1-1-1991

Union-Management Training Programs in the Public Sector: The New York Experience

Lois Spier Gray
Cornell University, lsg7@cornell.edu

Thomas B. Quimby
Cornell University, tbq1@cornell.edu

Kathy Schrier
AFSCME

Union-Management Training Programs in the Public Sector: The New York Experience

Abstract

[Excerpt] New York State has a long history of union-management education and training programs, making it unique in public sector employment. This chapter examines the programs undertaken at both state and city levels, as well as the applicability of the New York experience to other public sector jurisdictions. Although the profile of the New York State and city work force differs from that of the rest of the nation, there is much of value here for educators, union leaders, and others involved in public sector employment.

Keywords

union, management, education, training programs, public sector, employment, state, city, work force, educator, union leader

Disciplines

Education | Human Resources Management | Training and Development | Unions

6 · UNION-MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR: THE NEW YORK EXPERIENCE

Lois Gray, Thomas B. Quimby, and Kathy Schrier

New York State has a long history of union-management education and training programs, making it unique in public sector employment. This chapter examines the programs undertaken at both state and city levels, as well as the applicability of the New York experience to other public sector jurisdictions. Although the profile of the New York state and city work force differs from that of the rest of the nation, there is much of value here for educators, union leaders, and others involved in public sector employment.

The public sector, with its emphasis on credentialing for employment, could well become a major player in employee training and, with growing unionization, ripe for union-management cooperation in the delivery of its education and training services. To date, however, only New York has undertaken this seemingly natural partnership on a comprehensive scale.[1] Why is the Empire State

1. In 1987, the U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Labor-Management Cooperation, conducted a survey of state and local government labor-management committees in which it asked for information about program features. Only two jurisdictions

unique in this initiative? What led to the evolution of its union-management training programs at state and city levels? Does the New York experience suggest possibilities for other public sector jurisdictions?

This chapter, which draws primarily on printed reports and interviews with key officials, examines the New York experience with respect to funding, governance, administration, scope of coverage, and services offered, highlighting patterns of structure and administration that have evolved within New York State and New York City. Attention is focused on the applicability of these experiences to other public sector jurisdictions.

Characteristics of the State and City Work Force

New York State currently employs almost two hundred thousand workers in seven thousand job titles, ranging from unskilled to professional. The profile of this work force differs from that of the nation as a whole in its relatively higher percentage of minorities and females. In New York State government, for example, women constitute half of the total and minorities constitute 23 percent; the comparable figures for the U.S. work force are 44.6 and 13.3 percent. New York also differs in the extent and penetration of union membership. The vast majority of state workers (93 percent), including most supervisors, belong to one of six unions that negotiate contracts with the state. These include two affiliates of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)—the Civil Service Employees Association (CSEA), a general union of nonsupervisory employees; and Council 82, which represents corrections facility officers. Together, these unions represent 63 percent of all state employees. The Public Employees Federation (PEF), which is affiliated with both the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), represents technical, professional, and supervisory employees, constituting 28.5 percent of the total (Task Force on the New York State Public Workforce 1989). Labor relations in state govern-

outside New York State reported that their committees dealt with training issues. An interview with Al Bilik, president, AFL-CIO Department of Public Employees, confirmed the unique experience of New York in developing training programs sponsored by both union and management.

ment is regulated by the Taylor Law, which is administered by the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB).

Forces leading to an emphasis on employee training in New York State government stem in part from trends common to private sector employees: changes in technology that require restructuring of jobs; labor shortages caused by slow growth in the working-age population; and the need to train workers in basic reading, writing, and computational and reasoning skills to meet the demands of the new workplace. Further pressures for employee training have occurred as a result of a trend toward deinstitutionalization in the mental health field, explosive growth in the number of incarcerated criminals, massive efforts to rebuild the state's roads and bridges, and a downsizing of labor services as a result of cutbacks in federal funding.

