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33. Are you interested in receiving a report on the results of the Working Parents for a Working New York study that you participated in?
   - Yes
   - No

34. Are you interested in attending a meeting about the results of the WPWNY study?
   - Yes
   - No

35. Would you be willing to talk publicly with the union or others about your experience in the child care study?
   - Yes
   - No

36. Any other comments?

Thank you for your participation and input. Given First Lady Michelle Obama’s priority on work family issues and child care, our research project has the potential to be even more valuable as it may also influence future policy initiatives.
Study Purpose/ Background

Working parents of low to moderate incomes in New York City face great challenges in finding reliable, affordable child care. Both parents and employers have recognized that this challenge frequently impacts working parents’ work performance and even their ability to remain employed. In 2007 the New York City Council funded the Working Parents for a Working New York (WPWNY) initiative to study the impact on municipal employees and employees of subcontracted agencies of:

1. Helping parents pay for child care through the provision of child care subsidies
2. Providing work/family support workshops

The study focused on the variables of attendance, work performance, productivity and retention. The subsidy program was modeled after the Facilitated Enrollment Project which provides subsidies to income eligible families up to 275% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). The initiative included three Labor/Management Partnerships. The partnerships were between District Council 37 and NYC Health and Hospitals Corporation; International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local 237 and NYPD School Safety Division; and 1199 SEIU and NYC Home Care Subcontractors. The Cornell School of Industrial Labor Relations directed the case study research. The Consortium for Worker Education administered the subsidy distribution and the Center for Children’s Initiatives formerly known as Child Care Inc. provided workshops and informational/educational services.

Methodology

The study included both a study and a control group.

Key Findings:

1. Subsidy participants indicated that during the subsidy period they left work less often, concentrated better and improved their productivity at work.
2. Subsidy participants experienced a 17.8% decrease in disciplinary actions.
3. Subsidy participants indicated that they used less sick time in order to deal with child care issues. This allowed employees to use their sick days during periods of actual illness and reduced “presenteeism.” Presenteeism is defined as lost productivity that occurs when employees come to work but perform below par due to any kind of illness.
4. Retention was not able to be measured because the study period was abbreviated due to loss of funding.
5. The work/family support workshops are effective, low cost interventions to support working parents’ job performance. Seventy five percent of participants said the workshops were helpful to them in creating back up plans for holidays and vacations, 73% on planning for the unexpected (sick child or sick provider), 70% on finding a more convenient child care location and 62% on thinking about the impact of unreliable child care on their jobs.
6. The majority of all WPWNY participants (including both the subsidy and control groups) felt their supervisors were not willing to listen to conversations about family responsibilities. Seventy percent of WPWNY participants receiving a subsidy benefit indicated that labor/management cooperation through the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) is a good way to promote supervisory dialogue and ultimately improve the overall work environment.

7. The provision of the subsidy significantly reduced parent stress.

8. The initiative highlighted the importance of labor management collaboration.

**Recommendations**

1. Study results demonstrate that further research along these lines could provide valuable insights into how various economic and workplace supports impact work performance and work/family balance. The participants should consider negotiating subsidies through the upcoming bargaining for the city unions or getting a foundation to fund a new study with a longer study period and a larger sample size.

2. Immediate action which could be implemented to support NYC employees and employees of subcontracted agencies:
   a) Training of supervisors on work/family issues and workplace interventions
   b) Providing work/family support workshops
   c) Expanding the number of sick days or allowing the use of sick days for a sick child

25. **How did you use the money you saved from paying for child care?** (Please mark all that apply):
   - Household expenses
   - Food
   - Family entertainment
   - Clothes for family
   - Personal care expenses
   - Bills
   - Extended family (e.g., money obligations)
   - Other, please specify

26. **What impact did receiving the child care subsidy have on the following?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurred less</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Occurred more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrived late due to child care issues</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left work early due to child care issues</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. **What impact did receiving the child care subsidy have on the following?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used less time</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Used more time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used sick days to address child care issues</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used annual leave (vacation days) to address child care issues</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used compensatory time to address child care issues</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used leave without pay to address child care issues</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. **Which of the following Child Care Inc. activities did you participate in?** (please mark only one answer)
   - Attended the child care workshops facilitated by Child Care, Inc. staff
   - Had a phone consultation with Child Care, Inc. staff

29. **From attending the workshop and/or phone consultation, what did you learn?** (Please mark all that apply.)
   - The differences between licensed and informal care
   - Problems with licensed or informal care
   - Challenges parents face when selecting care
   - Important factors in child care arrangements
   - Planning for the unexpected
   - Evaluating how unreliable child care arrangements impact your job
   - Techniques of working with supervisors on child care issues
   - How to create a partnership with your provider
   - How to develop a backup plan for holidays/summer vacations
   - Information about better quality child care
   - Information about more convenient child care
   - How to problem solve with the provider
   - Other, please specify
Child care is a key issue that affects the lives of countless working parents, including thousands of city employees who provide critical services to our city each day. It is often the single largest expense (even larger than rent or mortgage) for many families. In fact the average cost of infant care in New York City is currently more than $19,000 a year per child.\(^1\) The high cost of child care can stretch families financially or force families to go without consistent child care and instead, rely on last minute and inadequate arrangements. Providing access to quality, affordable child care allows working parents who juggle job responsibilities, child care needs, and other family commitments to care for their children while also dedicating more time to their professional responsibilities.

Employers need dependable workers with reliable child care. Quality, accessible, affordable child care for infants, toddlers, preschoolers, and school-age children is essential for parents to be able to work their necessary hours, improve their skills, and perform their jobs without undue lateness and absence.

