

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

WORK AND FAMILY BALANCE
A FUTURE OF CHILDREN EVENT

Washington, D.C.
Wednesday, October 5, 2011

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction and Moderator:

RON HASKINS
Senior Fellow, Economic Studies
Co-Director, Center on Children and Families
The Brookings Institution

Overview:

JANE WALDFOGEL
Professor of Social Work, Columbia University

RON HASKINS
Senior Fellow, Economic Studies

Keynote Speaker:

MARYELLA GOCKEL
Flexibility Strategy Leader, Ernst & Young

Panelists:

HEATHER BOUSHEY
Senior Economist, Center for American Progress

ELLEN GALINSKY
President and Co-Founder, Families and Work Institute

MARYELLA GOCKEL
Flexibility Strategy Leader, Ernst & Young

JANE WALDFOGEL
Professor of Social Work
Columbia University

* * * * *

PROCEEDINGS

MR. HASKINS: Welcome to Brookings. My name is Ron Haskins. I'm a Senior Fellow here, and also I'm at the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

And along with Belle Sawhill, my famous colleague, we run something called the Center on Children and Families here at Brookings, and one of our favorite activities, if not our favorite activity, is work on the *Future of Children* journal, which is one of the -- in fact, I think it is the most widely quoted children's policy journal in the world. And we manage to attract fantastic authors, as you'll see in just a minute when Jane gives a summary of the journal. And we try to deal with topics that are relevant to what's going on today and, if possible, topics that have policy implications.

In this case, we think this issue of work-family relations, which is the focus of the journal, has a lot of practical implications, but it's not very high on anybody's policies either in Washington or in the states, so we took that as a special challenge and focus a lot of our

recommendations -- and we focus this event -- primarily on what the private sector can do, because we're not optimistic that there'll be government action. And, in fact, if you hang out in Washington and watch what's been happening lately, I'm not sure there'll be action on anything for the foreseeable future. So, we greatly enjoy doing the *Future of Children*.

We happen to have two people from Princeton, who will actually -- many people think the editors run the journal, but it's actually administrative staff, and we have Warren Moore, who's here from Princeton, and also Chris Emmerson from Princeton.

So, welcome. Glad you could come.

They're actually here to make sure that Bill and I are doing things properly, so I hope I pass whatever the muster is.

Okay, so here's the issue, and we'll begin with demography. First we have a tremendous number of mothers in the labor force. So I can tell, looking at this audience, many people here are young. Not necessarily everybody on the panel, but everybody in the audience looks pretty young to me. (Laughter) And you may not realize what a remarkable change this is.

I can still remember when I was in high school that I virtually had no friends who had mothers who worked. And in my lifetime there has been dramatic change. Something like almost 70 percent of mothers are now in the workforce, so that's a huge demographic change, and this

creates enormous issues within a family, because normally the mother was there to run the household and the father went out and worked and it was, you know, it wasn't necessarily great for mothers and they eventually figured that out. So, this is a huge change in our society and we have to respond to it.

The second thing is that we specialize in how to not only marry but how to break up families. About 70 percent of black kids and 45 percent of Hispanic kids and 40 percent of all American babies are born outside marriage. So, this means we have a tremendous number of single-parent families. At any given moment more than 25 percent of our kids are residing in a female-headed family. So, in this case you have one person who's responsible for both bringing home the bacon and for cooking it up and watching the kids and so forth. I mean, it is -- I myself was a single parent with two young children for many years, and I can -- and I had an adequate income, so this is a really huge change in addition to the change in moms entering the workforce.

And then of course the third element of the trifecta of difficulties for families is that we live so much longer now, so we have so many more elderly people, and many of the elderly, especially in the last year or so of life, are not capable, not fully capable of taking care of themselves. So, this, too, falls on families.

So, we have these three big demographic changes that have combined to create a real problem for American families and especially for

moms and dads who are trying to rear children. And you would think we might want to do something about it.

So, here's what we're going to do to try to eliminate this problem and discuss possible solutions, especially those in the private sector.

First, Jane Waldfogel from Columbia is here. She was one of the editors of this issue of the journal. She's one the nation's most distinguished researchers and writers in both developmental psychology and children's policy, and she's going to provide an overview of the journal issue and then we're all going to participate in a panel discussion when we get to that point. I think it's fair to say that there's no issue in developmental psychology or children's policy about which Jane has not published at least one book. I give a lot of talks, but every time I give a talk, she publishes a book of miracles. It's amazing. Then next she'll summarize what's in the journal.

And then next I'm going to make a few brief comments about our policy briefs, some of which I've already suggested to you.

And then we're going to have a special guest, Maryella Gockel, who is the flexibility strategy leader for Ernst & Young, a major American firm and a firm that has received numerous awards for its flexibility and for its attempts to help its employees. In fact, almost every year for many, many years now it's been on the Hundred Best Places To Work list. There are several of those, and they make them all. And

Maryella and Ernst & Young both were recognized by the Family Work Institute for its Annual Work Life Legacy Award. So, Maryella's done a lot to help improve -- and from a practitioner's point of view, someone who actually tried to figure it out and work for someone trying to make a profit. And so we're hopeful that she has a lot to say about how companies could do a better job here, and as I've already suggested we think companies are the key, at least at this point in American history.

Then after Maryella finishes we're going to have a panel discussion, and we're fortunate to add two people to the panel who will make comments to open the panel discussion. The first is Ellen Galinsky, who's the president and co-founder of the Families and Work Institute in New York. Ellen is a recovering scholar, who was at Bank Street College for 25 years, and she also has an astounding record of publishing books and scholarly articles, including the widely read *The Six Stages of Parenthood*. I neglected to read that book and paid the price. (Laughter) So, I recommend that all of you who have children or are thinking about it run out and get that book.

And then Heather Boushey, who's a senior economist at the Center for American Progress. She was formerly with the Joint Economic Committee in Congress, and she also for years was with the Economic Policy Institute, and she was co-editor of the *State of Working America*, which is really a spectacular volume that summarizes -- it's 250 pages or more, lots of tables and figures for ones who like that kind of stuff.

Everything you can't think of about the American workforce is in that book, and it's really a magnificent book. And I think Heather probably holds the record for appearances on panels in the Washington, D.C., area that have anything to do with social policy in children. She's everywhere.

So, Jane Waldfogel. Thank you for coming. Let's hear about the journal.

MR. WALDFOGEL: Thank you, Ron.

Well, it's great to be here today launching this issue of the journal on work and family, and it's always great to do something with the future of children. Get to work with Ron. Get to work with the great people at Princeton. And so when they asked me if I would help co-edit and organize a special issue on work and family I said, you know, absolutely.

So, as Ron said, the dilemma that we face and that came out really clearly as we worked on the journal issue is that parents really act as the hub for service delivery for their children. They provide direct care themselves, but they also coordinate the other care that their family members receive. And the same thing is true when people are providing care for the elderly. But most parents and most elder caregivers are also employed. And this is what leads to this work-family conflict.

So, to understand this better and to gather the latest evidence, Sara McLanahan at Princeton and I convened a group of experts, and the great thing about *Future of Children* is if you call people

up and say we're doing a special issue, *Future of Children*, would you participate, everybody says yes. So, you get these dream teams of -- everybody you'd want to get on the issue is in the volume. So, that's why it's such a fantastic thing to do. And the way the volumes work is they are meant to review the latest research on a topic. So they're really meant to be sort of as of today what's the state of knowledge on this so that you can refer to them and everything's there. And so we asked authors to cover what are the challenges when employees have young children, when they have school-age children, when they have children with special health care needs, when they're caring for elderly family members, and what's the possible policy response that might address some of these issues looking at the role of employers, the role of government, and then finally what other countries do.