Although New York City employs an even larger labor force than the state—320,000, including the Board of Education—the percentage of unionized workers is approximately the same.[2] New York City has a higher percentage of minorities, and more than half its work force is female. As in state government, the leading organization of city employees is affiliated with AFSCME. District Council 37 represents 34.6 percent of all unionized city workers; the United Federation of Teachers (AFT), 24.8 percent; and the unions of uniformed services (a total of eleven), 26.2 percent. Other major unions are Local 237 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT), 6.3 percent; the Communications Workers of America (CWA), 3.5 percent; skilled trades unions (eleven crafts), 3.1 percent; and sanitation workers (IBT), 2.8 percent. Overall, the city negotiates with more than fifty unions ranging in size from 40 members to 111,000.

Labor relations in New York City is extraordinarily complex. Most city agencies are regulated by a law separate and distinct from the state law of public sector collective bargaining and are administered by a separate agency, the Office of Collective Bargaining (OCB).[3]

2. These figures do not include state-chartered authorities in New York City such as the Metropolitan Transit Authority. Figures are from the Office of Municipal Labor Relations.

3. The Board of Education and state-chartered authorities, including the Metropolitan Transit Authority, are covered by PERB.

Evolution of Union-Management Training

New York State was the birthplace of the civil service system. Inspired by the 1881 assassination of President James Garfield by a disappointed job seeker in Buffalo, the federal government replaced "the spoils system" with civil service, which aimed to staff government with people whose talents were assessed by fair examinations. Shortly thereafter, Assemblyman Theodore Roosevelt promoted a similar statute in New York State. Thus testing and training became the province of the New York State Civil Service Commission.[4]

This long-established system came under challenge with the unionization of public employees and the establishment of the Governor's Office of Employee Relations (OER). Sandy Frucher, director of OER under Governor Hugh Carey in the early 1970s, says that one of the things he did was "consciously blow up the training unit of Civil Service" because he thought it was antiquated (Benjamin and Heard 1985 and personal interview). Frucher put training and development on the bargaining table in negotiations with public employee unions because he recognized the need for high-quality training targeted to specific goals and saw a way to get it funded. Experience showed that the budget process gave training expenditures short shrift, but the collective bargaining process gave training a constituency. Unions were given a piece of the action through a voice in the training to be funded and the choice of staff positions to oversee the training funds. The first state contracts with funds for training programs sponsored jointly by union and management were negotiated in 1971. Current contracts with CSEA, PEF, and Council 82 allocate approximately $14 million a year to this purpose, an annual expenditure of $85.50 per employee.

In contrast to the history of state labor-management training programs, which were initiated by management, the first city program was initiated by one of the unions. In the 1960s, District Council 37, which represents members ranging from some with minimal education and skill requirements (e.g., custodians, hospital orderlies, and park attendants) to others who must have professional degrees (e.g., accountants and engineers), became a major force through its suc-

4. Burstein 1986 describes the historical mission of the commission and its conflict and overlap with the Governor's Office of Employee Relations.

cessful drive to organize the city's Department of Hospitals. One of its major campaign issues was the development of a career ladder for hospital workers at the bottom of the wage scale. Initially, city officials did not respond positively to this demand. As one city official expressed it, "The City government did not see training as a long term investment" (Bellush and Bellush 1984:307). Influenced by a civil service orientation, the city expected to fill its staffing needs through individual employee efforts to acquire skills and education in traditional educational institutions.

Faced with city indifference to an organizational imperative, District Council 37 established an education department within the union that negotiated federal grants for career ladder training programs and offered a variety of educational services to members. In 1971, the union negotiated a benefit package that included city support for the expenses of training and education. During the fiscal crisis of the 1970s, increases in benefits became a trade-off for wage restraint (Bellush and Bellush 1984, chap. 14, and interviews with Al Viani). Set at $10 per covered member, the package has been increased in subsequent contract negotiations to its current level of approximately $60 per member, for a total of $7 million. Additional educational initiatives have been undertaken by Local 237 of the IBT, with the help of city grants, and joint programs have been inaugurated in public education through agreements between the New York City Board of Education and the United Federation of Teachers, affiliated with the AFT, and in higher education through contracts negotiated by the State University of New York (SUNY) with United University Professions (UUP), also affiliated with the AFT.

