of staffing, but not in terms of dollars. They are also told what positions they can hire. Different types of positions cost different amounts of money. A tenure-track position will likely cost more than a contingent or non-faculty position, and will encumber the university in a different way. From the point of view of the labor education program, the primary concern is to have enough people to do the work.

Overall, based on the programs that were able to report a figure, a small program (one full-time labor educator, several adjuncts) might have a budget of \$150-\$200,000 per year. A medium-sized program might have a budget of \$600,000 per year. A large program could have a budget of \$1 million to \$2.5, up to \$4 million.

Programs that could name their budgets also reported budget cuts. Most cuts were described as part of the overall corporatization of the university without specific attention to labor education programs. Programs that were in Centers (as compared to Institutes, Departments, Schools, etc.) reported that Centers in general were easy targets and were sometimes all eliminated. Others reported variable percentage cuts, for instance, from 4% one year to 6% the following year.

Staffing

Staffing is a much better indicator of the health of a program than a budget, because the cost of staff varies depending on the nature of the position.

Current staffing for the whole field of labor education is as follows: there are 87 tenure or tenure track faculty; 162 non-tenure track faculty or faculty with permanent or contract status; 261 adjuncts and 91 staff, which includes administrative, technical and other staff. Adjuncts are the primary workforce of the online programs but also teach in large face-to-face programs.

I was able to get trends in staffing information from 53 programs. Twenty programs reported a decrease in staffing; 6 appeared to have held steady. Thirteen of these were gone. Thirteen had increased staffing. In other words, out of 53 programs, if you add the ones that are gone and the ones that have lost staff (13 plus 21 = 34 out of 53) two thirds of the programs have lost staff or disappeared altogether.

Of the 6 that had held steady, one is on federal grants that have been stable (they are health and safety grants); at another, the staff agreed to all share a salary cut; the third is a two-person program; a fourth takes explicitly protective measures to keep individual staff out of the spotlight and the fifth has a substantial endowment.

Painting an overall picture of trends in numbers of staff is tricky, because in previous studies there was no clear distinction made between administrative, professional, grant-writing or other kinds of staff, and no mention of whether labor educators were tenure track or not. In addition, there are positions that have not been filled (i.e., a tenure line appointment), but remain available to the program for future use. Also, in the programs that have credit online programs, the number of adjuncts hired has boomed. Adjuncts are apparently the primary workforce for college and university based online credit programs. However, large numbers of adjuncts are also used in urban center programs that do face-to-face classes. Among the 13 programs that reported an increase in staff, at least 5 included adjuncts in their count.

The 13 programs that increased staff range in size and character. At one extreme is a community college where one sociology professor has started running a public lecture series. At the other end of the spectrum another community college program which handles 850 students per semester and hires 40 adjuncts. Some programs do what is historically known as worker education, including grassroots organizing and basic adult education. Others draw students from a global application pool and have a strong affiliation with international unions and labor organizations. Finally, some programs have gone entirely on line whereas others are entirely face-to-face extension.

While there is a very big difference between the complete death of a program and loss of one or two staff, the fact that two thirds of the programs I looked at have either lost staff or closed entirely should be a warning sign. Labor extension programming involves outreach and logistics work that faculty in traditional academic disciplines never have to deal with. Programs with very few staff pointed out that, unlike programs that serve for-credit students enrolled traditional college classes, extension work involves travel, outreach for recruitment and curriculum development, setting fees and collecting money, publicity and logistics, including sometimes having to find a place to hold the class. This work goes far beyond just showing up for class. Several persons interviewed noted that it would be impossible for a single person to keep a program like this alive. According to my count, between 6 and 10 programs are working with one or two full-time labor educators. However, since some programs have undergone complete re-organizations, staffing should not be taken to be the only, or even the main measure of the viability of a program.

Another measure would be how much work they are doing. Most programs reported that they were doing more with less – reaching more students, developing more programs, and hosting more events, despite having fewer staff. This was also a finding in the report done by Bruce Nissen (2002). But there is a burnout limit to how much even the most dedicated teams can accomplish.

This review of the staffing of labor education programs gives us a number we had not looked for in advance: the total number of people in the national workforce of labor educators. That number is 601; this includes tenure track, non-tenure track, adjunct faculty and staff. This is the number of people employed in colleges and universities to do labor education in all its various forms. Some of these are technology people or communications staff. This does not include the people working at programs where I did not do an interview. It does not include people called in to teach one or two classes as part of a conference. That would put the total number at over 700. We should think of these numbers not only as an indication of the number of jobs doing labor education. We should also ask if, given the purpose of labor education, this number is sufficient to carry out that purpose.