So, I'm just going to walk through the volume and highlight some of the findings, but I really encourage you to, you know, read the volume, suggest to other people that they read it. You can get a hard copy, you can get it on line from the Future of Children website, and I think it's a resource that you'll come back to over and over again.

So, for demographic changes, this is what I mean by dream team. So, we've got Suzanne Bianchi to do the demographic changes for us.

So, as Ron was saying, you know, American families have been transformed. Seventy percent of married mothers work, 76 percent

of single mothers, and they're heading about a quarter of families with children. Two-thirds of mothers are working within 12 months of their child's birth. So, not only are people working, they're working very early in life. And an increasing share of employees have elder care demands as well.

At the same time, work places have changed. There's more nonstandard work. There's more insecurity of employment. There's more earnings inequality. So, you have both of these sets of changes colliding and increasing work-family conflicts.

Suzanne was careful to note in her chapter that these challenges play out differently for families, depending on the kind of resources that they can bring to this. So, for high-income families we hear a lot about too many hours of work and the pressure of work. For low-income families we hear a different story about actually too few hours of work, too little control over their work hours, and not enough income to manage. And for people in the middle, there are the issues of job and financial insecurity but also limited resources to meet work-family needs because they're probably not eligible for some of the public resources and public benefits that low-income families would have, but they don't have the private resources of the higher income families.

For families with young children, Chris Ruhm wrote for us about the two principal types of policies that help families with young children, and that's parental leave and early childhood care and education.

What Chris emphasized over and over again in his chapter is how poorly we compare to our peer countries, other advanced industrialized countries in terms of providing public support and also in relying so heavily on private support, employer support, which then tends to be unequally available with the more highly paid employees getting better benefits and the more low paid employees getting fewer benefits.

What Chris documented for us is that European countries provide more integrated services, and in particular they all provide at least some job-protected and paid parental leave. So, it used to be just the U.S. and Australia were the only advanced industrialized countries without paid parental leave. Australia implemented paid maternity leave, so now it's just us kind of hanging out there on our own.

And then the other striking finding from Europe and other advanced countries is public funding for early childhood education. And typically this is universal, publicly funded pre-school in the year or two before children start school so that everybody's ready, everybody's on the same page. So, Chris recommends moderately extending paid leaves here and also improving quality and access to early childhood care and education.

Sometimes we think that family demands diminish once kids go to school, that these work-family issues are only about pre-school-age children. That's just not at all true. Somebody's, like, shaking her head no, that's not true. So, you know, parents are hugely important in the lives

of school-age children, adolescents. A couple of us older panelists were talking about having kids applying to college at the moment and how heavily we're involved in that process. So, it just never ends.

So -- but actually there's something for schools to do here, because schools are set up for the kinds of families that Ron and I grew up with where the mom's at home and she can come in for parent-teacher meetings, she can bring the kids back and forth, she can transport kids to after-school activities, and that's no longer the case.

You know, the authors of that chapter felt that workplace reforms are likely to play the greatest role, and what they really emphasized is workplace flexibility. Now, this is one of the learning things for me in doing this kind of volume. I've been working on work-family issues for a long time, and typically the work-family issues we think about are leave policies, early childhood care, and education -- those kinds of policies. And flexibility is now really what people are talking about in the work-family arena, and you'll hear a lot about it today.

If you ask parents, this is what they want. And it's something that employers are starting to provide. And the authors wrote about two particular types of flexibility: flex time arrangements, giving people flexibility about their work hours; and then policies to allow workers to take short periods of time off if they do have a family crisis and have something they to address.

The chapter by Mark Schuster and his co-authors on families

with children with special health care needs is fabulous. They talk about -- you know, all families have kids who get sick from time to time. All kids get sick. But in addition, 15 percent of families have kids with special health care needs, and this is really challenging in terms of a policy response.

Parents play a real central role in the health care of their kids in terms of both providing direct care but also coordinating the care. So, they talk about both short-term discretionary leaves and other leave mechanisms for families with children that have more ongoing health care needs. And again they stress that this is not just about families and employers in the government, but it's also that other systems need to accommodate -- to take into account the fact that the American family really has changed.

Elder care -- as Ron said in the beginning, Americans are living longer, and, you know, many elders are living healthy extra years. But at some point most will eventually need some kind of care and support, and that's often provided by employed family members, again leading to these work-family conflicts. And just as when you have children with special health care needs, when you're caring for someone who's elderly this could be acute or it could be ongoing and so it leads to both two different types of leave needs. One is short-term flexibility in leave, but the other is longer term flexible work arrangements for people who may need longer leaves to address a situation but want to be able to come

back.

The role of employers in providing more flexibility was a theme that cut across the volume -- Ellen is here so she'll talk more about that. Just to summarize what was in her chapter for the volume, employee surveys consistently show that employees want flexibility but that they have little access to it, and if they do have access they hesitate to use it. They worry about repercussions if they do use it.

Flexibility actually offers several advantages to employers, which I'm sure Ellen will talk about, and so they spend a lot of their chapter talking about a successful intervention that actually helped engage employers, employees, and communities in implementing more flexible workplace practices and promoting their use among employees so they wouldn't be afraid to use them.

The role of government -- Heather's here, so that -- you know, it's fantastic and I'm sure she'll talk about what's in her chapter -- but what recurred across the volume was the potentially important role of government. And you can think of government as playing several roles -- as an employer; as a source of data and information; but, in particular, as a generator of policy and that's what we really focus mainly on in the volume. And Heather does an amazing job in this chapter of going through the history of all the legislation and policies in these different areas, so she talks about the history of policies around workplace hours and flexibility, paid time off for family care, and covering the cost of care

when caregivers are at work or school. So, it's a history of the entire policy framework in these areas.

And then she talks about how policy development has kind of stalled in each of these areas and hasn't kept pace with the change in American families and what's happening currently at the local, state, and federal levels and what could be happening in the future to advance these kinds of issues, focusing in particular on workplace flexibility and paid family leave.

And then, finally, there's a chapter on what other countries do. As I've mentioned, a theme that recurred throughout the volume was the extent to which we could learn from other countries. There's often a debate about how relevant this kind of evidence is. I think some people hear international evidence and they don't want to know what other countries do. They want to know what California's doing or what Wisconsin's doing. But for some people it's very informative and inspiring, so the international evidence is there. If it's inspiring and helpful for you and if it's not your cup of tea, then Heather's chapter talks about what the states and localities are doing.

I find the international evidence very compelling, because in virtually every area of work-family policy, our policies are less well developed, and they're also less equitably distributed. So, there's this issue that I mentioned of the better paid workers having more benefits and the lower paid workers having the least benefits, because the benefits are

tied with employment and wages rather than coming publicly from the government.

What the authors do is focus in on the list of the world's most competitive countries. So, the countries that we're competing against -- because often the concern in the states is well, if we implemented these policies, wouldn't it hurt our competitiveness? Wouldn't it hurt our economy? And so they go right at that question by documenting what's in place in our main competitors. And they show that all of our main competitors provide paid leave for new mothers. That's universal now with Australia coming on board. All of them, except Switzerland, provide paid leave for new fathers. If you don't provide paid leave, fathers aren't going to take it. And most of them provide paid leave to care for children's health care needs, as well as paid vacation and paid days of rest each week. So, if you think about the recommendations about needing some mechanism so that people can take leave intermittently, if they have an ill child or a child with chronic health care needs or they're caring for an elderly family member who's had a fall or needs some help on a particular crisis, that kind of short-term leave is the mechanism that would address that. And it's important that it be offered with pay, because otherwise people can't use it; people can't do without pay.

So, cutting across the volume, Sara and I as editors saw three clear policy implications. The first, as I mentioned, is this key role for more workplace flexibility. This is a theme that just comes out over and

over again. It's what parents say they want. It's what elder caregivers say they want. This is what cuts across these things. There's not a one-size-fits-all remedy for work-family issues. Families are too diverse. The demands on them are too diverse. They change over time. So, really what people need is flexibility.

