

Small Group Discussion Summaries

The learning and research program for the Summit was based on a modified “world café model.” In a world café model program, participants engage in small group discussions exploring a single question or issue⁸. Similar discussions occur simultaneously at surrounding tables. Discussion members then carry key ideas and insights from one discussion into subsequent ones. The leaders also ensure that themes and ideas from prior discussions are incorporated into new conversations. A list of Summit speakers for each specific topic area is provided on the opening page of each discussion area’s summary section, and a full list of speakers is included in the Speaker Information section at the end of the Summit report.

During the 2006 National Employer Summit, three successive 50-minute discussion segments were scheduled. Each track—work-life effectiveness, diversity, work-place equity—included two small group discussions for each segment. Within every segment, each track explored both the voluntary practice and public policy aspect of its given topic. Thus a total of eighteen small group discussions were held during the Summit. The same speakers and tracks were offered during each of the successive discussion times. To capture the ideas and insights provided by participants, note takers were assigned to each table. The discussion summaries that follow rely heavily on the notes taken at each table as well as on notes and observations made during informal discussions held through-out the day.

Discussion summaries are presented in the following order:

Work-life Effectiveness

Practice

- Abstracts
- Discussion Summary

Policy

- Abstracts
- Discussion Summary

Diversity

Practice

- Abstracts
- Discussion Summary

Policy

- Abstracts
- Discussion Summary

Workplace Equity

Practice

- Abstracts
- Discussion Summary

Policy

- Abstracts
- Discussion Summary

⁸ The World Café. <<http://www.theworldcafe.com/>>

Work-Life Effectiveness Practice Discussion

Discussion Topic: Raising employer profits and employee potential...what is the true impact of work-life effectiveness?

Speakers:

- Jodi Levin-Epstein, Deputy Director, Center for Law and Social Policy
- Nina Madoo, Director of Workplace Strategies, Diversity & Workplace Effectiveness, Marriott International, Inc. (2006 FORTUNE 500 Company)
- John Wilcox, Deputy Director, Corporate Voices for Working Families

Following the abstracts is the synthesized version of the discussion based on notes taken during the three table discussions on this topic as well as insights offered during informal discussions throughout the day. The summaries may or may not reflect the views of all of those who participated.

ABSTRACTS

ABSTRACT A

Marriot International, Inc.

“Talking Success – Living our Core Values” Marriott’s Hourly Engagement Initiative

Prepared by: Nina Madoo, Director of Workplace Strategies, Diversity and Workplace Effectiveness, Marriott International

Promising Practice Overview

Marriott International, Inc. is a leading worldwide hospitality company. This initiative addresses the levers that drive associate engagement at work so they are motivated to go above and beyond to ensure Marriott succeeds—thereby ensuring their own success.

What challenges does the promising practice address?

Engagement is linked to improved associate and customer satisfaction, brand loyalty, and higher profit margins. We know that if we can improve the engagement of our associates, we will have a significant ROI for our company.

What does your promising practice offer (i.e. benefits, free services, etc.)?

We have four main themes of engagement and each offers different benefits, training or services. They are as follows:

- **Leadership Excellence** – New training class for managers (Engaging Hearts and Minds) and new GM Chat Session model rolled out. Two core classes revisited; mandated classes but realization that refreshers and more frequent delivery needed (supervisor training and Positive Associate Relations).
- **Personal Growth** – Personal financial training, English-as-a-second-language focus, and pilot program. Re-focus on internal promotion process.
- **Quality of Life at Work** – Increased awareness, communication, and education on our resource and referral program, myARL. Highlighting associate success stories and growing our peer review process.
- **Pride of Affiliation with a Great Company** – Focused on promoting and increasing the visibility of current benefits. Sharing our awards and company recognitions and celebrating the success of our associates.

What do you feel were your three biggest challenges in implementing the promising practice?

- Rolling out the initiative across our vast distribution and diverse population
- Implementing the initiative in a short timeframe
- Securing support from field operations when there are many competing priorities

What are three positives for your employees related to implementing the promising practice?

- A new diagnostic tool that helps property managers understand how to put together an action plan through an assessment of their strengths and opportunities around associate engagement
- A new “rap session” module with General Manager, giving associates the opportunity to be heard and to provide suggestions on improving their quality of life at work
- Improved communications campaign on existing but underutilized benefits (example: profit sharing) and newly developed programs such as financial literacy training and language literacy programs (example: Sed de Saber)

What changes has your organization undergone related to implementing the promising practice? For example, has your practice positively affected the day-to-day business culture of your organization? Does it have an impact on retention?

- The practice will change associates' engagement and ultimately their associate experience at work. It is our goal to engage their "hearts and minds" to bring them to a higher level of engagement and enhance their experience at Marriott from like to love! We have changed the associate experience by implementing "daily stand up meetings" about benefits, training, and growth opportunities. Daily basic wallet cards were created along with posters and brochures to help reinforce messages about personal growth and quality of life at work.
- Engagement has clearly been the burning platform for 2005 & 2006. All properties have mandated a roll out of the "Living our Core Values" program which includes the General Manager chats, daily stand up meetings, and the "Engaging the Hearts and Minds of Associates" training program which educates managers on the key themes of engagement: leadership excellence, personal growth, quality of life at work, and pride in company.
- As a result of the engagement strategy, flexibility has re-emerged as a critical lever to engaging associates. We have a pilot in our hotels right now testing a flexible scheduling model with hourly associates. We have also added a module to our key leadership development program addressing creative and innovative ways to attract and retain talent in light of changing demographics and other dynamics affecting today's workforce.

Explain how you know it is successful. Provide three ways that potentially measure the success of these solutions:

- We have seen increased utilization of core programs. Resource and Referral saw a 5-10% increase in utilization once the program was rolled out. Profit Sharing increased participation rates by market.
- We have a diagnostic tool that provides an evaluation of the physical work environment, culture, associate relations and other factors within a specific location. This can be used to help employers develop an action plan by identifying the key strengths and opportunities for improvement within their work environment.
- Anecdotes have been extremely positive and the program is very well received. Managers embraced the program enthusiastically, but also challenged us to think about their engagement. As a result, we are actively working on our management engagement strategy. We are currently finishing up our Associate Opinion Surveys, which also have an engagement index component. We will soon have a better understanding of whether this initiative had an impact on company wide engagement measures and associate satisfaction.