Politically-Motivated Attacks: Attacks from Outside

Another goal of this survey was to assess to what extent labor education programs were suffering attacks of various sorts. This request was stimulated by the news about attempts in recent years by Chamber-of-Commerce related right wing think tanks, such as the Freedom Foundation, the Landmark Foundation, the Maclver and Mackinaw Centers, to challenge the work of labor education programs in public colleges and universities, accusing them of using public funding to “promote private interests.” These attacks are often related to the efforts of Republican legislators. Since every state has a Chamber of Commerce, one could expect that every state with a labor education program sited at a public institution could expect these attacks. They are usually based on the claim that public money is being used for private interests, equating workers’ rights to representation with a private interest. Some labor educators remember the days when they were accused of being Communists, or when they were attacked for protesting the Vietnam War. “Marxist” is still a term of use by these critics. The blandness of the contemporary attacks does not make them less problematic.

As the interview process moved forward, I was being told by the people I was talking with that although attacks like these are time consuming to deal with, often involving Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests for massive numbers of documents including emails, they are not usually fatal to programs. One Director noted that the whole university understood that these attacks are attacks on academic freedom, which is valued across the institution. Also, colleges and universities are supposed to have officers who are trained in how to respond to FOIA requests, which know to distinguish what emails to produce, what to charge for the work, and what can be discarded on what timeline. One labor program reported that their university was well prepared for such a request; another reported that their administration was utterly unprepared.

Reports of attacks of this sort were limited to public institutions. This probably because private institutions are not run primarily on public funding and therefore are not subject to FOIA requests. Their budgets are also not in the public eye, debated in the legislature or attractive to a legislator or governor trying to get headlines. But the claim that the study of work, working class experience and workers’ rights is in the service of “private interests” or is not a genuine discipline, or has no place in the academy could equally be made against private institutions as against public institutions. According to the interviews for this survey, this has not happened.

Of course, there have been cases of what appeared to be ideological attacks from within the college or university. Whether they spring from ignorance or bullying is hard to tell. For example, one program director was told to “cease and desist teaching anything that might lead to insubordination.” Another was told to “do less advocacy and be more industrial relations.” Another college President, after doing what was apparently a skimpy internet search, decided that labor education did not belong in a College of Business. When political leaders advocated for another program, their Chancellor asked,

“If you have such friends, why don’t the unions pay your salaries?” Some administrators are susceptible to the argument that labor education programs “use public money for private interests.”

Politically-Motivated Attacks: The Changing Mission of Public Higher Education

What is more likely to harm a program, but is not a specific attack on labor education per se, is the trend that affects higher education in the United States generally: the push to shift the mission of higher education from providing citizens with the opportunity to get a traditional “good education” for democracy and a good society, to employer-and-industry designed, labor-market driven workforce development and professional vocational programs. This trend is ideologically in alignment with the external and explicitly political attacks and the impact is much larger and more permanent. Also, it is implemented by an institutional governance structure that resembles a mid-century industrial bureaucracy, heavy with administrative middle management and topped by high-salaried, democracy-proof CEO’s.

5. How the Corporatization of Higher Education Impacts Labor Education Programs

Whereas outreach to agriculture became, over time, outreach to agribusiness, outreach to the labor movement has become outreach to working people and is not a good plan for a profit center. Therefore running a college or university like a business gives labor education programs an uncertain footing in their institutions. First we should look at where labor education programs are housed. Many of the programs I looked at reported recent changes in name or institutional location. This can be seen as an indication of uncertainty about where they belong. Below are listed some different kinds of sites where labor education happens, listed from low to high, generally, in terms of autonomy and security.

- Individual courses dispersed among other programs, sometimes called an “emphasis” rather than a “program”
- Programs (this could be a concentration, a minor, or a major);
- Departments or Divisions
- Centers or Institutes
- Schools or Colleges

I say “generally” because some programs (a term I will use broadly) contend that having a low profile is safer than being highly visible, as a Center, for example.

Programs are often aggregated together with other disciplines in schools, colleges, departments and divisions such as the following:

- Schools of Social Work; Labor and Employment Relations; Management and Labor Relations; New Learning; Human Resources and Labor Relations,
- Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Social Sciences, Liberal Arts, Business, Health and Human Services
- Departments of Sociology, Economics, Interdisciplinary Studies
- Divisions of Continuing Education; Lifelong Learning; Continuing Education, Outreach and Online Learning

Most of these sites have something to do with social sciences or else professional vocational programs related to business and management. The point of listing them is to suggest that in the current fluid state of higher education, there is no easy agreement about a place for labor education in the sense that a math class belongs in the math department, or history belongs in a history department. Furthermore, most programs reported either a change in name or a change in location during the last ten years.

The stability of a program is also a function of the individual educator's status. An individual faculty person may have tenure or be on the tenure track, be contingent (on a year-to-year contract) or adjunct on longer contracts, or hold one of the dozens of positions labeled "visiting" or "professional," or otherwise be on soft money, including positions where individuals have to raise funds to cover their own salaries. In some programs a labor educator is required to have tenure in another department (sociology or economics for example) in order to have tenure at all; no tenure is granted to that person as a labor educator. According to this survey only 17% (87 out of 510) of the total number of full-time faculty doing labor education have tenure or are tenure-track. A slightly greater number (162, or 38%) have year-to-year contracts or some other form of security. The biggest share are adjuncts (51%, or 261 out of 510) who have no job security whatsoever. Although 18 out of the 52 programs reviewed have unions, I did not hear of any unions that had negotiated ongoing contracts for adjuncts.