The push for innovative training programs in the Board of Education, as in the rest of New York City, came from the union, whereas the UUP-SUNY program followed the pattern of state government initiative that had emerged in negotiations with the other unions of state employees.

Services Provided

A multiplicity of programs serve the wide range of educational and training needs of the state and city work force. Major categories,

classified by purpose, are basic and remedial education, training for occupational advancement, skills and knowledge enhancement, and personal growth.

Implicit in administering these programs are choices concerning the distribution of resources and the delivery of services. The rest of this chapter explores some of these choices and examines the decisions the parties have made in designing and administering programs funded under their collective bargaining agreements.

Basic and Remedial Education

Despite the civil service testing process, the changing workplace has created a continual need for city workers to improve their basic reading, writing, and math skills. Municipal unions have initiated efforts to provide these skills to all their members. The experience of District Council 37 illustrates the potential contribution of union involvement in overcoming barriers to basic and remedial education for adults.

The District Council 37 program is designed to provide basic education for workers who lack the credentials to pursue the career in which they are interested. The union's approach to the design, implementation, and evaluation of its basic and remedial education program is a response to the fact that many members have been victims of an education system that, as a result of gender, ethnic, and racial stereotyping, did not give them support to pursue academic studies. Besides working full time and attending classes on a part-time basis, the "DC 37 student" is often a single head of household and union activist. The students' many roles often come in to conflict, and the DC 37 program is designed to be both sensitive and responsive to this dilemma. Curriculum, course structure, administrative procedures, counseling services, and even recruitment methods are designed to develop confidence in an effort to guarantee academic success.

The confidence the DC 37 basic skills program inspires in union members is the key to its success. The union knows that its role is to defend its members, to be nonjudgmental in evaluating their concerns, and to be their advocate. In turn, members view the union as the vehicle to helping them when they have a problem at the workplace, the means by which they receive pay increases, and the institution that provides them and their families with health care and

other services. Likewise, the membership trusts that the union will help them pursue their educations. Members know that union-sponsored education programs will be designed to meet their needs and that due process mechanisms exist to resolve problems. Not surprisingly, many members turn to union education programs after failing or being disappointed in more traditional academic settings.

DC 37's basic skills program begins with recruitment. In addition to such traditional means as newspaper articles and direct mailings, recruitment includes personal appearances by staff of the DC 37 education department at work locations, union meetings, and union-sponsored conferences and seminars.

District Council 37 supplements the printed materials and oral presentations by union staff with a videotape in which students describe their experiences in union-sponsored education programs. Thus union members viewing the video hear fellow workers tell their success stories.

In some cases, the recruitment campaign points out the connection between the basic skills program and a specific career. For example, literature is distributed to hospital workers who applied for nursing degree programs and failed the college assessment examination. These letters congratulate the person for his or her desire to enter the field of nursing and describe how the basic skills program could help prepare the union member to take the entrance examination for the nursing program.

The basic skills program utilizes the members' educational goals as a recruitment tactic. Since many members considering enrollment in a high school equivalency or college preparatory program do not want to admit that they lack education credentials, the union's promotional materials stress the skills needed to receive a high school diploma, pass a civil service test, or enter college. Materials state that classes are designed to help students in reading, writing, and math. This approach is especially important because students are placed in classes to meet their particular educational needs rather than in groups in which everyone is preparing for the same examination or studying for the same purpose.

Before beginning their course of study, all students attend a multipurpose orientation and testing session (diagnostic tools are not called entrance examinations but rather placement tests, indicating that all prospective students are guaranteed a seat in class) at which

a counselor provides the students with information designed to help them make the transition back to school. Counseling is an integral part of the union members' endeavors. Every student is assigned a counselor who calls the student when he or she has missed a class, is available to discuss problems or difficulties, and is clearly a key supporter of the student's desire to be successful in school. Counselors also sponsor group sessions on time management, study skills, and resumé writing.