Second is I've emphasized there's a need for more equitable policies, especially around paid leave. The statistics are just staggering that the inequities and, you know, I'm in a well-paid job; I work for a private university; I have various forms of paid leave, and sometimes there's an assumption for us that everybody must have these types of benefits if they're employed. But a pretty substantial share of the U.S. workforce doesn't have any paid leave at all, whether its vacation leave or sick leave, and so if you take the time off in the best case you're losing pay; in the worst case you actually lose your job, because you don't have any job-protected leave. So, we really need to move to a more equitable situation.

And the third really striking piece that came out in the conversations when we brought the office together was how many of them were emphasizing the need to engage other sectors than families and employers. We often think that work-family conflict is about employers and employees and they're somehow in conflict, and there are other systems there. There are the school systems, the health care system; there are elder care providers -- all of which need to understand that families are different than they used to be.

So, in my final minute, I've got two slides -- so, we're there, we're good. The volume also led us to rethink some assumptions, so let me go through these quickly.

Work-family issues are not necessarily an area where employer and employee interests collide. We tend to think that they are, but actually greater workplace flexibility benefits both employers and employees.

The second myth that's out there is that work-family issues are just about women, and they're not. They are a big concern to men as well. Men are spending more time caring for family members. A lot of men have family obligations and men, too, say they want more flexibility. They want to be able to spend more time with families. And as I've emphasized previously, these are not problems that just families and employers need to address. There's a role for all of these other sectors to come in.

So, just to wrap up, you know, Americans have this fabulously strong work ethic. They also care really deeply about their families. And with more parents working, more employees having elder care responsibilities, it shouldn't be surprising that employees are increasingly voicing concerns about work-family conflict.

Employers -- I'm actually pretty optimistic about this -- I think employers are responding. I think they're providing more flexibility. They're trying to figure out ways to respond. And actually local, state, and

federal governments are responding by experimenting with policies to provide paid sick leave, paid parental leave, more support for child care. Up until the recent financial crisis, there was a lot going on, particularly at the state level, and I think all of us need to be generating the research and the interest so that when the money is there again we can move forward. We're ready and we're primed.

So, I hope the evidence in this volume will be useful in forming the responses and inspiring and informing further innovation once the funds are there.

MR. HASKINS: Thank you, Jane. You might have pointed out that we may lack on social policy, not just family leave but all social policies as compared to Europeans, but we're a hell of a lot better conducting war. So.

All right, so my goal here is to discuss very briefly our policy brief. It was available to you. Most of you probably have it. I hope some of you will actually read it.

The first point is I think we've said enough already to demonstrate that we have a demographic problem, and we have probably 70 percent of the households in which children live either have a single working parent or have both of their parents working. So, this is a problem that's virtually universal in the United States, and it is not going to go away. So, this is something that we'll be discussing and looking for solutions for many, many years here to come.

I think the essence, and you get it from the volume -- Jane implied this -- if not saying it directly in her presentation. And if you reflect on this issue I think you will quickly figure out that there are three basic things -- there are more than that, but three big and basic things that families want and would find helpful in trying to rear their kids at the same time that they work.

The first is paid parental leave. In the United States we don't have it. Some employers are required by federal law to provide leave but not paid leave.

The second thing is flexible hours, and as Jane said this probably is a fairly recent entry, but if you reflect on this, and having experienced this myself, to me it's the single most important thing, that you can get time off without penalty. And I don't mean just docking your pay, I mean the attitude, especially the supervisor's, that they really are actually encouraging you to take time off if it's to provide for your children, for the birth of a baby, for illness in children, and, as we talked about in the beginning, for helping elderly parents.

And the third and another huge one and very, very expensive and an area where the government is heavily invested is in child care -- not just during the preschool years but during after school care as well. We do have extensive policies in pre-school. Again, I think Jane could tell us chapter and verse that Europeans are mostly ahead of us in this regard and we have a fairly patchwork kind of system. But we

do spend a lot of money, and until recently there were increased policies. Frankly, I think we'll be lucky to keep what we have. Some states have already started to come back. But this is the third area where -- and this one I think government maybe could play its biggest role. Already it's playing a very big role, and I'm worried that it's going to actually decline.

So, the next point is I think we kind of have a thesis in our brief, and the thesis is that we'd better not count on government too much in the near future, because first of all this is not -- this issue of work-family tension has not really been at the top of the agenda for either party. I think it wouldn't necessarily be expected that Republicans would have this at the top of their agenda, though there are time when Republicans do agree with it. The Democrats often had this at the top of the agenda and have pursued policies. But in recent years, that has not has happened. So, first, politicians, elected officials at the federal level and pretty much at the state level as well, are not focused on this issue and it seems -- it's just not an issue that's likely to get any votes in the near future.

And the second thing is we have the tightest budgets we've ever had both at the federal level and at the state level. We're in immense trouble. Maybe some of you have been at our events. Many people here at Brookings are deeply concerned about this. At last, the American people are concerned. We are actually cutting programs now, and I feel that that will probably get quite ugly before it's over. We're going to get a little introduction to it this fall, and next year, especially if the Super

Committee achieves its goal, we'll get an even bigger introduction to what it's actually like to seriously cut budgets both of the military and of domestic programs. So, the prospects for more money for government programs is unlikely.

And then we have a horrible economy. Almost everybody believes now it's going to be many years before we even return to pre-recession levels of employment. So, the prospect that in this atmosphere that the government either at the state or federal level would impose mandates on employers to do things to help their families deal with these work-family issues -- it just seems pretty implausible. So, we need to look elsewhere.

I do want to mention -- I hope Heather talks about this some -- that for those of you who might not have reflected on this too much, we do have a number of federal policies that go way back 70, 80 years that policymakers have always been aware of, at least of obligations having to do with personal lives and families, and the three things I think are most important are:

The Fair Labor Standards Act, which establishes hours and overtime, child labor laws, and minimum wage laws.

Secondly, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which basically outlaws discrimination, and what's really, at least in my opinion and my reading literature, has been quite successful. And we still have some discrimination, but it has declined greatly with regard both to gender and

to ethnic group.

And, finally, the Social Security Act, which is, despite what Governor Perry might say, probably the number one element of American social policy, that is, if you do polling, the public support Social Security. They're worried about it. They think it's poorly financed. But they love Social Security and they want Social Security. And also it's not going to go away; it's another example of the federal government's commitment to these more personally issues having to do with the wellness of families.

But now as we say, there probably is not going to be any action at the federal and state level. But there's another consideration that comes out in several of the chapters that I think's very important and that you should at least consider, and that is even if the federal government can't do thing for the country as a whole and finance paid parental leave, for example, and it's not going to put mandates on employers, as an employee -- the federal government is a huge employee -- they can set an example for the rest of the country of good work-family policies. And I think the federal government actually does quite a good job of that already, and there's even talk about expanding some of the rights an employer -- the policies that help employers at the federal level. And so the federal government can continue to be an example, a beacon, for the rest of the country about what good employee policy would be, especially parental leave and health insurance, which is a big issue for almost all American families. So, that's one thing the federal government can do.

The second thing -- and if you read the volume and read the chapter in the volume -- Jane mentioned this -- where you'll see this very clearly, and that is fund research. There's a lot of very interesting research going on. If I were being quarrelsome, and I might be during the panel, I would question the issue of whether we really, truly can have family policies that on the bottom line increase profitability. There is some evidence, and Ellen will review it, but I think there are lots of skeptics about that, and the more and better research we have that show that these family policies or the type we're discussing here can actually influence a company in a positive way and improve the bottom line because of better morale, increased attendance, more consciousness and commitment to the company, and so forth. All of those things can happen, and there are some studies that suggest they have. But that's an example of the kind of research that we need more of, because we need to convince more employers that that's possible.