Whether or not a union represents faculty also makes a difference. Twenty-three programs had some faculty with tenure. Eighteen had faculty who were represented by a union. Sixteen had both tenured faculty and a union. Programs where faculty were represented might send a delegate to a Central Labor Council or have other direct relationships with the state and local labor movement.

What follows is a list of impacts labor education programs have experienced. In some cases, they have fought back and survived. In other cases, these are ongoing "frog-in-boiling water" situations. The common theme here, is that step by step, programs are tested to see if they can become better at generating revenue – if they can contribute to the institution as a business. If they fail that test, they are vulnerable to losing funding

and staff until they can no longer function.

- Declining enrollment is punished with cuts in funding; this is a management strategy for an institution as a whole, especially if it is one of several institutions in a system that are made to compete with each other.
- The program exists as a line item in the state budget and is lined out entirely by the Governor or the legislature. One program had all its funding cut – except for \$1,000. That \$1,000 per year is presumably still rolling into a university budget category somewhere.
- In a given institution, every program that stands out is eliminated, with Centers especially, vulnerable, being faculty-heavy. Foreign language centers, Cancer Research centers, Agriculture Extension Centers – all gone.
- All “public service” programs in an institution are required to become self-supporting.
- Labor educators are asked to charge fees comparable to fees for classes for business executives. This may be between \$600 and \$1,000 per day.
- Individual labor educators are required to cover their own salaries with fees.
- A program with a large endowment moved from the College of Business to another site; the College of Business kept control of the endowment.
- Programs are shuffled around and moved to new locations; in this new location, new contracts are written that increase costs, requiring them to cover rent, overhead, etc. Needs such as video conferencing equipment is lost in the move.
- An administration decides to “apply all rules” in ways that small programs with little or no staff can not follow, such as keeping buildings open during vacations when faculty are away.
- Class size minimums are raised; if enrollment falls below 15 (or 20 or 30), the class is cancelled. Whether the class is an extension class at a university or a community college class where funding is a per capita formula, the entire revenue is lost. If the teacher is an adjunct, they lose a teaching job.
- The assignments of labor educators are distributed into administrative tasks in other programs because they have “transferrable skills” leaving less time to perform labor education.

- Staffing is reduced to below where the work can actually be done (recruiting, publicity, administration, outreach, teaching).
- Tenure lines are eliminated or changed to contract positions. No approval is given to hire into tenure lines.
- Organizational structures are downgraded: a Center becomes a Department, a Department becomes a Program, a Program becomes a set of courses dispersed through other Departments; a major is eliminated.
- The accreditation process itself is used as a tool for transforming a public higher education (see the example of San Francisco City College). Explicit demands that the college become a workforce-development and transfer institution, eliminating adult and general education programs, are made.
- A program is given an unreasonable deadline for putting courses on line.

6. Responses of Labor Education Programs to Pressures and Attacks

There are basically three ways in which labor education programs are responding to these attacks. Despite being situated in the heart of an industry (higher education) that is travelling swiftly towards the corporate model, labor education programs that are committed to worker advocacy and collective empowerment have found ways to at least delay loss of effectiveness.

The first strategy is to regularize labor education programs in ways that embed them more in the institution or even the state policy scene, make them visible and part of the public calendar, and multiply the voices that speak on their behalf. The second strategy is to go beyond the old target demographic of union leaders and their members and reach out to new demographics including women, minorities, immigrants, and especially non-union low-wage workers who are part of the rising social justice movement. The third strategy, which overlaps in many instances with the first two but has an additional planning element, is to develop programs that will not only perform public service but will also bring in substantial revenue to help keep a program sustainable.

Strategies for regularizing and strengthening labor education programs

Below are presented some of the ways that labor education programs have regularized and institutionalized structures of support.

- Building an active Labor Advisory Board. These are usually on a statewide level and include both labor leaders and important public figures, sometimes from social justice organizations like Jobs with Justice. Some programs have regional or local labor advisory boards. Some programs

expect the organizations that have representatives on their LAB to host at least one program per year. Members of LABs can also advocate for state budget priorities that support higher education generally and thereby, make allies with the college or university.

- Helping to build a campus labor coalition across all campus unions or if non-represented, other worker groups such as transportation workers, cooks, landscapers, building service personnel, clerical staff, etc, with regular meetings to address issue of importance to college or university employees. This places labor educators in a positive relationship with faculty from other disciplines who are equally employees of the institution.
 - Developing alumni networks and using alumni as ambassadors for recruiting and for advocacy for the program.
 - Building relationships with Central Labor Councils to offer a regular series of education events, sometimes open to the public. Some Directors of labor education programs serve on Central Labor Councils.
 - Hiring labor leaders, including staff or labor lawyers as adjuncts to teach credit classes and thereby building networks of informed and supportive public figures. These networks can be state-wide.
- Getting labor studies classes accepted as electives that fulfill a general education requirement; creating a labor studies minor or major; including labor studies classes among classes listed for history, ethnic studies, interdisciplinary studies, etc.; getting labor studies classes approved for transfer (for example, in a community college with a transfer agreement with a four-year university system);
 - Creating internships with a research or capstone component which can be carried out in an area social justice organization;
 - Develop and set up specialized fundable units that focus on a highly visible issue: a Black workers or Latino center, immigrant resource center, center for social justice, precarious worker center, etc.
 - Carry out joint projects (mentoring, internships, research requiring access to unions) with law schools, Centers for Occupational Health, departments like history. “Bring down the Berlin wall between academic and extension faculty; become more policy-oriented and strategic, hold issue-related conferences” that drive research.