All union members are eligible to enroll in basic skills classes. Classes are currently offered in the five boroughs of New York City and at union headquarters and are given during the day, in the evenings, and on Saturdays, so that all members, regardless of their work shifts, can attend.

Enrollment is continuous, although there are three semesters per year. Students can enroll at any time, and students who need to withdraw from a class can return at any time. This flexibility is imperative to the success of adult education programs since personal and family problems and responsibilities often require a union member to interrupt study. In addition, it is difficult for adults to make the commitment to return to school. It is therefore important that administrators not require potential students to wait until the beginning of the next semester to start their education.

To make it easier for members to attend classes, the union offers activities for their children on Saturdays in guitar playing, photography, and ballet. In addition, younger children may be left at an activities center, staffed by union members who work for the New York City Board of Education, while their parents and/or grandparents attend classes.

The District Council 37 basic skills program is structured so that students can study at their own pace. At union headquarters, where students are placed in a class by grade level, a learning lab is available for students who need tutoring in a particular subject, as a supplement to the classroom experience. At the union's off-site programs, each student has an individual learning plan and is assisted by an instructor in meeting his or her educational goals. Individualized study is complemented by weekly lectures and group discussions.

Another approach to basic education for city employees is the citywide Worker Literacy Consortium spearheaded by Local 237 of the

IBT. The unusual features of this program, which is targeted at workers who lack even the most basic reading skills, are its emphasis on reading required in the workplace—a stimulus to motivation—and its utilization of co-workers as recruiters and instructors.

The District Council 37 training fund is directed by a board of trustees that consists of representatives of local unions affiliated with the district council and council officers and is administered by staff appointed by the trustees. While the city personnel office has the power and responsibility to review and approve expenditures related to program content, it has rarely if ever vetoed union-initiated programs. The Worker Literacy Consortium, funded by state and city grants, is also administered by union-appointed staff and is governed by a policy board of union representatives.

Training for Occupational Advancement

Many training programs cater to union members in state and city government who want to get ahead within the civil service system. Classes are offered to prepare these workers for specific civil service examinations and for state and national licensing tests.

New York has pioneered two programs that prepare employees for upgrading; one is a traditional apprenticeship program, a concept borrowed from the private sector but adapted to the special needs of state government employees, and the other is a new form of apprenticeship that upgrades school personnel to professional positions as teachers and guidance counselors.

In 1982, New York State and CSEA established an apprenticeship program that is unique for the public sector. Unlike apprenticeship programs in other states, New York's is collectively bargained and based on the private sector model. Inspired by a shortage in skilled personnel to operate the state's physical plants, the first pilot apprenticeship program, for stationary engineers, was incorporated into the 1985–88 collective bargaining agreement between the state of New York and CSEA and thereby established a statewide Joint Apprenticeship Committee (JAC). This concept has been applied to other trades and now has an enrollment of eighty-nine apprentices and annual funding of $900,000. At its inception, the program encountered conflict with the traditional promotional system of civil service, but these barriers were resolved through negotiations (Burstein 1986:40). The program is now rated as highly successful

by representatives of both the union and state agencies, who note that its high retention rate, high-quality training, and relatively low cost are the result of the active involvement of union and management in all phases of the program from recruitment and selection of apprentices to curriculum design to the monitoring of results by regional labor-management committees.

The JAC also provides continuing education for journey-level personnel through periodic seminars designed to enhance their technical knowledge. A further step toward skills enhancement and occupational mobility has been forged by linking apprenticeship and college degree programs through agreements negotiated by the state JAC with Empire State College, a unit of SUNY that grants credit for knowledge acquired through experience.

Another approach to preparation for upgrading is a program sponsored jointly by the UFT and the New York City Board of Education in which paraprofessionals are prepared to become fully qualified teachers. This program, initiated by the UFT in a period of tense community relations, is tailored to community activists, most of whom are minority group members, who work as paraprofessionals in neighborhood schools. The program provides counseling as well as tuition support for courses required to attain a bachelor's degree.