ABSTRACT B

Corporate Voices for Working Families

"Business Impacts of Flexibility - An Imperative for Expansion"

Please Reference: [http://www.cvworkingfamilies.org/downloads/Business Impacts of Flexibility.pdf](http://www.cvworkingfamilies.org/downloads/Business%20Impacts%20of%20Flexibility.pdf)

ABSTRACT C

Workplace Flexibility 2010

Center on Aging & Work/Workplace Flexibility

"Legal and Research Summary Sheet: Phased Retirement"

Please Reference: http://agingandwork.bc.edu/documents/Center_on_AgingandWork_Phased_Retirement.pdf

Discussion Synthesis: Work-Life Effectiveness Practice

Trends

Making work “work” is a growing concept in the field of work-life effectiveness⁹. This concept encompasses the idea that work should be rewarding for both employers and employees. Proponents of this approach observe that work can be structured to achieve the employers’ bottom-line goals for productivity and creativity as well as the greatest level of engagement by employees. Redesigning work achieves these outcomes by promoting work options that respect and support employees’ work-life interconnections. This is done by offering flexible work options, providing health and wellness benefits, or supporting care giving responsibilities, for example. Flexible workplaces then often measure worker productivity rather than actual time spent in the workplace (a.k.a face-time). Work designed in this way provides employees with a greater sense of autonomy, which has been linked to higher engagement and which has been subsequently linked to higher levels of customer service and productivity¹⁰. It also provides employers with alternative methods of dealing with cost factors such as real estate or transportation¹¹. For example, some government and for-profit models of telecommuting show that employers can reduce real estate costs and experience minimal or no disruption in productivity by the effective use of telework options¹².

Making work “work” means effectively and strategically intermingling life with work—such as when employers schedule flu shot clinics during work hours and eliminate the need for employees to take time off for doctor visits. Other employers may help open up community options for employees by using their influence on the local economy to persuade community medical providers to stay open later to accommodate the needs of shift workers.

As proponents of work-life effectiveness address the need to redesign work, the tool most often cited is workplace flexibility. Rather than view workplace flexibility as an accommodation to the needs of specific subsets of employees, proponents view it as a tool for reshaping work options and attitudes that can empower both workers and employers. An additional positive by-product of making work, “work,” say those active in promoting work-life effectiveness, is that it makes the workplace accessible to the largest possible pool of employees. By designing work options that measure productivity by results instead of face-time, it allows workers that may have had a harder time fitting into traditional work structures to be available for employment (i.e. caregivers, impending retirees, people with disabilities, etc.) For example, Home Depot and CVS have designed work schedules that take advantage of the availability of a specific group of employees: “snow birds,” older workers who migrate between geographic regions to take advantage of warmer climates at different times of the year¹³. The do-it-yourself store chain offers flexible, part-time schedules that are particularly attractive to retirees and includes the option for regular employees to have temporary transfers.

There is experimentation going on within employers around work design options related to work-life effectiveness. Early models for flexibility, which included job-sharing or compressed work weeks, were found to be too rigid to effectively address the challenges of today’s more fluid work and life realities. An emerging trend, observed through such programs as the Business Opportunities for Leadership Diversity (BOLD)¹⁴ Initiative, is to talk about flexibility in the context of designing work in combination with managers and workers. The BOLD Initiative favors a team-based approach to designing flexible work options that involves work teams designing their

⁹ When Work Works. Families and Work Institute. 2007. <<http://familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/3wbooklet.pdf>>

¹⁰ Gibbons, John. “Employee Engagement: A Review of Current Research and Its Implications.” Conference Board. 2007. www.conference-board.com; also see Bond, James T., Ellen Galinsky. “How can Employers Increase the Productivity and Retention of Entry-Level, Hourly Employees.” Families and Work Institute. 2006. <<http://familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/brief2.pdf>>

¹¹ TelecommuterHire Savings Calculator. www.tjobs.com/hiresave.swf; and also see: 2006 Flex In the City Campaign. City of Houston. 2007. <<http://www.houstontx.gov/flexworks/flexinthecity/index.html>>

¹² “The Alternative Workplace: Changing Where and How People Work.” Harvard Business Review. Reprint 98301. 1998. <<http://harvardbusinessonline.hbsp.harvard.edu>>

¹³ Cornell, Christopher. “Follow the Flock.” 2006. Human Resource Executive Online. <www.hreonline.com/HRE/storyid=6367339>

¹⁴ BOLD Initiative. <<http://www.sloan.org/report/2004/workplace.shtml>>

own work schedule in coordination with supervisors. This method takes into account both individual and group needs for flexibility—allowing everyone some access to flexible options—while simultaneously addressing concerns about productivity and control.

Proponents of greater workplace flexibility are struggling with adapting workplace flexibility so that it can meet the demands, structures, and schedules of different types of workplaces and industries, i.e. retail or service industries versus white collar, office work. Examples within shift-based industries of employers, such as those at JCPenney and JetBlue, provide workers with access to online tools that allow them to set or swap schedules in conjunction with others in their work group under the oversight of supervisors¹⁵. According to some Summit participants, it is important that both salaried and hourly workers feel that their needs for flexibility are being met. For example, some service industry employers who offer flexibility find ways to offer even employees with customer-service responsibilities ways to take a few hours off as needed. Some employers have developed advanced time-tracking software that allows employees to track times in and out versus daily start and end times¹⁶.

How to effectively harness technology to redesign work options is a question stemming from an outgrowth of 21st Century technological advances. Like a genie let out of the bottle, technology has redesigned work options in positive, negative, and completely unexpected ways. Now, employers and employees are trying to use technology in more deliberate ways to reshape the workplace to their specific or sometimes mutual benefit. While, technology has brought improvements in productivity (i.e. the personal computer) there is also a less positive flipside to be addressed: products of technology such as cell phones and Blackberries™ can create a work-life imbalances for employees when they become available “virtually” 24/7.

Work-life is not just a discussion happening within a small group of change agents—although actual change may be happening only on a limited scale. While only a relatively contained portion of employers offers formal work-life programming, there is an expanding public dialogue on how work and life interconnect and quite often collide for many employees and their employers. Different segments of the workforce also have varying expectations for work-life interactions, for example, younger, entry-level employees are demanding that flex-time be more inclusive and less selective to allow people to take time off for training or school and not only for family issues.