- Develop an MA degree.
- Join with other department heads or Directors to form a Council of college or university employees holding that position; form a union-like collective that can negotiate with upper management.
- Move to another School, College or site within an institution where the principles which frame labor education (labor rights, for example) are accepted as fundamental and correct.

Directions of expansion into new demographics

Labor education programs have reached out to new demographics, which means workers who are not in unions, workers coming through workforce development or job training programs, workers centers that assist immigrants or undocumented workers, etc. At least one program does workers education in prisons. It also means reaching out to workers, unions and union leadership in other countries and building on the idea of “global” unionism. The following is an incomplete list of different activities undertaken by programs to extend the work they do:

- Incubating a workers’ center for immigrant workers, or for workers in a specific industry;
- Working with prisoners in local prisons;
- Creating a state-specific or locally-specific or industry-specific workers’ rights manual targeted at unorganized workers in the state;
- Hosting a festival open to the public, such as a film festival, labor heritage festival, social justice organization festival, arts festival, Pride festival;
- Become a hub for conferences and “conversations” about difficult issues related to work, to which organizations with varying perspectives can be pulled together;
- Develop international programming or a degree that draws students from other countries; build close relationships with international labor bodies or unions in other countries;
- Teach US-type industrial relations content in developing countries;
- Broaden scope of work to include “community studies” or “urban studies:” take a comprehensive approach to the study of work.

- Do applied research specific to certain industries, such as research on prevailing wage, on the employment effects of mining, or on policy proposals such as the impact of right-to-work or increase of the minimum wage, pensions and corporate stewardship, for which the audience is industry leadership or state and national policy makers.

Revenue-generating strategies

Labor education programs have also increased revenue-generating activities. Some of these are also strategies for integrating programs into the most stable aspects of the institution and/or reaching out to new demographics, but they are listed separately (or repeated here) because they are also especially revenue generating.

- Develop online credit courses (probably the biggest revenue-generating activity of all; but how the revenue from online programs is distributed to the labor education program where they originate varies from one institution to another and is not always at the discretion of the program). However, putting courses on line is time-consuming and some programs are finding that they are being asked or pushed to put courses online without adequate time or support.
- Develop online non-credit (labor extension) classes. Different budget agreements will apply, but this is a way to use available university technology to do extension labor education;
- Work with national-level unions to teach at a national level in multiple regions. Some labor ed programs have become virtually the labor education department of certain unions.
- Produce regular research projects dealing with state-level workforce issues reporting to the state legislature. The regularity of an accurate, comprehensive annual study of the future of work in a specific state makes it hard to do without once it becomes established.
- Establish a regular, repeating leadership academy or institute that draws enrollment from specific leadership levels of unions; depending on who the target participants are, these are referred to as “Boot Camp” or “Leadership Academy,” and are taught as cohort groups.
- Do direct fundraising. Use the alumni network for fundraising as well as for public visibility and advocacy.

- Build an endowment.

The key to many of these is structure and regularity. Annual projects, research publications, leadership schools, festivals, and graduations all can be built upon year after year to create a supportive public. Labor Advisory Boards with regular meetings and alumni groups who can be ambassadors to the labor movement are structures that can also support other structures.

Online programs seem to be a very good source of revenue, both for the institution and depending on how the agreements are negotiated, for the program. The most stable arrangement seems to be when an online program also leads to a BA or MA, and when its courses are integrated into general education requirements.

7. Multiple Constituencies, Multiple Messages

Labor education has three primary constituencies with which they must build productive and ongoing working relationships if they are to survive and thrive: unions and labor councils; the colleges and universities where labor education is housed and practiced; and the legislators that can fight either for or against their funding. The UALE Executive Board has released a "Messaging Guide" in conjunction with this report to offer specific recommendations, based in part on the findings of this study, about how Labor Educators and especially Directors of Labor Education and Labor Studies programs can approach messaging within these key relationships.

The message guide also offers some recommendations for messaging within two other relationships that are key to the success of labor education within Higher Education. These are recommendations for labor leaders. They cover how labor leaders might consider communicating about what they need and how collaboration with Higher Ed programs might serve their strategic goals, and how labor leaders who advocate within state legislatures on behalf of funding for these programs might approach the messaging challenge.