State governments -- I think the prospects of anything happening seriously in the near future are just about zilch.

So, that then brings us to the brightest hope for policy in the future, and that is for employers. And in that regard, we are very fortunate today to have Maryella Gockel, as I said in the introduction.

One of the things that I've learned in doing events at Brookings -- we do a lot of events at the Center on Children and Families, and one criticism we get is that many of our events focus on Washington

types and people who are scholars, and we often do not hear from people out there in the countryside who are actually trying to solve the problems. And so that is why we're very fortunate today to have not only Maryella, but Ellen is here, people who actually deal with this on a day-to-day basis, and so let's hear from the actual employer perspective about what we can do to solve this problem. Maryella Gockel.

MS. GOCKEL: Well, hello, everyone, and thank you, Ron, for having me.

For those of you that are not familiar with Ernst & Young, we are a professional services firm. We do business in over a hundred countries throughout the world. We've got hundreds or thousands and thousands of employees around the world, and we are one of what is known in the business as one of the Big Four. So, big accounting firms -- we offer professional services and audit tax advisory, etc.

And I'm going to pretty much keep my remarks to what we've done in the U.S., because, of course, around the globe it is different. And there are paid leaves in other countries, not necessarily in the U.S., but at Ernst & Young of course we have paid leave here. But I am going to keep my remarks to the U.S. specifically.

But I do like to tell one story just to give a bright glimmer of hope around what happens around the globe, and Ellen will recognize this story. We have a colleague who tells this story often, and he was traveling with his CEO in Asia and one of the questions that his CEO got

from the stage was, "Are the babies in the U.S. more important than the babies in Asia?" And what that question intimated was the fact that we do a lot -- we, corporate America -- do a lot in the U.S. around providing things like childcare centers and resource and referral and the kinds of things that our busy families need but they don't necessarily translate across the globe. So, one of the things that we need to think about is what will this look like in the future around the globe -- not only around paid leave but around the kinds of things that will help families succeed.

But I digress, because let me again talk about what Ernst & Young does here in the U.S., and I thought I would start with a personal story -- and, Ron, thanks for letting us know that some of us are a little old, and when I prove this -- I will prove this, that I am.

I started with Ernst & Young in 1980. I started as an audit staff person in New York City. And in 1985 I decided to transfer to what was then our New Jersey practice, because it just seemed like if I was going to have a family and if I was going to have a career and --- if, if, if --- doing it from New Jersey, which is where I lived, would have been a lot easier than doing from New York City.

So, I transferred to New Jersey and, lo and behold, in 1988 we decided to adopt our first child from Korea. The reality is we had what one might call maternity leave. It was really disability, and so you had to be disabled, which of course if you adopt a child you're not. So, I didn't have paid leave, if you will, which many of my female colleagues did,

because most people would not assume that I was disabled.

But, like all good things, I had a great leader, and my great leader said we'll figure it out. And so we did. In 1988 I took some off and I returned on what was then not the most fashionable thing to do, but that was to return on a reduced schedule, flexible work arrangement. And, again, not something that one would have done in 1988 and thought about having a real career at a real firm like Ernst & Young.

But it sort of worked. And in 1991 I decided to adopt another child, and my daughter arrived, and the same thing. I wasn't disabled. And I didn't get "paid parental leave." But, again, my leader was fantastic. He believed in women in the workforce. He believed in the kinds of skills that I had and said not to worry, we'll figure it out. And we did. But this time it was a little different and he said Mare, I don't care where you work, I don't care where you work from, I don't care what you do. Just please don't leave the firm. So, at that point, he was kind of a believer in not only this whole concept of leave but his concept of flexible working.

Fortunately for me, I worked a long time in the New Jersey practice and in 2001 took this role, and my title was the Director of Work Life Integration. I can't tell you what I was really supposed to do, but I knew I could figure it out, and the reality was I was the person who was put in place by our current CEO, Jim Turley, to really think about how flexibility can translate -- what it is going to look like at Ernst & Young that was going to allow our firm to become more flexible and our people to

really succeed in both their personal life and their professional life.

And so we started thinking about what could that look like. And thanks to Ellen and a lot of great thinkers, we actually stopped calling it work life, because we believed at Ernst & Young when you had a career, a big career, much of it was -- your work was very much a part of your life. So, we started using this term "flexibility." We started thinking about it as what else do you want to do? How else do you want to succeed? How else can you think about what your career and your life outside of work is going to look like?

So, fast forward 2001, we still don't have paid parental leave. We have disability for our women if you give birth. But if you adopt or you're a foster parent or you're a dad, you're out of luck.

So, I took the role in 2001, and one of the first things we did was implement paid parental leave, because for me personally it was very personal. And it was important that we at least put our adoptive parents and our birth parents kind of on somewhat of an even footing.

Let me back up just for a minute. We started noticing in 1996 that we were losing women at a faster rate than men, and part of that was around the whole issue of flexibility, FWAs, how are women going to succeed. And so we started studying that, really looking hard at FWAs. We've promoted our first female flexible work arrangement partner. We've promoted lots of women to partner. But our first female promotion to partner on a reduced schedule, flexible work arrangement

was in 1993. So, we'd already had some momentum. But we were still seeing that we were losing women faster than men and had to focus on that. But let me be really clear. This isn't just a women's issue, and it's not just a working mom's issue; it's family issue. And so the kinds of things that we really wanted to do was we wanted to look at parental leave for everyone, including our men.

So, we did a lot of benchmarking. We called a lot of friends from a lot of other companies and said what do you do, and many of them had paid parental leave on the books for men, but they said most of our men don't use it. And again this was back in 2001. And that was disappointing, because we had no idea whether our men would use it or they wouldn't use it.

So, we figured let's give it a whirl and let's see what happens and we implemented paid parental leave effective I believe it was September 30, 2001. And in that first year, what do good accountants do? They ask their actuaries how to make things work and what is it going to look like, and our actuaries predicted -- is that the right word, Heather? -- predicted that we would have about a thousand births year. And in that first year we had 950 people take parental leave, including men. So, 60 percent of the paid parental leave people were women, and 40 percent of them were men.

So, we thought that was a huge, huge coup, because it meant that our culture was supportive not only about our women but also

for our men. We also found that the men who took paid parental leave, and at the time it was only two weeks, and that was a big deal -- I mean we were into this and not knowing what was going to happen -- so it was a big deal that our men took up the leave. So, effectively, everyone who was eligible for paid parental leave in 2001 took it, and that was an amazing statistic, because, again, many, many companies have it on the books, but many people -- many men in particular -- don't use it.

Of course we knew our women would use it, because they already had their six weeks of disability plus this extra two weeks. So, now we're at least up to two months of paid time off.

I should also say that when FML was mandated, Ernst & Young took a more aggressive approach, and instead of 12 weeks of FML we went to 16, and I'll explain how that impacts our women -- in particular our women -- in sort of a different way.

Fast forward to 2006 and we enhanced parental leave to six weeks of paid leave for men and women. And, again, we found that men continued to take two weeks off but only about 10 to 20 percent, depending upon the year, took the full six weeks off, because we said you had to be the primary care giver of the child, and many of our men -- their spouses don't necessarily go back to work or they don't go back to school, and one of the requirements for being the primary caregiver was that your spouse isn't there, so to speak, and that she has returned -- or he if it's a domestic partner situation -- has returned to work or school.

So, we knew that having women in the workplace was critical. We knew that paid parental leave was one way to keep our women at Ernst & Young. We also knew that having men take up a benefit that many of our women had previously only used was really important, because it enabled our men to help our women succeed.