The UFT and Board of Education initiated another apprenticeship program in response to an acute shortage of vocational teachers with the skills needed to train today's labor force. It combines classroom training under the supervision of licensed instructors with on-the-job training in the trade in private sector employment. At the end of five years, the apprentice "substitute vocational assistant" becomes a vocational high school teacher.

Yet another program sponsored by the UFT and Board of Education enables teachers to become guidance counselors through an internship supervised by a licensed guidance counselor. The teachers are given release time and tuition assistance to acquire graduate-level education.

Job-Related Knowledge and Skills Enhancement

Improving performance on the job, normally the major focus of private sector employer-sponsored training programs, is also an important theme of joint training programs in New York. A number of

training initiatives deal with specific job titles. State collective bargaining agreements set aside approximately $1.5 million each year, for example, for grants for which state agencies and unions may apply. Small projects are reviewed by administrators of a program (union and management designate one administrator each). Larger grants are reviewed by top union and agency officials and must be approved by both. This somewhat unorthodox structure appears to have several positive attributes. First, it encourages labor-management cooperation at the local level by requiring the parties to interact on issues such as need, subject matter, scope, and vendor selection. Second, it gives the parties a great deal of flexibility and room to be creative. Third, the modest administrative structure and workshop orientation suggest low per unit training costs. Fourth, by being clearly bilateral and operating on an agreement rather than a meet-and-confer basis, the structure obviates issues of control and ownership at high levels and requires key decisions to be addressed at lower levels.

Supervisory Training

Another example of job-related education for state employees is the supervisory training funded under their contracts. Except for building construction and printing, unions in the private sector rarely include supervisors among their members, much less as participants in their training. In contrast, only 7 percent of the New York State work force is classified as managerial/confidential, which means that most supervisory employees are members of a union. Under contracts with CSEA and PEF, training for supervisors is an ongoing activity, most of which is provided through contracts with colleges and universities.

Teaching Skills

Toward the same objective, the UFT and the New York City Board of Education sponsor a variety of programs to increase the effectiveness of classroom teaching. Teacher centers offer graduate-credit courses taught by experienced teachers, and skills-oriented classes with such titles as "Critical Thinking," "Creative Conflict," "Learning Channels," and "Techniques for Working with Exceptional Students" are offered by area colleges for participants nominated by district organizations of their union. On-the-job training for teach-

ers is provided, through mentor interns, as is intervention for experienced teachers who are in trouble. These programs are cosponsored by the union and Board of Education and are staffed by union members.

Handling of Grievances

Performance as union-management representatives in the collective bargaining and grievance resolution process is also a subject of state-funded training programs under PEF and CSEA contracts. PEF has contracted with Cornell University's School of Industrial and Labor Relations for a labor studies credit and certificate course funded under its contract, while CSEA's contract funds a Labor-Management Institute that offers a variety of workshops, including "Using the Grievance Procedure Effectively," "Counseling and Disciplinary Procedures," and "Conducting Effective Labor/Management Meetings." Although formal control of the institute is exercised by two high-level appointees, one union, one management, in practice the parties have delegated administrative responsibilities to the director, who works with union locals and state agencies to determine the content, timing, and format of the workshops. Local union and agency representatives are allocated seats that they fill with their own nominees.

Professional Development

PEF's contract aims to provide employees with a wide variety of professional training and development opportunities ranging from graduate credit and degree programs to workshops, conferences, and independent study and research. In addition, major programs of professional development are sponsored jointly by the United University Professions, which represents the faculties and other professional employees of SUNY, and the Governor's Office of Employee Relations.

The PEF contract, funded at $13.6 million a year and covering fifty-seven thousand professional, scientific, and technical workers, is administered through Rockefeller College, a unit of the state university, and includes the largest university-based professional development program in the United States.[5] In consultation with a

5. Foerman, Quinn, and Thompson 1987, pp. 310–19, describes the program in detail and analyzes its implications for other public sector jurisdictions.

higher education advisory committee, composed of representatives of PEF and state agencies as well as educational institutions throughout New York State, the program is overseen by two management and two labor representatives. Much of the curriculum and course development is subcontracted to other universities, which also deliver the classroom instruction. Educational services available to PEF members include graduate and undergraduate courses specifically developed for public administrators; professional noncredit workshops of one to five days duration; and a variety of graduate and undergraduate courses generally for professional development.