The Working Parents for a Working New York (WPWNY) initiative was developed to study the impact of child care subsidies on city employees and their workplaces, with a focus on the variables of attendance, performance, productivity and retention. A total of $1.525 million was allocated during the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 city fiscal years for this project.

This initiative was initially conceived of by the New York Union Child Care Coalition (NYUCCC). The NYUCCC was formed in 1994 as a coalition of 10 unions committed to a child care, work and family agenda. It has since grown to include 15 unions and has won official recognition from the New York City Central Labor Council and New York State AFL-CIO. The Coalition has become a forum for unions to share problems and develop cooperative strategies and to address mutual concerns regarding work and family issues.

This initiative was based on the Child Care Facilitated Enrollment Project currently underway in various locations throughout New York State. Like Working Parents for a Working New York, this project was developed to extend access to child care subsidies for low to moderate income working families who historically have had extremely limited access to this type of assistance. In addition to expanding access, Facilitated Enrollment creates a more user-friendly and worker oriented enrollment process. Over $70 million has been allocated by the New York State Legislature since 2002 through TANF dollars to fund the Facilitated Enrollment Projects operating in New York City, Monroe County and the Capital Region.

\(^1\) This is the New York State Market Rate for infant care.
Key Elements

Eligibility Parameters

Through this initiative municipal employees and employees of subcontracted agencies, earning up to 275% of the Federal Poverty Level, received child care subsidies administered by the Consortium for Worker Education (CWE) as a subcontractor of NYC Administration for Children’s Services (ACS). In addition to income guidelines, qualifying families were required to reside within one of the five boroughs with a child less than twelve years of age, work a minimum of twenty hours per week, and belong to one of the following unions while working for one of the following employers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Council 37</th>
<th>1199 SEIU</th>
<th>IBT 237</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harlem Hospital</td>
<td>CABS</td>
<td>NYPD ~ School Safety Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coler Hospital</td>
<td>Family Care Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Hospital</td>
<td>Family Home Care of Brooklyn &amp; Queens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Hospital</td>
<td>FEGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outreach and Participant Selection

In order to facilitate working families’ access to the WPWNY’s application process, recruitment events were conducted at targeted sites from October 2007 until February 2008. Over this period 25 recruitment events were held at various locations such as worksites and union headquarters. Events were also held on Saturdays and during the evenings including one at HHC’s Coler Hospital that started at 11:00 PM and ended at 4:00 AM. A phone recruitment option was also adapted into the model during the last few months of the recruitment period. During the outreach events interested parents completed a pre-screening process conducted by either the NYUCCC or Consortium for Worker Education (CWE) staff in order to determine their eligibility. Once the parent was deemed a qualified candidate, a consenting form and baseline interview were completed by the Cornell ILR’s research team in face to face or telephone interviews. The consenting process was essential because an individual’s enrollment and involvement in research as a “human subject” must be completely voluntary and fully informed.2

| 2 See Appendix for Consent Form |

13. Since completing the first Cornell interview in 2007, if you arrived late or left early due to a problem with your child care arrangements, did you experience any negative work-related consequence as a result?

- Yes If yes, please indicate what you experienced (please mark all that apply).
  - Coached or counseled by supervisor
  - Given a verbal warning
  - Given a written warning
  - Formal disciplinary action
  - Suffered a negative job evaluation
  - Denied promotion or career opportunities

- No If no, please go to question 15

14. Since completing the first Cornell interview in 2007, have you ever filed a grievance because of a negative work-related consequence that happened because of a problem with your child care arrangements?

- Yes If yes, what was the resolution?
  - Grievance was won, discipline removed
  - Grievance was won, discipline reduced
  - Grievance was lost, discipline stayed in place

- No

15. Since completing the first Cornell interview in 2007, have you arrived late/early or been absent due to any of the following: (Please mark all that apply.)

- Personal health
- Transportation breakdown
- Personal issues
- Family issues
- Elder care issues
- Other, please specify

16. Have your job responsibilities changed since completing the first Cornell interview in 2007?

- Yes If yes, how well do you understand the change in the responsibilities of your job?
  - Extremely well
  - Very well
  - Somewhat well
  - Not very well
  - Not at all well

- No If no, please go to question 18

17. Since completing the first Cornell interview in 2007, how would you rate your satisfaction with your job?

- Extremely satisfied
- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Not very satisfied
- Not satisfied at all
9. From the time you leave the house, how long does it take you to drop off all your children to their respective child care providers, including any new arrangements?
   ○ Less than 30 minutes
   ○ 30 minutes to less than 1 hour
   ○ 1 hour to less than 1-1/2 hours
   ○ More than 1-1/2 hours, please specify ________________________
   ○ Not applicable (e.g. if child care provided at home)

10. After all children are delivered to their respective child care providers, how long does it take for you to get to work?
    ○ Less than one-half hour
    ○ One-half hour to less than 1 hour
    ○ 1 hour to less than 1-1/2 hours
    ○ More than 1-1/2 hours, please specify ________________________

11. Has your normal method of transportation to work changed?
    ○ Yes  If yes, please answer the following question, then go to question 12
    ○ No   If no, please go to question 12

   What is your normal method of transportation to work? (Please mark all that apply.)
   - Bus
   - Commuter rail
   - Subway
   - Cab
   - Private Passenger Vehicle
   - Walk