The other thing that we really looked at was creating a very flexible culture, so not only around flexible work arrangements but around day-to-day flexibility. I mentioned our first female partner in 1993 promoted to a flexible work arrangement. This year we had 32 people promoted to partner principle executive director and director, which are the highest ranks of the firm, on a flexible work arrangement. The vast majority of them were on reduced schedules but many of them were also telecommuters.

So, things have changed. Things have definitely moved ahead in a way that was really important. But, again, the biggest policy difference from 2001 to now was that paid parental leave. We do now see that women stay at the same rate as men, and to say it another way, they don't leave as fast as men, they don't leave any faster than men. And that's a really important difference. The advent of flexibility and flexible work arrangements was a huge difference for our women and our men. And the take-up of a formal flexible work arrangement is probably only about 10 to 15 percent of men use it. But the day-to-day flexibility that 95 percent of our people utilize, as Ellen talks about, whether it's going to

a doctor, going to a soccer game, taking care of an elder, taking care of yourself, going to the dentist, whatever it happens to be, is utilized across the board by everyone. And it's not just what we would consider our client serving staff but our administrative staff have the same kinds of leave options and the same kinds of advantages around flexibility that anyone else has.

So, if we look at parental leave, when you think about a woman who gives birth, she typically will get 12 paid weeks off, so 6 weeks of parental leave, 6 weeks of disability. And I said I would come back to FML, because it really is a differentiator. We do offer 16 weeks of family medical leave, but we run our disability program separate from that. So, in other words, if you are disabled, you give birth, you have 6 weeks of disability, and then FML starts and your paid leave starts. So, in other words, when the federal government mandates 12 weeks of FML, we actually offer 22, because it's the six weeks of disability and then the 16 weeks of FML, 12 of which are paid. Does that make sense?

So, it's a differentiator in that the 22 weeks of job guaranteed time off is obviously 10 weeks more than the government is mandating at 12. So, very proud of that.

We also have things that help our men and our women succeed: parents networks. You mentioned, Jane, special needs families. We have a network of parents with children of special needs. So, we do a lot of things that help our parents succeed. We do a lot of

things that help our people succeed. We want to have that competitive advantage around our people.

As our CEO says all the time -- and, again, Ellen has heard this a million times -- we don't have any other assets other than our people. And our people walk out the door every night, and we have to create the kind of culture that makes them want to come back the next day.

And so that is why we do it. It's not a nice-to-have; it's not the right -- well, it is the right thing to do and it is a nice thing to do, but it really is a business imperative for us. We have to offer these things, because our people have choices. They can vote with their feet, and they often will. So, we've got to create the kind of environment that Ernst & Young does provide to our people in order to help them succeed and to help their families succeed.

So, with that I thank you, and we'll go on to Ron.

MS. GALINSKY: I'm going to make six points in the time that I have about what we've learned about the U.S. workforce, the access to flexibility that they have, who has it, what difference it makes, and then can you do an experiment that increases the flexibility that employed people in the United States have.

I'm primarily going to speak from Families and Work Institute's national study of the changing workforce. That's a nationally representative study that we've been doing since 1992. We do it every

five to six years. It's a study that we legally adopted from the Department of Labor, the Quality of Employment survey that took place in 1977. So we have 30 years of data on the lives on and off the job of the U.S. workforce.

It's a 600 data point, 49-minute random digit dial survey with a 54.6 response rate, so it gives us a very good picture of what's going on. If we can get people not to hang up when we say hello, that is our poll says hello, we have a 99 percent completion rate, which tells you how much people really are interested in talking about this.

The first point I want to make is that Americans are experiencing a time famine, and we've seen this increase over time, that if you look at not having enough time for your children, in 1992, 66 percent of employed parents said that they didn't have enough time with their children, up to 75 percent in 2008, which was the last year we did the national study.

Same issue for time with your husband or wife or partner, from 50 to 63 percent, particularly strong among people who have children; 73 percent of parents feel that they don't have enough time with their husband, wife or partner compared to 52 percent of non-parents.

And time for self has gone from 55 percent to 60 percent. And 87 percent of people, if they were looking for a new job, say that flexibility would be extremely or somewhat important.

In the national study, we look at more than 25 different types of flexibility. And there's a table in your handouts that's called Table 1 which lists the types of flexibility that we look at.

We look at choices in managing time, we look at flex time and flex place, we look at reduced time, time off, and a culture of flexibility, and we find that access is particularly important. It's almost like an insurance policy. People that necessarily use it all the time, knowing that it's there, makes a big difference. If you look at Table 1, you'll see that the access is pretty uneven. For example, even though 84 percent of employees report that they can make short notice schedule change, that is, stay home for the plumber or so forth, that about 58 percent of -- only 35 percent of people say that it's not hard at all to take that kind of time off. And about 60 percent of people feel that there is jeopardy for using flexibility. So that's the second point, that the access varies.

The third point I want to make is that more advantaged employees have much greater access to flexibility. If we look at paid time off for children's illness, for example, we find that 48 percent of employed parents have at least five days off for a child's illness. But the people who are better educated, the people who are more highly paid, the people who are full-timers, the people who work in the service industries like Maryella has been talking about, managers and professionals and higher wage earners are much more likely to have greater access, and that's pretty well across the board. We find that that kind of access, the better educated,

the more highly paid you are, the more likely you are going to have access to flexibility.

The fourth point I want to make is that there is a correlation, and this is a correlation between access to flexibility and outcomes that both employees and employers care about. There are a number of charts in your packet that show that.

For example, people with high access to flexibility, only 10 percent are not highly engaged and 30 percent are highly engaged in helping their employer succeed. So the relationship between job retention, Maryella was talking about that -- of people who are -- have high access to flexibility, only 48 percent are likely to make a concerted effort to look for a new job in the coming year, and 71 percent are not at all likely. I said that wrong, but look at figure 4, and the people with low access, 45 percent are really planning to stay compared to 71 percent with high access.

The next issue that I want to talk about is, the fifth issue is, can you change this. So we know a lot about research, but does research ever affect action, and that was a challenge that the Sloan Foundation gave us in 2003. Okay, we know that people want flexibility, we know that -- at least the correlations show that it makes a difference, can you create an intervention that would make a difference?

And we had, in fact, been looking at building a theory of change by bringing together the people who had done very successful

public engagement campaigns -- stop smoking, seatbelts, the environment and so forth -- and we had asked them to talk about what they had done that had made the biggest difference, and developed a theory of change around which we constructed this experiment. It's called "When Work Works." The notion is that work has to work for both the employer and the employee. We took a place based approach, that is, we started in communities. We asked communities to bring together the movers and shakers, the people who people in the community listen to, to be an advisory board to this initiative.

We then asked them to do education, because we know that change takes a long time, to do media outreach, and we gave an award for effective and flexible employers. And the way that the award works is that employers self-nominate, and it can be any size -- small, mid-sized, large -- it can be any type of company, and if they're in the top 20 percent of employers nationally, because we also do a study of employers, then their employees apply, and that's round two. And then two-thirds of the winning scores is from employees, because that's where the rubber meets the road.

We've had thousands and thousands of employees apply. This past year we had 425 winners from around the country. They are doing some of the coolest things that you can possibly imagine. We have a booklet called "The Bold Ideas for Making Work 'Work'". We also give each company that applies a benchmarking report so that they can look at

what they're doing well and what they're not doing so well so that they can improve.

So we have seen an increase in flexibility and an improvement in flexibility among our applicant companies. Ernst & Young is one of them, but they're also the dog and cat hospital of, you know, it's just amazing, we're really reaching the employees in this country.