The parties have adopted meet and confer as their method of operation on issues involving graduate and undergraduate public administration courses as well as workshops. On issues involving professional development courses, the parties must agree. In practice, it appears that management seeks agreement on most issues. The parties have delegated substantial authority to the contractor, Rockefeller College, on a wide range of matters, including the selection of subcontractors and instructors, delivery sites, and class size. When the number of applicants exceeds available seats, local management and union representatives are responsible for selecting students.

Representatives of both the union and management seem proud of this program and cite its stability; graduate-level, custom-designed offerings; cooperative, bilateral nature; size; and positive impact on New York's higher education system. The parties' selection of a public university as the third-party administrator appears to have had several positive outcomes. First, it appears to have mitigated most issues concerning program control. Indeed, with its several committees and jointly employed staff representatives, the program appears largely insulated from disruptive political influence by either labor or management constituents. Second, Rockefeller College appears to have given the program a prestige that pleases both parties and contributes to the stability of the program. Third, the subcontractors—the colleges in the SUNY system that design and offer the courses—are responsive to Rockefeller College, which is a member of their same system. On the down side, there is the possibility of higher costs per training unit given the program's third-party, contractor-subcontractor structure coupled with the cost of custom-designing undergraduate and graduate-level courses.

The UUP-SUNY program is directed by the Professional Development and Quality of Work Life Committee (PDQWL), consisting of

a total of six representatives, three from the UUP and three from the state (including SUNY and OER), and is managed by a full-time staff that is responsible to the committee. Policy decisions and staff appointments are made by mutual agreement. Currently, the UUP's collective bargaining contract allocates $1.8 million a year for professional development, which has been defined, in practice, to include individual awards of study leave for library and professional employees; research grants and travel funds for faculty members; and special campus programs for professionals to increase their skills and enhance their performance. In the latter category, projects generated and conducted by local campus groups deal with such wide-ranging subjects as teaching students with learning disabilities, AIDS education, time management, computer training, and new faculty orientation.

Another joint venture of the UUP and SUNY is focused on retraining retrenched or high-risk professionals. Under this program (Continuity of Employment), which spends some $300,000 a year, individual grants enable UUP members to undertake education leading to the acquisition of new skills and knowledge so that they may change occupations.

Personal Growth

One of the unusual features of New York's jointly sponsored educational programs is the attention given to personal growth and development. Both the state and the city, as well as the unions, are committed to the concept of lifelong learning and personal growth. The unions see the results of these programs in their employees' job security and mobility, and the employers support the investment in a more productive and stable work force. Therefore, most of the union contracts do not restrict tuition reimbursement to college courses in job-related subjects. District Council 37 of AFSCME and 237 of the Teamsters have established liberal arts college-degree programs under the auspices of colleges and universities in New York City and encourage their members to attend.

CSEA's Labor Education Action Program (LEAP) is a massive college enrollment effort funded at approximately $4.5 million per year. LEAP contracts statewide with public and private colleges and universities for seats in their classes for the membership of the bargaining units CSEA represents. The program is overseen by the

training arm of OER and is administered by union-employed staff who negotiate with educational institutions; publicize, accept, and prioritize applications; and enroll students in classes.

Although program administrators have the authority to act on routine matters, they must get approval from OER to make personnel changes in the administrative staff and large expenditures, initiate new programs, and the like. Thus LEAP is organizationally and politically responsible to its client population—the union members—and empowered to act on day-to-day matters, but its authority on critical issues, especially financial matters, is limited by the need for management approval. If approval is not forthcoming on a particular issue, LEAP must be prepared with an alternative plan. This structure suggests that LEAP must be responsive to members, since it must get their support in dealing with management, and, at the same time, be cost-conscious, since its program is subject not only to management's scrutiny but to the scrutiny of the union membership. Indeed, LEAP's principals cite responsiveness and cost effectiveness as among the strong points of the program.