12. Please mark one response for each of the following statements:

   Since completing the first Cornell interview in 2007, I have:
   - Frequently (at least one time per week)
   - Sometimes (one to three times per month)
   - Never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IBT 237</th>
<th>SEIU 1199</th>
<th>DC 37</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrived late or left work early because of a child care issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used sick days because of a child care issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used annual leave (vacation days) because of a child care issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used compensatory time because of a child care issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used leave without pay because of a child care issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WPWNY Outreach/Recruitment Tally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IBT 237</th>
<th>SEIU 1199</th>
<th>DC 37</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Recruited</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Ineligible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Eligible</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Eligible</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Base Line Surveys Completed</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Completed Base Line Surveys Based on Recruitment</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Applicants Placed in Subsidy Group by Cornell</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected # of Children in Subsidy Group</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Applicants Placed in Control Group by Cornell</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After approximately one hundred people from each union/agency completed the pre-screening, baseline interview and consenting process, they were divided into two groups through a random lottery process directed by Cornell’s Survey Research Institute (SRI). The “subsidy” group was selected to receive an application for a child care subsidy and work/family support workshop training and the “control” group was selected to receive neither of these benefits. However, those parents placed in the control group received two $60 stipends and a metro card for the time they spent participating in the study. Upon conclusion of the subsidy period members of both the subsidy and control groups were asked to complete a follow-up questionnaire by Cornell’s research team. Those individuals placed in the “subsidy” group had to complete an application administered by CWE and supply documentation that their household met the eligibility criteria for the WPWNY Initiative prior to receiving any benefits. The overall participation rate was 54% for the subsidy group and 46% for receiving the control group.
Collection of Employer Data

Before the major recruitment efforts began, a senior Cornell researcher contacted representative(s) from each participating employer group, usually a member of the human resource department, by telephone to have a preliminary conversation about their practice and method of tracking information on employee work performance, productivity and attendance. A follow up email was sent with a broad inventory of variables to determine what common data sets would be available for a study comparison and constituted the baseline of employer data.

Based on these extensive conversations and subsequent analysis, a standardized employer data collection form was developed with the following categories: name, address, job description, shift, performance review rating, annual leave used-attendance, and sick leave used. These customized employer data forms included employee lists of all study participants in alphabetical order to ensure that there would be no way to detect control or subsidy group designations.

For the purpose of comparison employer designees completed the data forms twice during the study period. These forms were completed in three ways:

1. the human resource designees completed the forms based on annual supervisory evaluations and record keeping;
2. the human resource designees provided annual supervisory evaluations and record keeping on site to Cornell researchers who completed the forms;
3. the study participant/employees of the New York City Police Department School Safety Division sent Cornell researchers copies of their annual supervisory evaluations and record keeping. The Cornell researchers compiled the data and completed the employer data collection form.

It is significant to emphasize that it was the human resources representatives, and not the employees’ supervisors, who compiled the employer data collection form. This illustrates the single blind component, of the scientific methodology that was part of the research design.

Work/Family Support Workshops

Participants placed into the subsidy group were required to participate in informational workshops conducted by the Center for Children’s Initiatives formerly known as Child Care Inc., either in person or via the telephone. These workshop trainings covered such topics as understanding child care choices, how to develop a personal child care plan that includes: planning for emergencies when care falls through due to children’s illnesses or school vacations, and how to find a back-up care giver. The workshops also addressed how to be proactive with an employer/supervisor.

Although there were three overall employer group designations, there were additional subgroups due to administrative or contractual agreements. For NYC Health and Hospitals Corporation, two separate employer data sets were tracked. For the home care subcontracted agencies, five separate employer data sets were tracked. The New York City Police Department did not release employee data, but gave permission for employees to supply researchers with copies of their performance evaluations that included the requested data.
Labor/Management Collaboration

As a direct result of the parameters of the WPWNY initiative, a unique opportunity for labor/management cooperation was built into the framework of this multi-union, multi-employer project, via the following partnerships:

- District Council 37 & NYC Health and Hospitals Corporation;
- International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local 237 & NYPD School Safety Division; and
- 1199 SEIU & NYC Home Care Subcontractors

This collaboration took many forms, including partnering to secure rooms for onsite recruitment, communicating with supervisors to grant “union leave time” requests, and sending organizational designees to attend advisory board meetings convened by the WPWNY project organizers. The “added value” of this labor-management partnership was in the identification of areas of common ground and cooperation that are essential to a greater return on investment whether that be in dollars and cents or in human capital.

Advisory Board

In addition to creating a forum for Labor/Management partnership, the WPWNY initiative also included the creation of an Advisory Board. The Advisory Board was comprised of representatives from the New York Union Child Care Coalition, city agencies/sub-contracted agencies, the Consortium for Worker Education, Cornell University-ILR, the Center for Children’s Initiatives, representatives from unions including 1199 SEIU, District Council 37, IBT Local 237, the United Federation of Teachers and the City Council. The advisory board convened periodically to provide feedback and expertise on issues related to the workplace partnership, study design, implementation and on public policy implications.

Study Methodology

The case study research determining impact of child care subsidies on employee performance, productivity, absenteeism and retention was directed by the Cornell School of Industrial Labor Relations in Buffalo and New York City.

The key concepts measured in the baseline and follow-up surveys are as follows:

1. Current child care arrangements;
2. Work situation;
3. Child care impact on work.

Child care arrangements were evaluated based on variables such as the hours needed, ages and number of children, levels of care, and licensing status of the provider. The work situation was measured on variables such as shift, job title, and job status. The concept of child care and the impact on work was measured by variables such as the ability to concentrate on work, attendance, and work performance.
Population Surveyed
The survey respondents are pre-screened municipal workers who are employed at selected city or city sub-contracted agencies. The Working Parents for a Working New York Initiative, in consultation with the participating unions, selected the worksites that would be targeted. Respondents self-selected as to whether they wished to participate in the study. The Cornell Survey Research Institute (SRI) assigned each respondent to one of two categories—subsidy recipient or control. The final participant group included in the study had to meet the following criteria:
(a) maintained employment with participating WPWNY employer;
(b) completed both baseline and follow-up interviews within the study time frames of October 2007-April 2008 and April 2009-May 2009, respectively and;
(c) researchers had matching employer data in order to compare the baseline and follow up year.
As a result of these parameters, the final study pool was comprised of 169 participants across all unions; of those, 92 respondents were in the subsidy group and 77 were in the control group.