The final point that I want to make is that flexibility alone is not going to affect these kinds of outcomes. You'll notice that I call it the Sloan Award for effective and flexible workplaces, and we find that there are six ingredients of making work work for both employees and employers, and it includes other things like learning opportunities, autonomy on the job, being treated with respect, economic security, as well as flexibility, and we measure those things in our awards. The employees tell us what kind of workplaces they're working for, and they count into our scores. So we're not looking at it as a flexibility, as a magic bullet, it is a part of an overall strategy for improving the workplaces in the United States. Thank you.

MR. HASKINS: Great, thank you very much. Heather Boushey.

MS. BOUSHEY: Thank you. Well, this has just been a fantastic panel, and it was so wonderful to participate in this journal, so thank you. And it's great to see all of you here today.

You know, I want to start -- I have three points I want to make and two of them are going to be comments on things that Ron said, and I want to start with one comment that Maryella said, which is, our people have choices. And I think that Ellen has just sort of outlined to you that while we know that these things are important, and as Ron said in his opening comments, you know, a quarter of children are living in a single female-headed household, many of the workers who need these kinds of policies the most quite simply don't have access to them. And so my role here on this panel, and I think one of the messages I want to leave you with this morning is that voluntary just isn't working for the vast majority of American families, and for those workers who "don't necessarily have choices."

So I think that that is an imperative that we need to be thinking about, and if we care about the next generation or if we care about what's happening to our elders, we need to make sure that families have the flexibility to be both good family members, to do the things they need to do in their lives, and to be good workers, and that we sort of move beyond this work family conflict and find ways to really address it that work for all workers.

That means it needs to work for the worker at the deli where you're going to go and have your lunch, where we know that it is highly probable, unless you go to Teasim, that that worker is does not have paid sick days, and so if they are sick, they have the choice of either potentially

losing their job or showing up sick, and we know that significant numbers of them do, and that that is both a public health issue, but it is because we have not addressed this fundamental conflict that people need to have flexibility and there aren't -- there's not a level playing field to make that happen. So the first point is about equity.

You know, one of the things that, Ron, you did just a fantastic job in your opening of sort of outlining that the world has changed, right. We don't live in the same world that we did 20, 30, 40 years ago, and today, the vast majority of families don't have a stay at home person, a mom or anyone, quite frankly, who's home, who's not in the labor force, and that means that we do need to reevaluate what's going on.

In my chapter, I go back to really the fundamental policies that affect ours and economic security, the Social Security Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act are the two. And then I do talk about (inaudible), but I want to focus on those two big ones this morning.

I encourage you all to think about those in many ways as the foundation for what we need to do moving forward. The Social Security Act provides people with income when they can't work. Well, one reason that you might not be able to work is because you just adopted a new baby from Korea and you need to be home for a few weeks, right. That's very different than in 1935, when that law was put into place. At that moment, most families had a stay at home parent and we weren't being

able to adopt children from such -- that's so fantastic, but the world has changed.

We need to re-imagine our social insurance system to account for the ways that people can't be in the labor force today or where it's inappropriate. That new child needs a family member. My ailing grandmother needed my dad to take off time to care for her at the end of her life. These are important things, and we want those workers to come back into the labor force and to be able to work. So we need to think about how paid family medical leave should be a way to update the Social Security Act, or our concept of what social insurance is.

And we are seeing fantastic things happening in the states. If you are lucky enough to live in the state of California or New Jersey, you do have paid family medical leave for all workers offered by the state on a model similar to Social Security, and we can, of course, talk about that in the Q&A.

On the Fair Labor Standards Act side, that piece of legislation was about balancing work and family, it was about creating boundaries between how many hours employers could require you to work. That legislation came out of activism, and laws were passed at the state level for, you know, the decades before that that basically said women and children shouldn't be forced to work 12, 16 hours a day. The logic of that was really fundamentally about work family conflict and work family balance.

Today we have very different workplaces. They don't look like they looked back in the 1930's, and workers need different kinds of hours, flexibility. So what is it that we need to think about? How do we need to update our basic labor standards and our standards in terms of hours to adapt to the way that we work today and the fact that we don't have someone at home? So I think those are the two big places that we should be thinking, and I think a lot of the stuff we're talking about can be sort of thought of as re-imagining today's workplaces. So now in my remaining time I want to focus on a few things that Ron said. This is the fun part of my talk.

MR. HASKINS: For you maybe.

MS. BOUSHEY: Yeah, for me. So I want to start out by noting, the last time I checked, we lived in one of the richest countries on the planet. Let me just restate that. The United States is and continues to be one of the richest countries on the planet. The idea that we "cannot afford this" is just -- it's a -- there's not a polite word to say to explain what that is. I mean, so this is a choice. We as a nation are making an active choice to not provide workers with the flexibility that they need to care for their family members. We are deciding that profits are far more important than the next generation or caring for America's ailing folks.

We can afford this. That is not an appropriate starting place, because we are not Nicaragua, we are not El Salvador, we are not even most countries in Europe, we are -- I'm just going to stop on that.

Second, the idea that this is not a bipartisan issue is enormously -- I think is also quite inaccurate. I think that most Americans care about their families regardless of what party they align themselves with. And many of the conversations we have in this country are about family and family values.

The reality is that most families do not have a stay-at-home caretaker. That is a -- that transcends party lines. And this is, I think -- there are ripe opportunities for bipartisan cooperation on this if we think about them in the right way.

The third point I want to make on this is that there are -- wait, hold on, I want to say one quote. Oh, okay. The idea that this is "not high on the policy agenda" is actually being rebutted each and every day out there in America. So one of the most fantastic things going on is, over the past few months, in the depths of this recession, we have seen paid sick days be enacted into law in the state of Connecticut, in the city of Seattle, passed in the city of Philadelphia, and not signed by the mayor, but they're going to come back when they have a new -- after these elections, and come back to it in January.

This is actually motivating people to get to the polls and to focus on this fundamental challenge right now. So actually, I mean, I think there is solid evidence, evidence that when I was invited to be on this panel, wasn't as strong as the evidence is today, and certainly not when we started this volume.

And I would have been the first one two or three years ago, in fact, I was, I stood on podiums and said these are going to be tough things to do in a recession, and I have been proved flat out wrong, and the reason is -- and there's been this enormous and wonderful polling done on why people are responding so positively to this. Part of the reason is that one of the things that we've seen in this now great stagnation or great deflation that we're seeing with no jobs is, if you lose your job in America today, you are not -- your chances of re-getting a job are lower than they've been since the Great Depression, so you are just -- you are flat out of luck.

And people know that somebody who loses their job because they have a sick kid and they are -- have to decide between going into work and taking care of their kid, who loses their job, they're going to have a really hard time coping and getting back, and then they're a problem for state and local governments.

People get this, they understand that this is about valuing America's families. And they also understand that, yeah, profitability is important, but that is not the most important thing, and that is not the most important goal that government -- government should take account of that when thinking about these policies, but we also need to make sure that there is a -- that we're meeting employers halfway, that just because it's not profitable for an employer to have to find somebody to sub because their worker got the flu, that's not the most important issue, although we

could make, and I think there's fantastic evidence that shows that it is good for business, and, of course, if my colleague doesn't come in with the flu, then I don't get the flu, so then I don't have -- so, you know, there's a public health issue there.

But people get the issue, and they also get that it is an important thing to do especially when the economy is down. That's what the polling is showing, that's what people are doing when they are voting with their feet on this issue right now around the country. So I think that there is an enormous opportunity.

I want to -- I actually finished a second early, so hold on, let me see if there's another point I want to make. You know, I think I'm going to just stop there so we can go to questions. But I do want to stress that there is movement at the state and local level, there are important policies, but we need to think about updating and re-imagining the structures that we set in place decades ago.

Thank you.