Innovation in work design is occurring in all segments of the market—small, medium and large employers are experimenting with how to make work “work”. The incidence of formal and informal flexibility policies can differ based on the size of employer. Capturing information on how effective these programs and policies are for employers and employees is not easy, and ensuring that the information bubbles up to reach other employers is one of the greatest challenges faced by those wanting to promote more effective work design options.

Common Ground

Workplace flexibility is the most talked about tool in work design discussions. It is viewed as having the potential to reshape work structures to the benefit of a variety of industries and a myriad of workers¹⁷. “Selling” flexibility as a way to make their workplace more competitive than the non-flexible organization is a challenge faced by change agents. The desire is to create work environments that foster loyalty and meet productivity requirements is important to many employers. But it can’t be forgotten that for some employers, the costs of hiring and training new staff is not considered prohibitive. To that end, work-life effectiveness and workplace flexibility options are also being touted as a means to open up the workplace and advancement opportunities to an expanding pool of current and potential employees.

Employers and employees interested in flexibility are turning away from rigid definitions of flexible options such as part-time schedules or job sharing. Instead, they are striving to create work-life program options that are more organic and that are developed collaboratively between management and employees to meet mutual goals. Explained one participant, the family-friendly policy approach is not getting employers where they want to be ... so they are focusing on work design that instead allows flexibility to be created in cooperation with managers and workers.

¹⁵ Workplace Flexibility for Lower Wage Workers. Corporate Voices for Working Families. 2006. <www.cvwf.org>

¹⁶ Ibid

¹⁷ Gehl, Elisabeth. “Workplace Flexibility: What It Is and How To Get It.” BusinessWoman Magazine. 2007.

<www.businesswomanmagazine.org>

Leading-edge employers are modifying their work design based on the understanding that there can be an effective way to meet individual needs for flexibility while still supporting group work and collaboration. It is crucial to be able to design work options where everyone can have some access to flexibility. The freedom to take risks and experiment appears to be a critical factor in the work design movement. Programs mentioned by Summit participants were aimed at meeting the needs and changing the workplace culture among various groups of employees. Other programs were targeted specifically at changing the work culture among managers or expanding the input of line workers into their schedules. Management-targeted programs give managers more autonomy in arranging their schedules and focused on producing results versus logging in face-time. For hourly workers, experiments focus on scheduling occasional time off within fixed hourly schedules. Stress faced by hourly workers often comes from not knowing if they can take time off when needed. Employers have explored different software for time reporting systems to make it easier for employees to take off small chunks of time.

Proponents of flexible work options are also seeking scalability of solutions and technology. Small, medium, and large-size employers may all view flexible workplaces as an incentive to keep qualified workers, but the formalization of policies varies. This can mean that the perceived benefits of offering such programs may vary greatly among employers. While large employers may be more savvy at using flexible programming as a way to promote themselves as an employer of choice to recruit and retain qualified employees, small employers are often less likely to promote their own informal practices and thus reap the true recruitment benefit.

Technology, including its benefits and detriments, appears to be among the strongest elements affecting the workforce and employers in all industries. Understanding, addressing, and utilizing technology in the realm of work-life is a shared goal among employers, employees, and advocates.

Actionable Strategies

Actionable strategies in the topic area of practical work-life effectiveness leaned towards a desire to share and explore real-life practices and programs with other Summit participants and the greater public. The second strategy lay in encouraging the types of experimentation being undertaken by employers in various industries. These organizations are developing innovative programs that appear to have greater adaptability across industries and that are more scalable across employer size.

Harnessing technology to drive useful workplace change appears to be a critical factor in the success or failure of such programs. For example, new tracking software is allowing some managers to track hourly employees time-in and time-out rather than start and end times; this allows hourly workers to have “chunks of time off” within the work day or occasional flexibility for doctor appointments rather than having to take a whole day off from work. European software tracking systems allow employees to trade hourly time by tracking and keeping points. Employees can put in preferences for shifts. The software allows people who work overtime and need time off to trade with the employee with the lowest points¹⁸. Other software options allow teams of employees to self-schedule using online scheduling software to cover open shifts. Some companies utilized online bulletin boards that offer a less formal scheduling where employees can swap shifts operated independently of supervisors, although they can step in if necessary. This appears to work best for employees that have the same job descriptions.

The inflexibility of early flexibility options—such as creating set options for part-time, compressed work weeks, or leave, etc. — works at some employers. Others, however, have found them too inflexible to meet the evolving needs of a workforce and workplace running on a global, 24/7 timetable. As a consequence, companies that were on the leading edge of flexibility ten years ago are now struggling to maintain momentum for the practice.

In new models, managers still have overall control of scheduling, but the new models don't require them to have control over a daily or weekly schedule. Instead, a focus is on expanding and exploring the implementation of different work-design programs. This process allows managers and employees to collaborate on developing a work environment and schedule that allows everyone some flexibility while still meeting the employer's productivity goals. One model, being developed under the BOLD Initiative, includes testing and adapting a team-designed work plan that includes flexible schedules¹⁹. It also takes the onus off managers in having to decide what reasons for

¹⁸ TimeCare: Workforce Planning. <www.timecare.com> ; Also see, Workplace Flexibility for Lower Wage Workers. Corporate Voices for Working Families. 2006. <www.cvwf.org>

¹⁹ BOLD Initiative. <<http://www.sloan.org/report/2004/workplace.shtml>>

flexible work alternatives are worthy of flex-options and addresses how to get work done versus accommodating personalized requests for flexibility.

Strategies such as this focus upon finding new ways of measuring productivity that go beyond documenting the amount of time spent in the workplace. Examples of such strategies include the following:

- In the United Kingdom, some McDonald's franchises are pilot testing a program that allows family members working at the same store to decide who comes in for a given shift. This allows individual family members flexibility in determining the balance between work and family responsibilities but ensures that managers have hours covered²⁰.
- In Sweden, a point-system for shift work was piloted with nurses. Nurses could self-roster (book or swap) their schedules online. Different shifts were allotted different points with less desirable shifts earning more points. Managers would monitor holes in the schedule and go to the person with the least amount of points first to book the shift²¹.
- Online bulletin boards or scheduling systems are a popular option for a number of shift-based jobs including airlines (JetBlue), retail (JCPenney), or phone retailing. Because of the low-cost of entry into this type of system and the ability of managers to easily monitor schedules, this type of system is seen as being quite scalable—useful to small, medium or large employers²². However, the system seems to work best when all employees within a department or division using the system have the same job description.
- Cross-training is one way that companies are trying to lessen the impact when employees take time off. Some big companies develop a team of people that spend time learning everyone else's jobs. This group of employees then becomes a backup team. However, in some instances pooled or centralized workers, such as an experimental program conducted in east coast hospitals, staffers felt isolated from doctors and nurses. Prior to the centralization project, people at the staff level were achieving an in depth knowledge of a specific area, whereas when they were pooled, they had to learn a little bit about everything, which they disliked and therefore it lowered employee satisfaction and engagement.
- Snowbird programs such as those at Home Depot and CVS make full use of the seasonable availability of retirees—snowbirds who move from Michigan-Ohio to Florida over the seasons²³.