Questionnaire Development
Cornell’s Survey Research Institute (SRI) worked with the Cornell principal investigator to develop both the baseline and follow-up questionnaires. The baseline questionnaire was modified a number of times before being finalized on January 22, 2008. The follow-up questionnaire was modified a number of times before being finalized on March 5, 2009. No formal testing of the instrument was conducted; rather, the survey instruments were thoroughly tested informally.

Mode of Data Collection
Both surveys were administered face-to-face or in a few cases over the telephone in English or Spanish by the Cornell ILR research team with the responses recorded on paper. The paper surveys were given to SRI on February 22, 2008 for the baseline, year one interviews. The completed paper surveys were delivered to SRI on May 1, 2009 for scanning and verification for the follow up, year two interview (See appendix).

Survey Response
Below is a summary of the response outcome of the survey by group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>No Subsidy</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
<th>Total Eligible Completions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HHC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Care Agencies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPD School Safety Division</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Please indicate one response for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. If I were provided employer-subsidized child care, I would be willing to stay at my current job even if I didn't like my boss.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If I were provided employer-subsidized child care, I would be willing to stay at my current job even if it meant less promotional opportunities.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. If I were provided employer-subsidized child care, I would be willing to stay at my current job even if it meant I needed to travel an extra hour compared to a job closer to home without this benefit.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. If I had a choice to get a percentage raise or money for childcare, I would choose:
○ The raise ○ Money for childcare

Thank you for your participation!
Data Analysis

Structure of the Survey Data

The survey contains a variety of different response options, and a number of questions that ask the respondent to select all that apply amongst the response options. Many of the questions have either “yes/no” response options or are Likert scale responses, with poles of “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” For the analysis, missed responses are excluded.

Employee performance

Employee performance was measured in two ways; (1) timely, regular employer evaluations and (2) employee self-reports from two individual research questionnaires. With the participant’s permission, two employers furnished supervisory performance evaluations directly from the HR departments to the Cornell researchers. A third employer gave permission for the employees to furnish copies of their supervisory evaluations to the Cornell researcher themselves. Employers used the following categories of unsatisfactory, good and above including outstanding, superior and excellent to judge employee performance.

Reporting of Results

This report presents raw or un-weighted frequencies of responses by question. Results are reported only for valid responses by whether or not the respondent received a subsidy. Statistical analysis for comparisons on follow-up versus baseline, or subsidy versus no-subsidy, was done with a two-tailed z or t test, where appropriate, at a 90% or 95% significance level with the appropriate degrees of freedom, if applicable. All significant differences were noted, however not all insignificant differences were noted. Given the small sample size, reporting of statistical significant differences is cautioned.
**Challenges**

In addition to the small sample size, other factors undermined the quantitative statistical significance of the WPWNY’s study component including, a timing problem with the flow of the original funding allocation which shortened the study period, the ending of study six months sooner than originally anticipated due to New York City budget difficulties and employer data that was incomplete or inconsistent. Nonetheless, important trends can be noted using the qualitative self-reported data of this case study. Furthermore research indicates that the self report method has provided valuable data concerning organizational behavior questions in the past and makes a valid contribution to future knowledge.  

**Research Findings**

**Demographics of study population**

The study population was multicultural, almost exclusively female, and had an average age of 35 years. The mean salary ranged from an average low of approximately $22,000 to an average high of approximately $36,000.

**169 WPWNY Families**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>♀female 95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race &amp; Ethnicity</td>
<td>65% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Salary</td>
<td>Home Care: $21,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


---

30. Over the past year, have you arrived late/early or been absent due to any of the following: (Please mark all that apply.)

- Personal health
- Transportation breakdown
- Personal issues
- Family issues
- Elder care issues
- Other (please specify)

31. Please indicate one response for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The demands of my work interfere with my home, family life or time with my children.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill all my family responsibilities.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Things I need to do at home do not get done because of demands my job puts on me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My job produces stress that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Due to work-related schedule changes, I often have to make changes to my plans for family activities.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Do you have alternative child care arrangements, i.e., a back-up plan, should a problem occur with your normal child care arrangements?
   ○ Yes  ○ No

25. Please indicate **one response** for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequently (at least one time per week)</th>
<th>Sometimes (one to three times per month)</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrived late or left work early</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used sick days</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used annual leave (vacation days)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used comp time</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used leave without pay</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. If you arrived late or left early due to a problem with your child care arrangements, did you experience any negative work-related consequence as a result?
   ○ Yes  If yes, please indicate what you experienced (all that apply):
   ○ Coached or counseled by supervisor
   ○ Given a verbal warning
   ○ Given a written warning
   ○ Formal disciplinary action
   ○ Suffered a negative job evaluation
   ○ Denied promotion or career opportunities
   ○ No  If no, skip to question 28

27. Have you ever filed a grievance because of a negative work-related consequence that happened because of a problem with your child care arrangements?
   ○ Yes  If yes, what was the resolution?
   ○ Grievance was won, discipline removed
   ○ Grievance was won, discipline reduced
   ○ Grievance was lost, discipline stayed in place
   ○ No

28. How satisfied are you with your ability to handle any problems that have occurred (or may occur) with your child care arrangements?
   ○ Extremely satisfied
   ○ Very satisfied
   ○ Somewhat satisfied
   ○ Not very satisfied
   ○ Not satisfied at all