MR. HASKINS: Thank you. I suffered worse criticism than that. I want to stick with it for a minute, though, because I think this is an extremely important issue. I would -- I'm not familiar with what's going on around the country, but at the federal level, there certainly has -- it's been a long time since there's been any serious effort, and I've been known to hang out with Republicans quite a bit. So what I would like to do is to say to you -- is to ask you how you respond to what I think are the two most

familiar arguments that Republicans make, and they're making them now. I mean, this is a challenge for our whole country because this is the kind of arguments that are made in Congress.

We've begun too dependent on the government. Individuals are responsible here. I'm going to ask a follow-up question in a minute to make this more explicit. But individuals are responsible. We should not have to rely on government.

And the second thing, especially from NFIB, for those of you who don't know, National Federation of Independent Business, represents thousands and thousands of small business men, it's a very important part of the Republican Party, and they have a very distinct perspective. They have never liked government except if the government is giving them something, but -- and they are even hostile now, okay. And many of their members have one or two employees, and now a few of them have only the guy that -- or woman that started it is the one -- is the only employee they have. And they're saying our margins are so thin, and you may think profits are not the most important, but I have to think they're the most important, because, otherwise, I'm out of business. How do you respond to those two points?

MS. BOUSHEY: Those are great questions. So let me start with the second one. I mean, first of all, I mean, I think -- and I also will defer to my colleagues up here who spend a lot of time talking to business owners, but in the conversations that I have been in with business owners,

and many of my family are small business owners, if you have an employee who comes in with the flu and there's only two of you, you're probably going to tell that person to turn right around and go home because you don't want to get it, right.

So the question isn't whether or not those are good human beings and whether or not they get that their employees have family issues, you know, small business employers that, you know, I often talk to, if they're a two-, three-person job and one of their employees has a family issue, well, they have a lot of flexibility. What they're really bumping up against is what those rules are and what government is doing. Now, first of all, most of the -- all of the policies that I can think of off the top of my head do not apply to those very, very micro businesses, right, so it's really the ones that we're thinking of that maybe have 15 or 50 or more employees.

MR. HASKINS: Are you okay with that?

MS. BOUSHEY: Well, I think that there are -- no, I mean, I think that it should apply to every, you know, it should apply to all of them, even the one person ones, let's just go that far, Ron. But I think that you -- I think that the response is, we have a responsibility to make sure that firms are not competing on the backs of workers who are sick or who need to care for their family members. That is not a good competitiveness strategy. If that is the difference between you being a successful business and not, that's a pretty sad place to be to begin with.

But what we are doing by not leveling the playing field is saying that that employer who is going to make just a little bit more even at that, I mean, they're going to see a lot more turnover. It's going to be a lot more expensive for them if they aren't addressing these issues, but that should not be the way that we are setting the playing field for workers to compete. We did that back with the Fair Labor Standards Act and said if it's an hourly employee, you can't work them more than eight hours a day without paying overtime, that did not destroy capitalism, and we still have some businesses in America.

So, I mean, I think that, you know, it may be new, but the world has changed and we need to figure out ways to update it. Yes.

MS. GALINSKY: Can I just come in on the small business question? We actually have two different systems operating in the country currently. So in the states that have temporary -- just thinking about paid parental leave, specifically paid maternity leave, the five states that have temporary disability insurance, New Jersey is one of them, if you are a small business owner, you have a couple of employees, one of your employees gets pregnant, delivers, needs to be out for six weeks for paid leave, the cost of that paid leave is born by the State Insurance Fund. So as a small business owner, you don't have to pay her while she's out on leave.

And the other 45 states, if you're a small business owner, you're really stuck, because you want to do the right thing, you don't want

to see your employee go without her paycheck for the six weeks that she needs to recover from pregnancy and delivery, but at the same time, for you to pay her while you're also paying for a replacement is very tough. So I think we sometimes in this country assume that when we talk about things like paid leave, that we're talking about the employer has to pay it, and in none of the advanced industrialized countries is that the model. The model is that everybody pays into a sickness fund or a social insurance fund, and that's why I think it's so helpful that Heather talks about the social insurance history, Social Security, we all understand that.

We're not saying that when you get older or you get disabled or you're unemployed, that your employer pays you. Do you know what I mean?

MR. HASKINS: Uh-huh.

MS. GALINSKY You're paying out of a fund that you've paid into. And actually, California is the political compromise in order to pass their paid family leave. Originally it was going to be contributions from employers and employees, it's 100 percent contributions from employees. So the employees pay into it, they pay pennies every paycheck, and then one day, if you need to use it, the money is in the fund. And so employers, you know, no employer is opposed to that because it doesn't cost them, and, in fact, it lets them off the hook in terms of having to pay for that leave period.

MR. HASKINS: Well, I think small business employers would immediately respond, money is not -- I mean, money is a big deal, and if it's social insurance like that, maybe I could live with it, but then being gone for six weeks is a big deal to me, too, this is my only employee, you know, what, do I ask my aunt to come, I mean, how can I replace them, I don't want them to have six weeks, I'd like to do the right thing, but I'm trying to stay in business.

MS. GALINSKY: We look at how much employees use the flexibility that they have access to, and virtually all mothers take time off, and if you are low income, you tend to take less time off because it's not paid. But pretty well they're having to figure out how to do this anyway because there just is a period of physical disability.

And there's an assumption that employees will abuse the flexibility that they have, they don't. I mean, if you think about the number of vacation days that people get and the number of vacation days that people use, people in this country don't even use their full vacations. They get 15.4 vacation days, if I'm remembering correctly, and they use -- I can look it up in a second -- and they use, you know, three days less than they have in this country. So people -- I guess the reality is that people are using flexibility, and that even if you have a policy, like even if you work for a great company, like Ernst & Young, you might have a boss in that company who doesn't believe in it, and there's, you know, there's uneven -- the culture and how we create a culture around flexibility is, I

would say statistically at least, more important than whether you actually have access to the policy.

Having a cultural flexibility where you feel like you can take it without jeopardy is more predictive of positive personal and work outcomes than not. So I think policy is one issue to work on, employer practice is another, I don't believe in either/or, but we really have to work on the issue of an overall acceptance of that this is a way of doing business in this changed world. That's very important that we make that widespread.

MR. HASKINS: Based on your own statement, there has -- it is moving in the right direction, and that's what your data shows.

MS. GALINSKY: Well, jeopardy hasn't changed. Jeopardy, the feeling that if you use the flexible time and leave policies in your company, it's been about 40 percent; since we started asking that question, it's totally flat-lined, you know. So we don't see -- even though we see an increase in flexibility, and among our winning companies we see a very supportive culture of flexibility, in the population as a whole, it's pretty flat-lined. The other thing I do want to say is that even if --

MR. HASKINS: Wait, how do you interpret that, Ellen? I mean, if you've got -- if you have companies and you find a lot of companies, and listening to the stories that Maryella told about Ernst & Young, you'd think that we are moving in the direction that everybody on

this panel wants us to move. But you're telling us now, if you ask the employees, they don't see it, they still feel like they're in jeopardy.

MS. GALINSKY: They have more access to flexibility, certain kinds, but they still do believe that there's jeopardy for using it. And actually David Binder did a very interesting polling recently about employees' attitudes about flexibility, and they actually, particular in a bad economy, they worry that if they use it, it's going to put their employer out of business, as well as being jeopardized. So we really need a whole education process, and we need it in the states that have laws. We did a study in four states that passed family leave legislation before we had FMLA as a national legislation, and I can tell you that most employers in those states, despite everybody's efforts, didn't know that it existed, you know.

And even now when we do our National Study of Employers, we find many employers that are legally supposed to provide family leave don't do it, and I imagine that they're saying, we have it and we know it and we're going to tell you that we're not using it, I think they don't really even know it. I don't think that they would answer a poll and say we don't -- we're not doing this. We ask how long of leave and maximum you give, et cetera, if someone has birth, and we get, you know, like 40 percent of companies who said they don't even give 12 weeks, then we know that they're legally --

MR. HASKINS: Heather, did you want to answer?