Employers who participate in these types of programs observe a direct correlation between how they treat their employees and what customers think of the organization.

"It helps those customers who "like" their products to move onto "loving" their products, which increases customer loyalty, which ultimately benefits the company," explained one participant.

Additionally, the less successful of these case studies clarify that successful programs aren't simply based upon the actions of an understanding employer who allows a more flexible atmosphere. Instead, successful programs are those that make work meaningful to employees and increase the desirability of their jobs. Flexibility, it must be remembered, is just one tool among many to encourage greater employee engagement.

As participants discussed actionable strategies, it was important to consider a number of key elements in the development and propagation of voluntary practices.

- Proponents of the voluntary adoption of promising practices suggest that the agenda for creating equitable, flexible workplaces can move forward faster with healthy competition among employers; thus, providing an alternative to government involvement in decision-making. They ask: what real-life examples exist that support this idea, and are there additional examples of public policy and voluntary practice complementing each other so that they can create win-win situations for all involved? Concerns raised about a voluntary-only adoption process were also expressed. It was asked: If change agents leave this movement toward flexible, equitable workplaces to voluntary, market-based changes and do not work to make it a "policy," do they make it vulnerable to fluctuations in the economy or new management trends that can be revoked in the future when companies can't "afford" to be flexible?

²⁰ Levin-Epstein, Jodie. Getting Punched: The Job and Family Clock. Center for Law and Social Policy. 2006. <www.clasp.org>

²¹ TimeCare: Workforce Planning. <www.timecare.com> ; Also see, Workplace Flexibility for Lower Wage Workers. Corporate Voices for Working Families. 2006. <www.cvwf.org>

²² Workplace Flexibility for Lower Wage Workers. Corporate Voices for Working Families. 2006. <www.cvwf.org>

²³ Ibid

- Research on the implication of workplace practices would be very helpful to employers and others trying to understand how such issues as minimum wage, immigration, etc. impact stakeholders.
- The scalability of practices must be considered when looking at innovative programming. To disseminate them and spur adoption, it is critical to consider how they can be scaled up or down or adapted to different industries and workplace designs.
- The role of managers in the adoption and success or failure of voluntary workplace practices cannot be underestimated. Support for managers including training and ongoing support to manage the change process involved in the development of different workplace cultures is critical to their success. There's a certain level of self-management among employees, but more visible employees help set an example. If the standard executives establish is a 60-hour work week that includes sending e-mails during weekends, then that becomes the organizational standard and support for flexibility dissolves.
- To encourage the adoption of promising practices in all size employers, small companies need a space to talk about what they can do that the big companies cannot. Their own successes in developing equitable and flexible workplaces need to be mined as well. For example, what do small businesses do naturally that can be used for other companies?
- What is energizing that adoption of work-life flexibility ideas? – Explained one participant, in her workplace it was not work-family issues or working parent concerns that pushed its widespread adoption, it was efforts by younger employees who demanded flex-time be more inclusive and less selective, e.g., allowing time off for school, professional development opportunities, etc.

Lessons can also be learned from failures in work redesign. Not every option, for example, works for every workplace culture. What many of these experimental programs indicate is that communication with and between staff and management is the best problem-solver and is what is needed in most situations to make flexible work options viable.

Work-Life Effectiveness Policy Discussion

Discussion Topic: What policy or government programs exist that impact work-life effectiveness options? Overview of key policy areas or government programs related to work-life effectiveness and what is in development by policymakers, advocates, or employers.

Speakers:

- David Gray, Director of the Workforce and Family Program, New America Foundation
- Kaitlyn Kenney, Policy Research Consultant, Workplace Flexibility 2010, Northeastern University
- Karen Furia, National Office Coordinator, Department of Labor-Women's Bureau

The synthesized version of the discussion which follows the abstracts is based on notes taken during the three table discussions on this topic as well as insights offered during informal discussions throughout the day. The summaries may or may not reflect the views of all of those who participated at a given table during the course of the day.

ABSTRACTS

ABSTRACT A

New America Foundation
Workplace Flexibility 2010

Work-Life Effectiveness Presentation

Prepared By: David Gray, Director of the Workforce and Family Program, New America Foundation, and Kaitlyn Kenney, Policy Research Consultant, Workplace Flexibility 2010, Northeastern University

Section 1: Overview of Topic/Research

Creating flexibility in the amount, location, and scheduling of work has been shown to be beneficial for employees and their workplaces. This presentation on work-life effectiveness has three primary foci:

- Consideration of evidence illustrating the need and desire for flexible work options as a mechanism to improve work-life balance and effectiveness;
- A brief review of current business practices to promote work-life effectiveness; and,
- A discussion of what role government plays in increasing access to workplace flexibility in ways that work for employers and employees.