29. Would you be interested in learning about methods and strategies for any of the following child care matters: (Please mark all that apply.)
   ○ Dealing with problems (such as unreliability) in child care arrangements
   ○ Understanding how to resolve conflicts with my child care arrangements
   ○ Improving the quality of care for my child (children)
   ○ No, I am not interested

Since eligible parents knew that the subsidy funding would be of a limited duration, most maintained their existing child care arrangements instead of upgrading their care. Despite the fact that only 16% of parents switched their child care arrangements as a result of receiving a WPWNY subsidy, those in the subsidy group indicated the following reasons for changing child care arrangements the prior year: 40% better location; 24% more affordable and 20% for better care. Although only a small percentage of parents were able to pursue licensed child care arrangements as a direct result of this subsidy, families experienced substantial savings regardless of their choice of child care as a result of this project. In fact a WPWNY child care subsidy is the equivalent of a 4.8% to 79.8% raise for home care workers, a 3.3% to 54.9% raise for hospital workers and a 2.9% to 48.4% raise for School Safety Agents based on their mean salaries and the minimum and maximum annual subsidies distributed during the program.
Furthermore, the assistance in paying for child care provided by the WPWNY subsidy led to improvements in other areas of family life. Parents indicated that the money saved from their reduced child care expenses was used to better manage family necessities and household expenses. WPWNY subsidy participants indicated that as a result of these savings the money they ordinarily used on child care was directed to the following family basics: food, household expenses, bills, clothing, personal care, family entertainment and on extended family members.

**Participant Insights**

The impact and importance of the WPWNY initiative is also reflected in the following participant comments:

** Interviews:**

- “I had to fire my first sitter because she was always drunk and now my son’s girlfriend sits for me. It’s cheaper, but she’s always late so now my good attendance is down the tube.”
- “I adopted my sister’s four kids who were in foster care and with my four, I now have eight and I am a single parent working the night shift at the hospital.”

21. Please indicate **one response** for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Over the past year, I have been able to learn something new in my job.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. There are opportunities for advancement in my current work.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I am paid a fair wage for the amount of work that I perform.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My benefits are the same or better than other people I know who do the same work in other workplaces.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I am able to do my job well because I have a reasonable workload/schedule.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Please indicate **one response** for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My supervisor understands my family demands.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My supervisor listens when I talk about my family responsibilities.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My supervisor acknowledges that I have family obligations.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Please indicate **one response** for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My co-workers understand my family demands.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My co-workers listen when I talk about my family responsibilities.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My co-workers acknowledge that I have family obligations.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow Up Interviews

- “While I understand that I had children and they are my responsibility, those months that we received the money were so helpful! Much less stress, fewer migraines, paid rent on time and the refrigerator is full.”
- “Because the child care subsidy has ended, I won’t be able to work as many hours as before.”
- “Being able to receive the subsidy was one of the best things because a lot of parents aren’t able to work productively because they don’t have reliable child care.”
- “This program was very helpful, because of the subsidy I was able to stay at work until the end of my shift.”
- “Child care is very important to working parents to relieve stress.”
- “I would like the program to continue because I can’t afford quality educational programs for my child without it.”
- “I wish the program could continue! It helped tremendously with balancing my other family obligations.”
- “I hope this helps parents in the future who need reliable child care because there are a lot of parents who have to travel far to get to work.”
- “I was so disappointed that they cut the funding. It was so helpful. I’m a single mother and struggling very hard. This kind of child care assistance is really needed.”
- “I would like for other working parents like me to have the same opportunity (to get the subsidy) because these types of programs are crucial.”
- “I need assistance with child care and want the union to do more to get it.”
- “The study was really good and helped a lot. I would be interested in participating in future studies.”
- “Not having to worry about child care is a blessing.”
- “This was the best opportunity for working people.”

WPWNY Impact on Work Performance, Productivity and Attendance

All WPWNY subsidy participants were asked through questionnaires administered by the Cornell researchers, to rank their perceptions on their performance, productivity, attendance and ability to handle family responsibilities at the start of the subsidy in comparison to the end of the subsidy. Based on analysis of these self-reports receiving the subsidy clearly had a positive impact on each of the categories identified while losing it had a negative impact.

Additionally, according to data collected from employer evaluations, the average overall employee performance of those who received the WPWNY subsidy was 25% satisfactory and 75% good and above. The above category includes outstanding, superior or excellent. Subsidies supported the continued high performance of these workers, which is particularly significant in this economy where New York City employers will be relying on their workforce to become even more productive and efficient.

Based on the baseline and follow-up questionnaires employees who received the WPWNY subsidy indicated that they left work less often, concentrated better at work, and improved their productivity at work.
Child Care Subsidies Improved Participants’ Work Performance

Participants receiving a WPWNY subsidy experienced a 17.8% decrease in disciplinary actions during the study period as compared to the control group that received neither the subsidy or workshop benefit. This drop in disciplinary actions includes reductions in being coached or counseled by a supervisor, verbal warnings, written warnings, formal disciplinary actions, negative job evaluations, or being denied a promotion.

Work Productivity as Measured by Disciplinary Actions

8. Please indicate one response for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Action</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Because of my current child care arrangements, I can handle my family responsibilities better.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Because of my current child care arrangements, I am better able to concentrate at work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Because of my current child care arrangements, I have to leave work less often to deal with family situations.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Because of my current child care arrangements, I feel that my productivity at work has improved.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please select all that apply for the next two questions.