Administrative Structures

Jointly sponsored training programs in New York State have evolved a variety of structures for making decisions about the day-to-day administration of programs and the delivery of services. Broad policy agreements are normally incorporated into the collective bargaining agreements that fund these programs. At this level both unions and management participate equally. There are marked differences, however, between the state and the city in the administration of program services.

Not surprisingly, programs that were initiated by the unions are administered largely by union-appointed personnel and day-to-day decisions about content, methods, and delivery systems are made by union policy makers with the concurrence of management, which has a rarely exercised veto power. State programs that were initiated by management have established structures for administration in which unions have a strong voice with respect to the selection of content, administrative personnel, and contractors; nonetheless, the major initiative for change tends to come from management. In part, this may be influenced by the continuity and expertise of the

OER training staff; also important is the OER role in policing the fiscal controls of New York State.

Educational and training services for both state and city programs draw on in-house capabilities but also reach out to educational institutions and independent contractors. The city unions tend to rely on their own resources for job-related training and basic education programs while tapping the resources of local universities for college credit and degree programs. State programs make greater use of consultants and independent contractors, and the administration of the PEF program is delegated to Rockefeller College, which in turn contracts for services with other institutions of higher education. The extent to which these administrative structures are based on the mission of the programs and how much has happened by accident or through the sometimes chaotic process of collective bargaining and organizational politics is critical but difficult to determine. Programs such as these not only deliver training but also shape the relationship of labor and management, influence the public and proprietary educational system, and often influence the political fortunes of union leaders and government officials. Given the monetary, organizational, and personal impact of these programs, the following questions appear worthy of further study: Under what conditions is third-party administration necessary or desirable? What administrative structures and reporting requirements give the parties the oversight they need to discharge their legal and organizational responsibilities yet are not unnecessarily disruptive? What can be learned from private sector training and development efforts about jointness in administration and the use of outside contractors?

Conclusions and Future Directions

New York State and New York City have almost twenty years of experience in the co-sponsorship, design, and administration of educational and training programs. The value of these programs is evidenced by the continuing support they command from their sponsors, the growth in enrollment, and the expansion of funding even during periods of fiscal stringency. Both government and union leaders speak glowingly about what Tom Hartnett, New York State Commissioner of Labor and former director of OER, described as the "better product" that results from joint involvement in

the selection of content, methods of teaching, and systems of delivery, as well as the union commitment to promotion and recruitment of participants. Two of the programs (District Council 37 and PEF) have been evaluated by independent analysts and rated as unusually effective.[6] Further research is required to determine the link between these union-management training programs and their stated goals—increased productivity and employee satisfaction, improved morale, and upward mobility.

Whether the New York experience can be transferred to other public sector jurisdictions remains to be seen. The high degree of unionization and union acceptance by management at both state and city levels in New York may make replication in other parts of the country difficult. Also unusual is the unions' willingness to make long-term investments in member education a collective bargaining priority. Nonetheless, the positive results in New York should encourage other public sector unions to develop their own experiments.

There is wide agreement among experts that the United States faces critical challenges, including coping with its changing role in the world economy, accommodating to labor force shortages, and replacing an aging infrastructure. Labor and management are asking that training and development address more of these concerns. Unions increasingly equate education with empowerment and dignity for their members. Employers see education as essential to maintaining the quality of their work force. Both parties need more information on how to administer their training and development resources. The New York experience demonstrates that working together, public sector unions and employers can enhance the quality of life in the work environment.

---

6. The district council program was evaluated in 1984 by staff of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University and the results presented in an unpublished report. The council's college-degree program, offered in cooperation with the College of New Rochelle, was analyzed by faculty of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. These results were presented in a report funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York in 1975. Both studies were very positive in their assessments of the impact of district council programs on the self-image and potential for upward job mobility of their members. The PEF program has been the subject of ongoing research by faculty of SUNY at Albany. Preliminary results are reported in Foerman, Quinn, and Thompson 1987. The principal conclusion was that the flexible format fits the varied needs of participants.