Section 2: Clarify Implications for employers, stressing any return on investment implications

Much of the research to date regarding the impact of work-life effectiveness programs, such as flexible work options, has consisted of case studies among those organizations that have opted to implement flexible work or other family friendly workplace policies. For example, Corporate Voices for Working Families has published a report entitled, *Business Impacts of Flexibility: An Imperative for Expansion*, based on surveys of its 46 partner organizations and their experience with flexibility initiatives.²⁴ Additionally, a number of evaluation reports address the impact of flexible work practices on federal workers and federal governmental agencies.²⁵ Finally, there have been a few empirical analyses investigating the relationship between flexible work options, their impact on work-life effectiveness, and subsequent economic and managerial impacts on employers.²⁶ Collectively, these results illustrate flexible work options have had positive impacts on:

- retention
- recruitment
- employee engagement and commitment
- productivity
- efficiency of operation
- improved customer service
- profits, revenues, and shareholder value

²⁴ Corporate Voices for Working Families (2005, November). *Business impacts of flexibility: An imperative for expansion*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

²⁵ See for example, U.S. General Accounting Office (1997). Report to the ranking minority member, Subcommittee on civil service, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, House of Representatives, *Federal Workforce: Agencies' policies and views on flexiplace in the federal government* (GAO/GGD-97-116). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office; U.S. General Accounting Office (1985). Statement of Rosslyn S. Kleeman, Associate Director, General Government Division before the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the House Civil Service and Post Office Committee: Flexible and compressed schedules in federal agencies. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office; Saltzstein, A.L., Ting, Y., Saltzstein, G.H. (2001). Work-family balance and job satisfaction: The impact of family-friendly policies on attitudes of federal government employees. *Public Administration Review* 61(4), p. 453; and U.S. Office of Personnel Management (1998). *A review of federal family-friendly workplace arrangements*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

²⁶ See for example, Meyer, C.S., Mukerjee, S., Sestero, A. (2001). Work-family benefits: Which ones maximize profits? *Journal of Managerial Issues* 13(1), p. 38; Halpern, D.F. (2005, May). How time-flexible work policies can reduce stress, improve health, and save money. *Stress and Health* 21(3), 157-168; and Lineberry, J. & Trumble, S. (2000, Winter). The role of employee benefits in enhancing employee commitment. *Compensation & Benefits Management* 9-14; and Landauer, J. (1997, July). Bottom-Line Benefits of Work/Life Programs. *HR Focus*, 3-4.

Section 3: Clarify implications, if applicable, for employees/working women or policymakers

In light of the changing demographics of the workforce—more women in the workforce, an increase in the number of families in which both parents work, an increase in single parent working families, a growing older workers population—many workers need access to workplace flexibility in order to balance their work and family responsibilities and facilitate workforce attachment across the lifespan. Additionally, the younger generation of workers, Gen Xers and Gen Yers, seem to prioritize a work structure that will allow them time outside of work to spend with family.

A glimpse at some of the data currently available regarding the need and desire for flexible work options across demographic groups indicates the positive impact employees consider flexible work options can have on work-life effectiveness. For example:

- According to Family and Work Institute's (FWI) National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW), nearly 80% of employees would like to have more flexible work options.²⁷ Another report by the John J. Heldrich Center reinforced that the vast majority of employees were concerned with having flexibility in their work schedules, and also revealed that this work option is particularly important to women; 43% of women reported flexibility in work scheduling was extremely important as compared to 33% of men.²⁸
- In a national survey of workers ages 50-70, over 70% reported that they expect to continue to work at least part-time after retirement.²⁹ While some workers need to continue work in retirement for financial reasons, others feel work has a positive impact on quality of life by promoting continued usefulness and physical and mental well-being. In continuing their employment, older workers indicate a desire for alternative schedules, shorter hours, and longer vacations.³⁰
- According to a nationally representative survey of adults 21 and over addressing work priorities, men in their 20s and 30s, and women in their 20s, 30s and 40s indicated that a work schedule that allows them to spend time with their families is the most important job characteristic.³¹

For more data on employee needs, see:

http://www.law.georgetown.edu/workplaceflexibility2010/documents/FF_BW_FI_Fact.pdf

http://www.law.georgetown.edu/workplaceflexibility2010/definition/general/STO_FactSheet.pdf

http://www.law.georgetown.edu/workplaceflexibility2010/definition/general/FWA_FactSheet.pdf

Section 4: What roles can or have researchers, policymakers, employers or employees play/played in this area/topic?

As America increasingly struggles with the implications of various changes and shortages in the current workforce, it is critical that employers gain a better understanding of the needs and desires of employees in order to retain existing employees and attract other viable workers. In addition to providing employers and policymakers

²⁷ Galinsky, E., Bond, J.T., & Hill, E. (2004). *Workplace flexibility: What is it? Who has it? Who wants it? Does it make a difference?* New York: Families and Work Institute, p. 21.

²⁸ John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development & Center for Survey Research and Analysis (1999, March). *Work and family: How employers and workers can strike the balance*. New Brunswick, New Jersey & Storrs, Connecticut: Author, p. 6.

²⁹ AARP (2003). *Staying ahead of the curve 2003: The AARP working in retirement study*. Washington, D.C.: Author, p. 4. Retrieved online June 2005, http://assets.aarp.org/rgcenter/econ/multiwork_2003.pdf.

³⁰ Penner, R.G., Perun, P., Steuerle, E. (2002). *Legal and institutional impediments to partial retirement and part-time work by older workers*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. Retrieved April 2005 from, http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410587_SloanFinal.pdf.

³¹ Radcliffe Public Policy Center (2000). *Life's work: Generational attitudes toward work & life integration*. Cambridge, MA: Author, p. 3.

with further insights into the specific needs of employees, researchers also need to further develop empirical literature that evaluates ways in which flexible work options impact business. Policymakers and businesses should consider the lessons learned from the available research and work collaboratively to consider ways in which employers and/or policymakers might provide policies or incentives to better enable the restructuring of traditional work schedule models. In addition, they should discern whether there is a role for government (and if so, what it would look like) in enabling organizations to offer such policies.

Section 5: Discussion Starter Questions

- In your mind, what constitutes “workplace flexibility” or “flexible work options”?
 - See for example, http://www.law.georgetown.edu/workplaceflexibility2010/documents/2005_1017_Definition_Flexcopy.pdf
- Do you have any examples of ways in which your organization (or one you have studied) provides flexible work options or policies?
 - See for example, http://www.law.georgetown.edu/workplaceflexibility2010/definition/general/FWA_CaseStudies.pdf
- In what ways has existing policy, e.g. FMLA, impacted your workplace practices?
 - See for example, <http://www.law.georgetown.edu/workplaceflexibility2010/law/fmla.cfm>
- What are some of the greatest concerns associated with or barriers to adopting flexible work options?
- Are there any ways in which these barriers might be minimized or removed?
- Are there any policy tools that might better equip employers to offer and administer flexible work options?
- What is government’s role in increasing access to workplace flexibility in a way that works for employers and employees?
- What other work-life effectiveness issues should be considered?