9. What is your normal method of transportation to your child care provider(s)?
   - Bus: ○
   - Commuter train: ○
   - Subway: ○
   - Car: ○
   - Private Passenger Vehicle: ○
   - Walk: ○
   - Not applicable: ○

10. What is your normal method of transportation to work?
    - Bus: ○
    - Commuter train: ○
    - Subway: ○
    - Car: ○
    - Private Passenger Vehicle: ○
    - Walk: ○
    - Not applicable: ○

11. From the time you leave the house, how long does it take for you to drop off all your children to their respective child care providers?
    - Less than 30 minutes: ○
    - 30 minutes to less than 1 hour: ○
    - 1 hour to less than 1 1/2 hours: ○
    - More than 1 1/2 hours (please specify): ○
    - Not applicable (e.g., if child care provided at home): ○

Please go to the next page and answer question 13.

12. If your childcare is provided in your home and the provider is late, how long do you wait?
    - Less than 30 minutes: ○
    - 30 minutes to less than 1 hour: ○
    - 1 hour to less than 1 1/2 hours: ○
    - More than 1 1/2 hours (please specify): ○
    - Not applicable: ○
5. Why was it necessary to change your child care provider over the past year? (Please mark all that apply.)
   ○ Child aged-out of provider’s offering
   ○ New child born
   ○ Provider no longer in the field
   ○ More convenient location
   ○ Better quality care
   ○ More affordable care
   ○ Other (please specify) ______________________________

6. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1=low and 5=high, rate your current child care arrangements on the following characteristics. Please bubble in only one answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>High 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of care</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child enrichment/education offered</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability/Dependability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of child care</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please indicate one response for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   a. Paying for child care is a concern for me. | ○     | ○    | ○     | ○    | ○        |
   b. The cost of child care is important in my choice of child care arrangements. | ○     | ○    | ○     | ○    | ○        |
   c. I would change my child care arrangements if I could afford to do so. | ○     | ○    | ○     | ○    | ○        |
   d. An employer-provided child care subsidy is very important to me. | ○     | ○    | ○     | ○    | ○        |

After the subsidy period concluded, WPWNY subsidy participants saw a 45.5% decrease in their work performance effectiveness with a decrease in work concentration while also simultaneously experiencing a 34.9% decrease in their work productivity.

An unexpected finding resulting from the baseline and follow-up questionnaire data was that employees reported using less sick days for child care while receiving the subsidy. This allowed employees to use their sick days during periods of actual illness thus reducing “presenteeism” as well as the spread of disease and its corresponding potential public health risk.5 Across all three unions, 68% of participants receiving the WPWNY subsidy reported that they used their sick days for child care issues/emergencies with less frequency as a result of the project.

---


WPWNY Impact on Family Responsibilities
Over 84% of all WPWNY participants receiving the child care subsidy reported handling their family responsibilities better during the study period. After the conclusion of the subsidy period, participants reported a 34.1% decrease in their ability to handle family responsibilities better.

Promoting a Positive Climate for Workforce Performance
The WPWNY study participants were also asked to rate their work climate as measured by the willingness of their supervisor(s) to discuss work/family challenges. Over 50% of all WPWNY participants (including both the subsidy and control groups) felt their supervisors were not willing to listen to conversations about family responsibilities. The participants were then asked to rank workplace interventions that would be beneficial in promoting supervisory dialogue and ultimately the overall work environment. The highest rated intervention or 70% of WPWNY participants receiving a subsidy benefit across all unions saw that labor/management cooperation through the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) was a key factor in facilitating this type of supervisory dialogue.

Interventions to Facilitate Dialogue with Supervisors

Working Parents for a Working New York Initiative
A project of the New York Union Child Care Coalition (NYUCCC)
Administered by the Consortium for Worker Education (CWE)
Research Project by Cornell University

Name (Please print clearly)

Number from consent form

1. Indicate both the age group and number of children in the age group who require child care.
   - 6 weeks to 18 months # of children
   - Over 18 months to 3 years # of children
   - Over 3 years to 4 years # of children
   - Over 4 years to 5 years # of children
   - Over 5 years to 10 years # of children
   - Over 10 years to 12 years # of children
   - Over 12 years # of children

2. What type of child care arrangement(s) are you currently using for your child (children)?
   (Please mark all that apply.)
   - Day Care Center - care for more than 6 children at a time, not in a personal residence
   - Small Day Care Center - care for up to 6 children at a time, not in a personal residence
   - Family Day Care Home - care of 3 to 6 children at a time, not in a personal residence
   - Group Family Day Care Home care for 7 to 12 children at a time, in a personal residence
   - School-Age Child Care Program care for more than 6 children at a time from kindergarten through age 12
   - Informal care (neighbor)
   - Relative/Kin care
   - Other (please specify)

3. Do you have to make different child care arrangements for school holidays or summer holidays?
   - Yes  
   - No

If you have more than one child in child care, please answer the following questions 4 through 6 based on your youngest child in child care.

4. Has it been necessary to change your child care provider over the past year?
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - Go to question 6

Subsidy Control
Child Care Workshops & Workplace Problem Solving

Another variable studied regarding WPWNY subsidy recipients was the impact of informational workshops or phone consultations on their work/family problem solving strategies. Sixty percent of those who participated in a workshop or phone consultation with the Center for Children’s Initiatives, formerly known as Child Care Inc. (CCI), did things differently as a result of CCI’s activities and assistance. The workshop topics included choosing the best provider, planning for emergencies or school vacations and strategies to talk with supervisors. Parents reported that the workshops and phone calls educated and helped them change their actions in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important factors for selecting child care</th>
<th>Planning for the unexpected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about finding better quality child care</td>
<td>Information about more convenient child care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating backup plans for holidays/vacations</td>
<td>Problem solving with provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental challenge to selecting care</td>
<td>Job impacts of unreliable child care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed/Informal care distinction</td>
<td>Problem solving for licensed/informal care situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating partnership with provider</td>
<td>Working with supervisor on child care issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Care Workshops Make a Difference at a Small Cost