SECTION TWO: HIGHER EDUCATION AS AN ENGINE FOR CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

8. The Importance of Labor Education in Higher Education to the General Public

While it is the case that labor education within Higher Education is primarily used by organized labor and those few college students who are interested in labor history and politics, labor education as a practice, and the role it is struggling to play within higher education has broader implications for the general public and the economy, especially in this day and age when "union" has practically become a dirty word. We need a public voice based outside of unions to champion our importance and, to get that, we need a way to talk about labor education that will make sense to a general audience.

To get a sense of what labor educators think the public knows about labor education, a separate survey was posted on the UALE list serve in Fall 2014. Forty nine people, mostly self-identified labor educators, took the survey. These were people who have almost certainly had the experience of telling someone what they did for a living and having the other person say, "What's that?" Or in some cases, "Is that legal?"

The responders thought that the overwhelming majority (86%) of people don't know what labor education is. This was the case both with people that they meet and talk to and people who are "the general public." This indicates a void that is easy to fill with misinformation. The word "labor" itself gets a squirmy so-so response, although respondents would not want to stop using it. Interestingly, responders did not list university and college administrations as opponents of labor education. However, they did say that the most serious attacks on labor education are cuts in funding that come through their universities and colleges, and which take many forms.

In other words, the lack of public awareness of labor education invites attacks that can build quickly based on ignorance and stereotypical assumptions about what "labor" means and what unions do. This lack of public awareness means that there is no basis for a fight back that is broader than the fight that elements of organized labor are already prepared to undertake. There is no broad public program to combat ignorance and misunderstanding of critical issue, like right-to-work legislation, that have devastating effects on working people far beyond the scope of unions themselves. Also, defenses of publicly funded labor education programs have to be timed to intervene at critical moments in the legislative cycle of a state government. Attacks can be carried out almost instantly; repair takes time. Thus there is a visibility problem, a branding problem, a misinformation problem and a timing problem.

While labor education programs in private institutions or social justice community organizations can justify themselves directly as educating about a fundamental right,

programs in public higher education have a different task. To make an argument for labor education in higher education, we have to directly confront the direction that public higher education is moving, which is toward employer-designed, industry-driven job training and professional vocational programs. The constituency of labor education is working people, who need to learn how to claim a greater, fairer share of the wealth that they produce, and who need to play a powerful role in the governmental structures that decide what is fair and how resources will be shared. To see how increasingly distant this purpose is from job training, we have to go back to the historic origins of public higher education.

9. The Historic Public Mission of Higher Education

In order to understand how much things have changed in higher education, we can compare what we see happening today, and what labor education programs report as their experience in their own institutions, with the historic public mission of higher education. We will start with some of the framing documents of public higher education.

Until recently, certain historic public statements could be taken as uncontroversial in the way they framed the social role of colleges and universities. First of all, higher education was to produce a good society and secondly, to be used for the personal uplift and enrichment of individuals. The need of employers for trained workers -- workers trained on the public purse, specifically - was not one of the original purposes. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 actually uses the word "happiness":

Knowledge, being necessary for good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

The Morrill Act of 1862, which established the land grant college and universities at which most labor education programs were later situated, set up in each state:

...at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.

The "several pursuits and professions" which this "liberal and practical education" might promote would certainly include making a living, but it also would include being a decent citizen and enjoying the creations of civilization.

The GI Bill of Rights, (Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944), which is the legislation that may have had the greatest impact of any on higher education, provided financial support for veterans who wanted to go back to school – any approved school, from grade school to universities and apprenticeship programs – and put no limits on what they could study. A pamphlet distributed to GIs returning from World War II says, “You can study anything you want. Under ‘The GI Bill of Rights’ a veteran can go to any approved school or college and study anything he likes” (Army Times, no date). Although one section of the bill set up job counseling, there is no evidence that the purpose of the bill was to funnel veterans into employer-driven workforce development programs. The customer was not an industry or an employer; the customer was the individual who wanted to learn.

The 1947 report of the Truman Commission cleared the way for the establishment of our community colleges. The authors of the report were motivated by the post WWII crisis: returning veterans in need of education, occupied territories in Europe, the new place of the United States as one of two global superpowers, and the threat posed by the atom bomb. Their response to this was to promote education as a means to advance democracy.

“It is a commonplace of the democratic faith that education is indispensable to the maintenance and growth of freedom of thought, faith, enterprise, and association. Thus the social role of education in a democratic society is at once to insure equal liberty and equal opportunity to differing individuals and groups, and to enable the citizens to understand, appraise, and redirect forces, men, and events as these tend to strengthen or to weaken their liberties ... ”
(Serviceman’s Readjustment Act of 1944)

Note the following strong emphasis on what we call “critical thinking”:

At the same time education is the making of the future. Its role in a democratic society is that of critic and leader as well as servant; its task is not merely to meet the demands of the present but to alter those demands if necessary, so as to keep them always suited to democratic ideals...” (Serviceman’s Readjustment Act of 1944)

No workforce development program is going to educate students to be capable of “altering the demands of the present” if they are unsuited to democratic ideals. And note the Truman Commission emphasis on placing trust in “all the people” to be educable to solve social problems and administer public affairs:

In the light of this situation, the President's Commission on Higher Education has attempted to select, from among the principal goals for higher education, those which should come first in our time. They are to bring to all the people of the Nation:

- Education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living;
- Education directly and explicitly for international understanding and cooperation;
- Education for the application of creative imagination and trained intelligence to the solution of social problems and to the administration of public affairs..” (Report of the Truman Commission)

This argument, dedicating higher education to a broad liberal education for advancing democracy, can no longer be taken for granted. In February 2014 Governor Scott Walker of Wisconsin proposed a 41-word re-write of the 89-word University of Wisconsin mission statement, known as “The Wisconsin Idea.” The original, as quoted in the Wausau Daily Herald, reads:

The mission of the system is to develop human resources, to discover and disseminate knowledge, to extend knowledge and its application beyond the boundaries of its campuses and to serve and stimulate society by developing in students heightened intellectual, cultural and humane sensitivities, scientific, professional and technological expertise and a sense of purpose. Inherent in this broad mission are methods of instruction, research, extended training and public service designed to educate people and improve the human condition. Basic to every purpose of the system is the search for truth.

(<http://www.wausaudailyherald.com/story/opinion/2015/02/08/wisconsin-idea-scott-walker-philosophy/23006021/>)

Governor Walker’s re-write cut “the human condition” and “the search for truth” and put in “workforce needs”:

“The mission of the system is to develop human resources to meet the state's workforce needs, to discover and disseminate knowledge, and develop in students heightened intellectual, cultural and humane sensitivities, scientific, professional and technological expertise and a sense of purpose (Wausau Daily Herald, February 8, 2015)

He quickly retracted his proposal; saying that it had been a “drafting error,” but emails sent between his office and the budget department show that it was not.

In the days when higher education was expected to contribute to good government and the happiness of mankind, there was an obvious place for labor education. Labor unions were understood to be part of the natural balance between workers and employers, when the National Labor Relations Act and the New Deal itself were taken more or less for granted, and when the public sector was expanding and becoming more and more unionized in many states. Many labor education and industrial relations programs were

begun precisely at the time as the institution of collective bargaining was broadly adopted. During this period, it was not necessary for labor education to develop a justification for itself as a field of study. It was simply part of the overall picture of a fair society. It was one of the social mechanisms that made capitalism work. It is no accident that this was also the time of the beginning of the Cold War, when it was national policy to promote capitalism. In many institutions it was a part of the field of industrial relations, which was the applied philosophy of its day. Those days are over.

Today the threat of the bomb, emblem of the Cold War, is still with us along with the millions of even more dangerous weapons sold in the arms marketplace. In addition we have the rising inequality which we now understand to be a function of unregulated capitalism, which limits our choices as the clock ticks toward a hot, uninhabitable planet. These are “the demands of the present,” and it is clear that we need people who are capable of altering the roads we are travelling right now, which lead away from our democratic ideals.

10. Framing the Role of Labor Education in Higher Education

Following are perspectives that one might take as organizing principles for justifying the presence of labor education in institutions of public higher education. The brief discussion after each one suggests directions for debate.

1. *The Industrial Relations Perspective*

Industrial Relations is an academic field of study in which we learn the processes, laws, precedents, history and social and economic context of industrial relations so that workers and employers can “meet as equals.”

The problem is that this is no longer the case. Workers, workers organizations, management and employers do not meet as equals, even in long-organized industries. Instead, the relationship is highly politicized. Presenting this perspective requires drawing from history in order to explain and describe changes that have taken place in the power relationships in the labor marketplace over the last 50 years. It’s hard to take this perspective. IR Programs have labor people in them, but 80% or more of the faculty and staff are usually in a Human Resource Management program.

2. *Labor Studies as a Sister Field of Ethnic Studies*

Like ethnic studies, African-American studies, Women’s Studies, Gender Studies, etc, labor studies makes the claim that viewing the world from the standpoint of a particular underrepresented group has intellectual value that is worthy of a place in academia.

However, a major problem in making alliances with other identity fields of study is that organized labor has historically been on the wrong side of efforts to stop discrimination

against women and minorities, including immigrants. These battles have wound up in court and are well known. A one chair of an African-American Studies program said, "Labor has a bad reputation." In addition, today the less than 10% of the working class that is represented by a union is not only not the obvious oppressed minority, but instead is a target of attacks for being privileged. In fact, with important exceptions, these natural allies are likely to be willing to stand aside and let labor studies programs collapse without saying anything.

The various ethnic studies disciplines are "siloed", as one Director put it, away from labor education in another sense. As academic fields, a theoretical framework that is usually a variation of post-structuralism undergirds them. Labor education's theoretical framework is positivist and either explicitly or tacitly Marxist. Nevertheless, the real workplaces such as restaurants and hotels, the healthcare industry, and the criminal justice industry, just to name a few, where race, class and gender intersect dramatically, are an urgent argument for collaboration across these disciplines. Examples of actual workplaces where these critical factors impinge on workers' daily experience should push forward efforts to build connections and cooperation that rise above historic obstacles.