ABSTRACT B

Department of Labor-Women's Bureau

Work-life Effectiveness Policy Presentation

Prepared By: Karen Furia, National Office Coordinator, Department of Labor-Women's Bureau

Section 1: Overview of Topic/Research

The Women's Bureau Flex Options Project

The Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor promotes "Better Jobs! Better Earnings! and Better Living!" through demonstration projects. Three years ago the Bureau developed Flex Options for Women. The goal of the project is to encourage employers to enhance and/or develop flexible workplace policies. Over the past three years the Bureau has implemented this project through regional offices based in New York City, Chicago, Dallas, Kansas City, Denver, San Francisco and Seattle. This year we are going to expand the program to this area.

Section 2: Clarify Implications for employers, stressing any return on investment implications

As a result of this project about 200 employees that serve over 370,000 employers have created or enhanced over 350 flexible policies and programs. The Bureau provides a variety of tools that employers can access to learn about flexible policies and programs.

- Face-to-Face meetings
- One-to-One Mentoring
- An informative Website
- Materials
- Quarterly free teleconference calls
- And this year a National Gathering in Arizona

The project itself is flexible and continues to change to meet employer challenges. The range of flexible project includes formal and informal arrangements. Programs develop vary and include: development to telecommuting guidelines, use of teleconference calls instead of meetings, establishment of power hours, emergency flexibility, college class flexibility, shorter hours on Friday, take your child to work, job sharing, part-time arrangements, expanding the culture to accept flexibility etc.

Interested employers are encouraged to join the program by being a mentor, a participant and/or sharing their best practices that are then posted on the we-inc website.

Discussion Synthesis: Work-Life Effectiveness Policy

Trends

Concerns exist about the long-term sustainability of work-life programs and policies. As in other discussions, the primary tool for developing work-life effectiveness for many employees was often identified as workplace flexibility. Whatever the format, work-life programming is seen as vulnerable and subject to reduction or elimination for a variety of reasons. These reasons encompass challenges in implementation as well as the relatively undocumented state of bottom-line benefits to companies. The widespread lack of training for managers to help them deal with the implications of flexible work-design options means that the impact on supervisor work-loads and their perceived reduction in control over scheduling options hampers the spread and success of flexible programs. Vulnerabilities for flexibility programs also lie in their susceptibility to changes in the economy. For example, downturns in the economy can soften the labor market, reduce the demand by employers for employees, and lessen their business incentive to offer recruitment and retention aids. Thus, both advocates of public policy solutions and voluntary adoption of practices see the need to quantify bottom-line benefits to employers and society for providing sensible work-life solutions.

Public policy is one valid avenue for providing and supporting solutions to work-life issues because these issues affect a broad range of citizens across their life-span. Policy can help buffer work-life programs from rapid swings in the economy. Conversations about government policies that impact the work-life intersection define public policy in the broadest sense as government support or incentives that promote a particular workplace policy or practice (i.e.) flexible workplaces. This broad definition also includes the use of government resources to support or influences the voluntary adoption of a particular workplace policy or practice.

When helping employers and employees manage the work-life intersection, current public policy relies heavily on fostering the voluntary adoption of work-life practices such as the Department of Labor –Women’s Bureau’s Flex-Options program that encourages voluntary adoption of flexible work options by providing employers with educational services, business-to-business mentoring opportunities, and promoting the sharing of promising practices. The government also acts as a model for flexible workplaces with the federal government in particular ... having a flexible work policy in effect³². Participants explained that outcomes from federal employee workplace options show both the benefits and detriments to implementing a rigid menu of flexible options³³. At the NES it was stated that there was a natural bridge between the promotion of voluntary practices and the development of formal public policy. By studying promising voluntary practices, it is possible to learn under what circumstances government should write or rewrite policy to remove barriers to the expansion of successful voluntary policies and programs. This examination also enables more employers to adopt such policies by providing funding, incentives or educational opportunities.

A secondary debate developed around how far work-life proponents could rely upon voluntary adoption as a means to expand flexible work options and at what point government support or intervention becomes necessary. To some attendees, there appeared to be a limit to expanding solutions through voluntary practice because at some point the practices reach maximum penetration for employers inclined to see the business case. After that, moving forward requires policies and regulations that provide clearer definitions for flexibility, help to create cultures of flexibility within businesses or communities, or incentives for adoption. The counter argument was made, however, that if there is not a solid business case for adopting or retaining work-life programs, forcing change may provide solutions that create more problems than they solve. Understanding why more businesses are not adopting work-life flexibility as a tool for recruitment and retention could be a critical step in understanding where the line between voluntary adoption and public policy lies. Clearly, differentiations among the sizes and industries of employers may provide some answers as to how far voluntary adoption and policy development should go. It is also critical to understand whether there are societal benefits to work-life options that are worth government offsetting some of businesses expenses in providing them. For example, employees appear to benefit from flexible work options by a

³² 5USC Chapter 63-Leave. U.S. Code. <<http://uscode.house.gov/download/pls/0563.txt>>

³³ Levin-Epstein, Jodie. Getting Punched: The Job and Family Clock. Center for Law and Social Policy. 2006. <www.clasp.org>

reduction in stress and stress-related illnesses. Does the reduction in health care costs and lost productivity make both a societal as well as business case for offering them?

A lack of consensus exists about whether workplace flexibility can work in every industry. It is feared that broad policy changes could harm rather than help employers and employees under those circumstances. An example provided by Summit participants related to health care or senior care workers in which there is a staff shortage. Flexible work options, cautioned one participant, could compromise the quality or continuity of care as well as be a large financial cost to providers. However, other participants cautioned that it is important to understand that the term “flexibility” is a broad umbrella under which an extremely wide array of work design options exists—ranging from flexible start and end times to mechanisms that provide cover for short-term emergency absences (i.e. picking up an ill family member during work-time) to full-scale alternative schedules³⁴. Thus the ability of flexible work designs to address its own inherent constrictions among different industries or workplace cultures may determine its long-term sustainability.

When policy is developed, it needs to reflect the reality that flexibility is not one-size fits all. Participants expressed concerns about public policies that mandate specific flexibility options. These rigid definitions of flexibility can be a detriment to some industries such as the health care fields, as described in an earlier example. There was also concern for policy mandates that do not have dollars attached to help defray the costs of transforming the workplace such as providing management training, covering the costs of increased paperwork and tracking, etc. Policies need to work for both businesses and employees if they are going to be win-win, explained participants. Flexibility needs to be *flexible* in its implementation and understood to be *flexible*. It should also be understood that success in instituting a flexible policy or program may not rest on everyone being on a flexible schedule at the same time, rather it is an option for those who want to ask for the option and who could benefit from it.