Another variable studied regarding WPWNY subsidy recipients was the impact of informational workshops or phone consultations on their work/family problem solving strategies. Sixty percent of those who participated in a workshop or phone consultation with the Center for Children’s Initiatives, formerly known as Child Care Inc. (CCI), did things differently as a result of CCI’s activities and assistance. The workshop topics included choosing the best provider, planning for emergencies or school vacations and strategies to talk with supervisors. Parents reported that the workshops and phone calls educated and helped them change their actions in the following areas:
What will I be asked to do?
Those who participate in the study must be willing to take a chance in a lottery where one of the following will happen:

(1) You will be selected to be in the group that will:
   a. get financial assistance toward childcare
   b. attend workshops to talk about different kinds of childcare planning approaches
   c. participate in two individual interviews
   OR
(2) You will be selected to be in a group that will:
   a. not get financial assistance
   b. not attend any childcare workshops
   c. participate in two individual interviews
   d. receive $60 after completing the first interview
   e. the possibility of receiving $60 after the second interview if funding is available for the second year.
   OR
(3) You will not be selected to be in group 1 or 2.

Each person who is selected to be in a group will be asked to answer questions in two interviews. The first interview will be soon (December 2007 – February 2008) and the second interview will be approximately one year from now (December 2008 – February 2009), if the New York City Council gives the study funding for a second year. Interviews can be conducted in English, Spanish, Chinese, or Creole, if you ask.

We will ask you to sign a form to give your employer permission to give Cornell information that they already keep about your productivity, performance, and absenteeism.

What are the risks and benefits to me?
Risks: The risk is that you may not be selected to be in a group or that you may not receive the childcare financial assistance.

If you are selected to be in a group and leave your employment for any reason, you will not continue to receive the childcare financial assistance or the $60 at the end of the first interview and the possibility of receiving $60 after the second interview.

Benefits: The benefit is that you may be selected by lottery and receive childcare financial assistance for a short period of time of less than one year. There is a chance that childcare financial assistance will be extended for another 12 months.

If you are in the group that is only selected for the individual interviews, you will receive $60 after you have completed the first interview with the possibility of receiving $60 after the second interview, which will be in the winter (December 2008- February of 2009).

Either way, your participation in the study will help your union work towards getting additional childcare benefits for working parents.

Taking part is voluntary: Taking part in this study is up to you. Even if you agree to participate in the study now, you can change your mind at any time and have your name taken out of the lottery for the study. Deciding to leave the study will in no way interfere with your job security.

Outcomes
Receiving a subsidy impacted positively on work performance whereas the loss of it had a negative effect. After the subsidy period ended, participants saw a decrease in their work performance, concentration and productivity, coupled with an increase in tardiness and work/family conflict.

The study demonstrated that there are immediate, low cost employer interventions that correlate positively with an employer’s return on investment. For example, the subsidy participants indicated that their attendance at childcare workshops provided important information that is known to enhance effective workplace problem solving strategies.

Subsidy participants indicated that they used less sick time for childcare. Instead the subsidy participants had the time available if they needed to use sick days during periods in which they were actually sick – thus reducing the risk of greater health consequences for the public, their clients and eliminating the negative impact on their productivity of working while ill.

The high rate of participation of those in the study who were not selected to receive the subsidy, known as the control group, indicates the importance of childcare as an important work/family issue.

Academic research findings support the self report of study participants.

The study design is a valid model and it can be replicated in any workplace. It incorporates two important components of the scientific method, that of random assignment and single blind design.

About the Consortium for Worker Education

The Consortium for Worker Education (CWE), founded in 1985, is a private, non-profit agency that provides a wide array of employment, training, and education services to 60,000 New York City workers annually, including union members, New Americans and dislocated workers. CWE comprises 46 major New York City Central Labor Council affiliated unions representing over 1.4 million New York City workers, providing them with education and skills specific training programs to support and enhance their career growth. CWE’s Worker Service Center Program offers New Yorkers free courses in adult basic education, computer literacy, English as a Second Language (ESL) classes and other programs in neighborhood-based locations throughout the five boroughs. The programs are funded by the New York City Council, the New York State Department of Education and the New York State Legislature.

About the Center for Children’s Initiatives Inc. (CCI)

The Center for Children’s Initiatives, Inc. is nationally recognized as a leading voice for meeting the care and development needs of children from birth to school age. Founded in 1982, CCI champions the right of all children to start life with the best possible foundation of learning, care and health. The backbone of CCI’s efforts is: helping families find the best quality early care and learning for their children, partnering with professionals to improve and expand their services, and influencing public policy to assure sensible and affordable options. CCI is a member of the statewide network of child care resource and referral agencies.

For more information, please contact us at 212.929.7604 or visit our website at http://www.centerforchildrensinitiatives.org/

Appendix:

Working Parents for a Working New York Participant Consent Form (rev 12-10-07)

What is the study about? Cornell University will be conducting a study for the Working Parents for a Working New York, a group that includes your union. The purpose of this study is to learn how childcare benefits influence member’s productivity, performance, and absenteeism. Cornell will do this in two ways: 1) review records your employer already keeps from supervisory evaluations or other personnel records, and 2) conduct individual interviews with all members in the study to get your point of view about your childcare arrangements and how you think it affects your productivity, performance and absenteeism.

If you decide to participate in the study, you will not be singled out or treated differently. As usual, the collective bargaining agreement will protect you against any unfair workplace treatment.

All personal information collected from the employer or from the individual interviews will remain confidential. Cornell will write a group summary of this information for a presentation to the New York City Council with the goal of getting more childcare assistance for working parents like yourself and for your union brothers and sisters.