3. A Class-Based Perspective

The arguments for labor studies as a field that takes a class-based standpoint have not been aired recently with much success. As one Director of a labor education Program put it, "Class-based programs are having a hard time these days." If we argue that as long as there are Business Schools and classes in motivating a workforce for greater productivity there should be Labor Schools and classes in organizing that workforce for a greater share of productivity, we run quite quickly into being accused of conducting class war. The word "class" carries with it political significance that is a liability. Several people, including one labor educator, interviewed for this survey said that the word "labor" is actually a liability.

4. Interdisciplinarity

A field as broad as the study of working people's experience should be a good test for the definition of what is interdisciplinary. The other field that seems equally interdisciplinary is Environmental Studies. Between them, they cover people's relationship to society and to the physical world. Evidence of interdisciplinarity could be seen by looking at the various colleges, schools and departments where labor education is found and the various majors for which it is either an elective or satisfies a gen ed requirement.

5. *The Needs of Students and Society*

This would be an argument based on the needs of the people who will be the students, and the society that is supporting higher education, not on the perspective or content of the curriculum. This leads to the question of the constituency of labor education and beyond that, the constituency of public higher education. The University Of Wisconsin lists this statement from 1956 in its timeline of policies of the Board of Regents on Student Freedom:

The search for truth is the central duty of the university, but truth will not be found if the scholar is not free, it will not be understood if the student is not free, it will not be used if the citizen is not free. At a time when both truth and freedom are under attack the University of Wisconsin must seek the one and defend the other. It must employ with utmost energy the power of truth and freedom for the benefit of mankind." (December 8, 1956)
<https://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/legislation/Pages700-899.htm>

This argument is closest of any of these to the framing documents such as the Truman Commission Report that said that education is the making of the future. Its role in a democratic society is that of critic and leader as well as servant; its task is not merely to meet the demands of the present but to alter those demands if necessary, so as to keep them always suited to democratic ideals..."

It is also an argument used in the 1970s' specifically for the establishment of labor education programs in community colleges (Gray, 1975): look first at who will be in need of education, and design an educational program that will lead them into a better life. A paper, by Lois Gray, is historically interesting in that it assumes that organized labor is on the rise, not declining. She writes that now that the "American Dream" with regard to income and home ownership has been achieved, "Traditionally left out of the mainstream of higher education, blue collar workers and low paid white collar workers are beginning to enroll in college" (Gray, 1975, abstract). She argues for "job-related instruction," and "meeting the educational needs of working people," and assumes that these needs include labor education, which should be planned with the assistance of union leaders.

An important reference for this argument would be the enormous study by Lavin and Hyllegard, reported in *Changing the Odds: Open Admissions and the life Chances of the Disadvantaged*, Yale University Press, 1996, which compared the lives of students who came through City College of New York during the famous open-admissions period (no tuition, open-access to anyone regardless of how much remediation they needed) and after the open admissions was eliminated. The report, which was able to compare cohorts of many thousands of graduates from both periods, found that the lives of those who came through the open admissions process had significantly better lives according to measures like political engagement, marriages that lasted, employment, active

citizenship and involvement in arts and culture.

6. *The Argument from Workers Education*

This argument is similar the previous one, except that it takes as its basis the tradition of workers education that began during the Industrial Revolution and continued into the 1960's (and continues today, and is being carried out in some labor education programs). It can point to its exemplars as Antonia Gramsci, Stuart Hall, E. P. Thompson, Mike Newman, Miles Horton and Paulo Friere. It views labor education a social project.

Of these six arguments, the last two are the ones most likely to make sense to labor educators. The decline in the power of organized labor has made the IR perspective outdated as a way to organize support for labor education. While ethnic studies programs should be obvious allies of labor education programs, they are not. The class-based argument may be effective in some institutions, but they are likely to be elite institutions, not working-class institutions. Learning about class is often a privilege reserved for the upper class. To say, "We are interdisciplinary" allows a program to be housed in a range of sites within a university and may make it possible for labor education courses (labor studies) to count for general education credit, but as an argument for the need for labor education, it is weak.

The fifth and sixth arguments, which are both arguments from education, especially education for democracy, run counter to the direction that much of public higher education is headed and therefore confront the rising right-wing agenda directly. However, in doing so they speak to issues that are likely to unite many parts of the university that have survived the last twenty years of cutbacks and may be able to make allies with them on this basis. For example, the argument for education that can be critical of and take leadership in a democratic society, is consistent with the expectation that higher education teaching is protected by academic freedom. "This is one they all understand," as one Director put it.

But does the faculty still have to power to keep that protection? In many places, that depends on what share of the faculty has job security, the requirement for the practice of academic freedom. But job security can come in several forms, of course: tenure is one of them, union representation is another, and solidarity across segments of the faculty, where secure or contingent, is a third.

11. Conclusion: The Short Timeline

Thomas Piketty's message is right: Capitalism produces inequality. Furthermore, climate change is real. These are two converging processes that confront us in the near future, if not yesterday. As inequality increases, working people have even fewer personal resources. Public goods – healthcare, transportation, education, etc. – are being

starved. The few remaining ladders out of immiseration have been replaced with bad jobs for bad pay. Yet the 1% can even now buy private worlds of security.