At the heart of the debate on how and when to utilize public policy is “How best to create a culture of flexibility within employers and the nation at-large?” Should culture change be encouraged through policies mandating change in workplaces, policies that offer incentives to voluntarily adopt flexible programs, a combination of voluntary adoption and policy, or should it all be left up to market forces? Participants pointed out that in some cases policy could be equally well-used in updating or removing current regulatory or legal barriers that are preventing employers from adopting more flexible options or that discourage employees from taking them when offered. Currently, some regulations originally designed to offer support and safety nets for employees may now be discouraging the adoption of flexibility even when it is desired by both employer and employees. For example, the ability of employers to offer phased retirement options to maturing workers might be inhibited by current legislation that impacts tax deductions, access by employees to pension benefits, and health care plans etc. Phased retirement is when an employee works for their same employer within the same system on a reduced schedule³⁵.

Conversely, rather than legislating what forms flexibility should take, legislating a “right to ask” option was offered as an alternative beginning step in creating a national culture of flexibility. Such legislation would allow employees to ask their employers for flexible work options while not mandating that employers must grant it. Employees would be tasked with developing a plan to share with employers clarifying how work would be accomplished under the flexible schedule, while employers would be asked to give the request a fair hearing. Under this type of legislation, similar to one in effect in the United Kingdom, employers would be prohibited from retaliating against an employee that requests a flexible option but would not be required to accept the request³⁶. Participants said that the success of such a law would lie in its ability to remove the onus from both employers and employees for judging or justifying what a good reason is for allowing flexibility (i.e. sick family member versus educational advancement).

³⁴ When Work Works: Making Work “Work.” Families and Work Institute. 2007. <<http://familiesandwork.org>>; Also see: [Workplace Flexibility 2010](http://www.law.georgetown.edu/workplaceflexibility2010/index.cfm). <<http://www.law.georgetown.edu/workplaceflexibility2010/index.cfm>>

³⁵ Brainard, K. (2002, October). *Phased retirement overview: Summary of research and practices*. Prepared for the NASRA Phased Retirement Committee. Retrieved July 26, 2005, from <http://www.nasra.org/resources/Phased%20Retirement%20Overview.pdf>; Also see: Sloan Work and Family Research Network. <[http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/glossary_template.php?term=Phased%20Retirement,%20Definition\(s\)%20of](http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/glossary_template.php?term=Phased%20Retirement,%20Definition(s)%20of)>

³⁶ Levin-Epstein, Jodie. *Getting Punched: The Job and Family Clock*. Center for Law and Social Policy. 2006. <www.clasp.org>

Common Ground

Policy is not the only external force that can drive widespread societal change. For example, reactions to recent natural or man-made disasters induced some employers to develop emergency response plans that included teleworking and other remote work options. Some cities faced with growing traffic congestion have engaged employers in developing telework and flexible work initiatives to reduce traffic congestion and pollution. The broader issue of work-life effectiveness which encompasses flexibility is a policy-level question because it deals with the larger question of what is valued in society. This is a critical question for policy to answer because it determines what kind of baseline of work-life balance government is willing to support with tax dollars, mandates or incentives.

A societal benefit to the large-scale implementation of work-life flexibility is that it holds the potential to expand the available labor pool. While employers may consider that the needs of one set of employees is being met by such programs (i.e. working parents), there are, in fact, great multiplier effects with flexibility for any group that appears difficult to serve—people with disabilities, caregivers, impending retirees—that can help employers expand their labor force options by expanding their acceptance of alternative work design options. Innovative solutions to universal work-life issues hold the promise of engaging an expanded pool of employees into the workforce who will, in turn, benefit from the related income and career opportunities.

There appears to be an overall sense that policy can play a productive role in getting employers and employees to a place where they can discuss win-win solutions to work-life issues. If a case is to be made for policy-based expansion of work-life programming and flexible workplaces, flexibility needs to be looked at not just as a means of altering hours but of keeping employees engaged and productive across their life-span.

Understanding that the demands on employees' time and energy changes across that life span and can constrain their options can help employers who wish to retain experienced and committed employees. This increased insight into employee motivations can help employers craft work design solutions that can better deal with on-ramping and off-ramping or phased retirement issues. Similarly, policymakers that understand this life-span work paradigm and its effect on employers and employees may be better able to craft policy that enables employers to offer adaptable solutions as their workforce changes over time. Doing so removes impediments to fostering flexible options that help them keep valued employees and retain their intellectual capital.

While there does appear to be interest in policies that support the development of work-life effectiveness, there are problems envisioned by businesses that can make their successful adoption doubtful. To reach common ground with employers, their concerns about whether the solutions offered for work-life issues may be more costly than they are worth must be addressed. Some employer concerns that suggested policies would need to address include:

- Wage-focused issues—How do businesses replace the wages of someone who takes time off? Do they allow people to accumulate time off through overtime thus creating time banks people can use for sick leave, phased retirement or sabbaticals? Time banks are shared pools of leave to which employees contribute time. The question emerges again, however, who pays for this banked time? Does it get banked like pre-tax dollars for a 401 (K)?
- Incentives for business—What tax or other incentives can be made available to businesses to foster flexible work environments without mandating the form that flexibility takes? This combination of incentive with flexible options was held up as something that businesses might respond to well because it allows them the opportunity to tailor solutions to meet their own needs and workplace structure.
- Opening up discussions between employers and employees without opening up liability—How could more open communication between employers and employees be fostered by government activity? Open communication allows employers and employees to proactively discuss the option of flexibility without costly repercussions to the employee or the employer. Would this look more like a “right to request” law or a public service campaign?

Deciding when and where government policy is an effective spur to the development of work-life solutions will rely heavily on the availability of accurate data. Capturing and sharing data that accurately describes benefits, challenges and choices in work-life options (especially) flexibility for employees and employers is critical in driving forward both voluntary acceptance of promising workplace practices and in informing the development of win-win and, by implication, sustainable public policies. Government can play a role in this process by helping

capture information through existing sources such as the Census Bureau, Department of Labor, and the Bureau of Labor statistics or by funding such research. It could also offer guidance on the types of data that employers can capture on their own to accurately describe the impact of work-life options within their workplace.