The Case Study Can Be Applied to Other Academic Research

The following existing academic research supports and enhances the findings of the WPWNY Initiatives:

Unreliable child care is one reason parent-employees are tardy, absent or leave before the work day is over. Nationally, this is estimated to cost employers $3 billion annually.* The impact that unreliable child care has on workers also manifests in other ways; one of which is apparent in the comment of a WPWNY’s participant employer. Bill Pernisek, President, CABS Home Attendant Service said, “We have often found that the underlying cause for workers’ inability to meet increasing client needs is their own inability to obtain competent, reliable child care.” Employee turnover is another significant way in which unstable child care negatively impacts the bottom line of employers. The WPWNY study was not able to focus on “employee turnover” and retention as a variable in our study population given the limited time period of the study and the unexpected funding cut midway in the second year of the study. However, extensive research on this topic exists. It has been calculated that employee turnover due to child care related issues costs the equivalent of one and a half times the annual salary of an exempt employee and three quarters the annual hourly wage of a non-exempt employee. Another corresponding field of relevant study addresses how employers who adapt family responsive policies to deal with issues like child care are better able to retain valued workers. Studies have demonstrated that family responsive benefits have a significant impact on affective commitment and turnover of workers. Furthermore, employees demonstrate more attachment to employers who provide family-responsive policies, regardless of the degree that they may personally benefit.†

The participants in the WPWNY study live in all five boroughs, so the commuting time to child care and then to work is a major factor in time and attendance and retention, especially since more than 35% of all study participants had commutes longer than an hour. An interesting note is that of all our study participants who changed child care arrangements within the last year, 6% did so due to a better location. The availability of day care within thirty minutes of home as an important corollary for the job stability of moderate-wage mothers is another topic the WPWNY was not able to fully explore. Linking our preliminary findings to innovative community, union and workplace initiatives to create more accessible and affordable models for child care presents an interesting avenue to explore.‡

---

Future Directions for research

The WPWNY study, using a qualitative, case study self report approach, provides a rich foundation for future study. A more definitive study, replicating the WPWNY model including the following refinements would add to the body of knowledge on the corollaries between addressing child care issues and the workplace. The refinements would include:
(a) a longer time to study the impact of child care subsidies and expand on other measures of work performance, constructive workplace dialogue and problem solving, and short and long term health costs to the employer.
(b) more lead time to recruit the eligible populations to enlarge the study pool
(c) more lead time to select employers with comparable performance evaluation measures
(d) more in-depth study of the impact of the child care workshops on participants
(e) adding other variables to study such as:
   a. use of more time off or flexible use of sick time
   b. the impact of child care workshop for supervisors
   c. the impact on long term health costs, utilizing measures such as stress related illness
   d. the impact on the work performance variables and availability of conveniently located child care providers

Recommendations for Future Actions and Conclusion

This qualitative, case study has revealed invaluable data on the relationship between the receipt of child care subsidies and enhanced workforce performance participation and productivity. The WPWNY study raises interesting linkages to public policy and public good outcomes. It presents a sound academic model that can be easily replicated in any workplace setting. It also maps out practical ways to identify common ground for the multiple stakeholders and partnerships that joins labor and management with community resources to enhance workforce effectiveness for the City of New York.

Some specific recommendations based on the scope and goals of the WPWNY study as identified above include:
1. Training of supervisors on work/family issues
2. Conducting workshops on lunch hours or after work
3. Conducting a follow up study on the relationship of productive supervisory employee problem solving discussions and the provision of on-site work/family informational and strategy workshops attended by both groups of employees
4. Negotiating subsidies through the upcoming bargaining for the City Unions
5. Getting a foundation to fund a new study which would be more definitive (ie longer and with more lead time, selection of agencies with comparable data, more in depth study of workshop impact, subsidy impact separately, possibly adding other variables like more time off or more flexible use of sick time)

About the New York Union Child Care Coalition

The New York Union Child Care Coalition was founded by ten New York unions in the late nineties to address the urgent need of union members and other working parents for quality, affordable child care. In 1998 the Coalition became a sub-committee of the NYC Central Labor Council and the NYS AFL-CIO and expanded to include other unions. The Coalition together with child care advocates and providers developed the concept of facilitated enrollment and has successfully lobbied to win over $60 million in child care subsidies for working families since 2002. The Coalition is also active in support of the implementation of Paid Family Leave in New York State and Paid Sick Days in New York City. For more information, please contact 212.558.2276

About Cornell-ILR

Cornell-ILR founded in 1946 with a focus on labor relations now focuses on a broad array of workplace issues. ILR has the goal of disseminating information to labor and management in order to improve relations between the parties and workplace conditions. Overall, ILR strives for balance between management and labor and teaching and practice and special initiatives designed to meet the demands of critical social and workplace issues. Cornell also provides research assistance to unions and workplace to advance issues relating to the world of work.

About SRI

The Survey Research Institute (SRI) at Cornell University has been providing survey research, data collection, and analysis services since 1996 to a wide-range of academic, non-profit, governmental, and corporate clientele. With a state-of-the-art facility located at Cornell University, SRI possesses extensive capabilities for telephone, mail and web survey data collection. SRI has been well situated to conduct numerous major national and state studies on such subjects as the long-term effects of school-based intervention study on risky behavior among young adults, assessment of the prevalence of elder abuse in New York State, the effects of retirement on drinking behavior, health and safety issues of New York City firefighters, business climate assessment for New York State, major trends in the telecommunication industry, rising tuition at universities, how people cope with aging and careers, and topical issues such as support for civil liberties and the war in Iraq. For more information on these and other completed projects, please see our web site www.sri.cornell.edu. SRI has conducted over 700 projects to date.