Where does the transformation of higher education fit in, here? Only thirty or forty years ago, education really did provide ladders of opportunity for working class and middle class students. Today, many of the ladders have been taken away and some of the ones that remain lead into crushing debt. Higher education has become, in many instances, just another way to produce inequality.

The content of labor education confronts this directly. What people learn in labor education classes is how to fight back against the forces that intensify inequality, whether at the bargaining table or in communities. Labor education provides the intellectual, cultural and organizational tools by which working people can get control of their livelihoods, their communities and organizations.

This purpose is not a comfortable fit in the new corporate higher education, whether public or private. As we move into this convergence, the struggle is only going to get sharper. We are seeing it now, in all the ways that labor education is being attacked. It is not likely to let up.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

Act of July 2, 1862 (Morrill Act), *Public Law 37-108, which established land grant colleges*, 07/02/1862; Enrolled Acts and Resolutions of Congress, 1789-1996; Record Group 11; General Records of the United States Government; National Archives.

Alaska, University of. *Training tomorrow's workforce today*, University of Alaska website: <http://www.alaska.edu/research/wp/> Accessed March 21, 2015

Army Times, no date. *The GI Bill of Rights: An explanation of its points, Questions and Answers, Complete Text*. Daily News Building, Washington, DC.
www.nationalww2museum.org/learn/education/for-students/national-history-day/gi-bill-of-rights.pdf Accessed March 21, 2015

Barrett, James. August 24, 2014. *Are labor and working class history courses in decline, or healthier than we imagined?* LABOROnline, LAWCHA (Labor and Working Class History Association) <http://lawcha.org/wordpress/2014/08/24/labor-working-class-history-courses-decline-healthier-imagined/>

Bussel, Robert. 2014. *University Labor Education Program Offerings and Compiled Response Summary, Survey of UALE University/College Directors, February/March 2014*. Available from rbussel@uoregon.edu

Gereluk, Winston. 2001. *Labour Education in Canada Today. A Report from Learning Labour: A Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition Project*. Center for Work and Community Studies, Athabasca University. Part of a four year study of Canadian labour education, Bruce Spencer, coordinator.

Gray, L. S. and others (1975). *Organized Labor and Community Colleges*. Report of the AACJC-UAW-AFL-CIO Assembly, December 8-10, 1975. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Kornbluh, Joyce L. 1987. *A New Deal for Workers' Education: The Workers' Service Program, 1933-1942*. Chicago and Urbana: University of Illinois

Livingstone, D.W. and Sawchuk, P.H. 2003. *Hidden Knowledge: Organized Labor in the Information Age*. Toronto: Roman and Littlefield.

Nissen, Bruce & Byrd, Barbara. June 30, 2003. *Report on the State of Labor Education in the United States*. Center for Labor Research and Education, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, 2521 Channing Way, Berkeley 94720.

Northwest Ordinance, July 13, 1787; (National Archives Microfilm Publication M332, roll

9); *Miscellaneous Papers of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*; Records of the Continental and Confederation Congresses and the Constitutional Convention, 1774-1789, Record Group 360; National Archives. Accessed March 21, 2015.

Piketty, T. 2014. *Capital in the Twenty First Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Politifact. <http://www.politifact.com/wisconsin/statements/2015/feb/06/scott-walker/despite-deliberate-actions-scott-walker-calls-chan/> Accessed March 21, 2015.

Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. *An act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War II veterans, June 22, 1944*; Enrolled Acts and Resolutions of Congress, 1789-1996; General Records of the United States Government; Record Group 11; National Archives. Accessed March 21, 2015

Spencer, Bruce (Editor). 2002. *Unions and Learning in a Global Economy: International and Comparative Perspectives*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing. Tom Nesbit chapter 4 on "Education for Labour's Professionals: Britain, Canada and the USA. Page 30-60.

Taylor, Jeffrey. 2001. *Union Learning: Canadian Labour Education in the Twentieth Century*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Taylor, Jeffrey. 2004. Linking Labour Studies and Unions: Past Lessons and Future Visions. *Just Labour*, Vol 4 Summer 2004, pages 33-40

Truman Commission, *Report of the Truman Commission*
<http://courses.education.illinois.edu/eol474/sp98/truman.html>. Accessed March 21, 2015

Wausau Daily Herald (editorial).
<http://www.wausaudailyherald.com/story/opinion/2015/02/08/wisconsin-idea-scott-walker-philosophy/23006021/> Accessed March 21, 2015

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

Wisconsin. Faculty Legislation of the University of Wisconsin - Madison: Student Freedom Policies. <https://www.secfac.wisc.edu/governance/legislation/Pages700-899.htm> Accessed April 5, 2015.

Wong, Kent. May 2014. *Draft History of UALE*. Available as pdf on UALE website and via Google.

Worthen, Helena. 2010. *Institutional Histories as of March 18, 2010*. Working paper.
Available from Hworthen@illinois.edu