Public policy that affects workplaces is currently being developed at the local, state, and national levels. In developing new policy, when and where the most appropriate level for government interaction is needed could depend upon the size of the employer being targeted. The relative size of employers influences the availability of resources and the options open to them for creating effective work-life programs. Flexibility can be useful in both large and small businesses but the actual process of implementation and the needed supports can be quite different.

These differences would need to be reflected in any suggested legislation or regulations. For example, small businesses may be more proactive in offering flexible work options but they are also much less formal in their policies than larger employers. Large businesses can afford to bring in consultants to help them develop workplace programs but small businesses rarely can. Thus, providing publicly available educational opportunities to help businesses with the change process by offering grants, conference, webinars, how-to guides, and templates for forms or employee surveys would be particularly beneficial to small and medium-sized employers. These are also supports that can be provided at the local, state, or the federal level.

Policy is not a one-size-fits-all proposition for employers or employees. As policy is being developed, the starting point should be to remember that work-life needs exist for many different types of employees and not simply for working parents. Policy development needs to take into account providing incentives not only for employees to offer it but for the employees to make use of them—policy can help deal with the potential impediments to use.

Policy has to be developed with an understanding to the resources, including time and money, needed to implement and support it. A checklist of questions to consider when developing policy that creates win-win policy solutions might include some of the following ideas:

- How many decisions around work design will be made by employers and employees? Within the development of public policy, it is important to fully understand what rights are to be allowed to each of the major stakeholders: employers, employees, states, locales, consumers and understood in a way that it clarifies the bottom line impacts for each group including costs, benefits, and a way to measure the success of culture changes.
- Does it provide or support training for managers to help them understand how to balance employee needs with productivity requirements or explain how to implement flexible work schedules?
- Are there uniform data measurements that can help employers and policymakers determine when programs are successful? The effects of current limited examples of policy are in the early stages of documentation and it is not easy to say if public policies are driving changes in behavior or expanding flexible or other work-life options. This makes it harder to make the case for what public policy and government intervention can accomplish in this arena.
- Does the policy offer businesses the opportunity to tailor solutions to meet their specific workplace needs?
- Does the policy help open up discussions between employers and employees?
- How much of U.S.' tax dollars should be spent establishing a baseline for equitable, flexible workplaces (i.e.) supporting paid sick leave? Are the states or local governments to be engaged in paying for or implementing the policy?
- Does it provide answers to the wage replacement question? Solving the wage replacement issues for certain types of flexible options such as sick leave, part-time, long-term or short-term disability or leave is a critical one for both employers and employees because it has significant impact on their mutual bottom-line.

Actionable Strategies

Addressing important questions on opportunity costs, rights, and responsibilities becomes a critical strategy in itself when considering what types of policies to develop in support of successful workplaces. How much of America's tax dollars should the country spend on establishing a baseline for employees that supports work-life options enabling them to be available for work and productive on the job (i.e. paid sick leave)? Are the states going to be involved in the implementation of policies or bear any of costs associated with them? How many decisions are going to be left to the employees and employers? It is important to clarify what rights are allowed to each.

Solving the wage replacement issues for certain types of flexible options such as sick-leave, part-time work, or long or short-term leave is a critical one for employers and employees. It can be a prohibitive cost for both groups. Currently, many employees who qualify for leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act do not take it because they cannot afford the time off. For employers, holding a position open for an employee on FMLA means not only paying out benefits to the employee on leave but covering the costs of temporary help or spreading the work among other employees.

Thoughtful analysis of potential policy options related to work-life effectiveness is required. To that end, the following questions were offered to both discussants and to those pondering new public policy:

- 1) Considering the mismatch between existing law, regulations and policy and reality, why has the federal telework initiative been minimally effective in increasing the number of workers who are teleworking³⁷?
- 2) If the U.S. were to offer some form of wage replacement for leave time from work, how might this be organized or structured? From whom would the money to run this program come? How would it be tracked?
- 3) What are some ideas that might work for business in terms of incentives for offering flexible work practices?
- 4) How might a conversation be facilitated between employers and employees regarding what might work in terms of work structure and meet the needs of both?
 - Smaller employers seem to be able to “work it out.” How do we make the broader policy applicable to larger businesses?
 - What about the notion of a right to request with an appeals policy (something akin to the United Kingdom policy)?
 - Current policy that does exist within organizations/corporations or abroad, seems to suggest going down the road of encouraging this conversation between employers and employees to determine potential arrangements. Does this seem a reasonable approach in the United States?
- 5) When considering the issues of wage replacement, there are examples in the United States such as programs made available in California³⁸. What do we know from these examples about what works? When developing something similar at the federal level or within other states, what factors need to be considered?
 - Is there a way to create a fund where employers are paying into it along with government to provide wage replacement?
 - Who should pay into such a fund?
 - Should taxes be used to supplement the fund?
- 6) What are some potential incentives that could be considered for prompting businesses into adopting workplace flexibility policies? Some ideas offered included:
 - Government supported programs that lead employers voluntarily into adopting promising practices such as the Department of Labor-Women’s Bureau Flex-Options program
 - Programs that provide subsidies that allow organizations to hire consultants to help them figure out which policies would work best in their organization
 - Tax incentives such as credits or deductions

However, using taxes for this purpose leads to the philosophical question regarding what choices or tradeoffs are citizens willing to make? Is government responsible for offering some benefits? Employers? Where do we place this responsibility?

It seems logical to believe that employers are not going to automatically accept policy changes, especially mandated policy changes. One policy suggestion offered in support of employers who want to voluntarily develop or expand work-life effectiveness options was to develop outlets where businesses could go to receive valuable information regarding work-life practices and policies. Such outlets are currently housed at various nonprofits such as BPW Foundation’s Rawalt Online Resource Center or the online library of Workplace Flexibility 2010.

Supporting public-private partnerships to promote the development of flexible work practices was another suggestion. Finally, the discussion suggested that grants be offered through the Small Businesses Administration (SBA) for use by smaller organizations in the development of work-life policies.

³⁷ “The Status of Telework in the Federal Government 2005.” Office of Personnel Management. 2005. <http://www.telework.gov/documents/tw_rpt05/index.asp>; Also see: Worklife: Telework. US. Office of Personnel Management. <http://www.opm.gov/employment_and_benefits/worklife/workplaceflexibilities/telework>

³⁸ California Employment Development Department. <<http://www.edd.ca.gov>>