MS. BOUSHEY: So I want to just -- there's a great new study by Eileen Appelbaum and Ruth Milkman looking at the state of California and the implementation of paid family medical leave there. They passed a law back in '03, so there's been some time to study it, and they have found that most employers are not reporting that this is a problem, they're reporting that it's -- they've implemented it, it's been fine. And I would encourage you to -- I don't remember the small employer -- I mean, I'm sure that actually Andrea and the audience knows the exact number on what it is, but I can't remember the exact numbers on small employers, but I want to say it was like 9 out of 10. I mean, it was off the charts in terms of people saying, yeah, we did this.

I mean, I think it goes to the fact that if you're a small employer and your employee has a baby, I mean, you know, they're already dealing with it. That person is not going to give birth and then, you know, I mean, at some point they physically need time off, but they're already dealing with it, it's just they're not getting the support that they need through a social insurance.

MR. HASKINS: So I get it from this answer you're assuming you'll join NFIB and become a full member of NFIB?

MS. BOUSHEY: NFIB is great, you know, they do a great survey each month.

MR. HASKINS: Let's say, before we go to the audience, I want to ask you about low income. I mean, our centers, many of our

activities most easily are concerned mulling folks, and so once again, with employee benefits, the very type we've been talking about here, they get less of it than other people do, and you can see why. If you want it just polled hard and a way to look at it, a lot of them work for -- they're replaceable.

You made the point that the reason that your company did this was, it's fine to be nice and all that, but it was the bottom line, you didn't want to lose your employees, but I have the feeling, and I think there's evidence that lots of low income people are easily replaceable, there are plenty of people looking for jobs, once they're trained and everything, and some, you know, it varies. But still, I think a company -- there's less motivation to try to hold onto the low income employees.

So in this case, the conclusion I come to reluctantly is, the government has a more important role to play than they do for people, you know, middle-class people making 60, 80, 90, 100,000 with administrative responsibility and all that. Do you agree with that? And if so, what could we do to persuade policymakers that this really is a vital thing and that they ought to do something about it?

SPEAKER: Ron, just let me clarify, we do this for everyone, so whether you are an employee in the mail room or you are a 20-year partner with a firm, everyone gets paid parental leave.

MR. HASKINS: Right, and our tax laws have requirements about how you have to -- if you give benefits to certain high income

employees, you have to give a certain comparable type of benefit to low income employees, so that's good.

SPEAKER: Well, those are pension requirements, right, you're talking about?

MR. HASKINS: Well, we also have cash laws that are, I forget exactly, but I sat in on discussions with -- anyway, so the point is, there's still a lot of people who work for McDonald's, who work for --

SPEAKER: Oh, sure.

MR. HASKINS: -- you know, some local hardware store and so forth, and they make let's say 25,000 a year, and they're not likely to get these benefits, that's what everybody has said and that's what the survey showed, so.

SPEAKER: And this is somewhat a newer direction for the work family, you know, sort of as a researcher, this is a newer direction for us. These used to be sort of middle class issues, they used to be about professionals, there was a lot of talk about the mommy track, and these are now being linked up with anti-poverty issues. So, you know, Sheldon Danzinger, who does a volume every five years on the latest poverty research and policies, the last time around he had me write a chapter about work family policies as anti-poverty policies for the reasons we've been talking about, because they help people stay in their jobs.

MR. HASKINS: Well, you're in a good position to answer the question then. What can we do to get government to take some action on it?

SPEAKER: Well, what we can get government to do to do anything, Ron --

MR. HASKINS: Well, you're making my point.

MS. GALINSKY: Can I say something about the low wage workforce?

MR. HASKINS: Yeah, absolutely.

MS. GALINSKY: At the Families and Work Institute, from the day we were founded, we've been very interested in what happens to the lower wage workforce. We, in fact, in, you know, very soon after we were founded in 1989, we convened a group of employers who employed low wage employees to try to work with them to do a business to business kind of an outreach on the importance of these employees. We have done numerous papers that show that even though employees who are lower wage have less access, which is, you know, consistently true every time we look at it, that the access has a bigger payoff for the low wage worker than it does. They're more engaged than people who are more advantaged. They are less likely to leave than people who are more advantaged. They're more -- in better health. You know, it just -- again and again and again with any outcome we look at, we see that there's --

that it makes a bigger difference for the outcomes that we look at than for higher wage employees.

MR. HASKINS: All the more reason we need to figure out it.

MS. GALINSKY: Yeah.

MR. HASKINS: Heather.

MS. BOUSHEY: So, I mean, that is totally -- you guys do such fantastic work on that. There's a couple of other data points to look at. I mean, one -- from the studies of the cost of turnover, how much it costs to replace an employee, when you look at it, there is not a difference in the cost that it costs an employer to replace an employee across the wage distribution until you get to the very highest paid people. So if you look at workers who make, you know, anything from minimum wage up to \$75,000 a year, it costs about 20 percent of an employee's annual salary to replace them. And this is sort of from a meta analysis of all the studies we could find out there on the cost of turnover, which I think is very powerful.

There is the sense that that McDonald's employee may be replaceable, but actually they may already know how -- they already know how to do something and they do have skills and they're working as part of a team, and there are costs to the manager, who has to go out and find the new employee and train the new employee, and anybody who hires people knows that that takes a lot of time and energy. There are real costs to that, so I think that that's one issue.

I mean, second, some of the issues with turnover actually have to do with the kinds of things we're talking about today. There's great work by Susan Lambert and Julie Henley out in Chicago that looks at the mismatch between -- they do these great studies looking at employers and employees and their child care centers, and basically if you are a low wage worker and you're not getting enough advanced notice on your schedule, it's really hard to navigate that with your other care responsibilities to get your child care. And when you don't get your schedule for Thursday and you've got to pay by the week and all of this, that then makes those employees bad employees because they're trying to, you know -- or maybe their child care center isn't open on the weekend, but they just got a weekend -- and all this kind of stuff.

So there's an interaction, though, which I think there is an important role there for then somebody who can look at the big picture, i.e., government, to come in and help make a better fit between the mismatch between what people need in terms of the availability of child care and what they need, or elder care. We always -- I think we -- I mean, although this is about children, we definitely need to keep elders in there, and these service and low wage jobs, that that is a big piece of the problem.

And then finally one last comment, in all that work that we did on welfare reform in the 1990s, I mean, that all encouraged low-income women to work. I mean, this is really the next -- I mean, I'm so

glad we're doing this and that we're here today because this really is the next step, right. We want that single mom in the workplace, but you've got to make sure that she can -- that all these pieces match. And we just -- we hadn't thought about that really as a society before the 1980s -- 1990s, and so this is a very new and emerging. So it's good to hear that we're putting those two pieces together.

MS. GALINSKY: And I'd like to add that employers have a role even if there is public policy. For example, we just finished a two-year -- three-year project where we tried to connect employees to the publicly funded benefits that they are entitled to, like EITC and like food stamps and other sorts of things. And they're -- so they're there and they're entitled to them, but they don't have the transportation to get them. They have to go to one office to another office to another office to get them, I mean, it's a nightmare to try to navigate the system even when we make them available.

And we, again, got employers involved in trying to improve, like bringing the people on-site at the employer's so that people could have access to these benefits. And so if we have policies, either employer policies or public policies, there's an education piece that has to take place.

In Savannah, they have a commitment to reducing poverty, and it's called Step Up Savannah, and it was started by one mayor, and it's been led by the next mayor, and all the executives take a course in like

what -- the simulating poverty course where they have to go through and figure out what it's like to navigate the system that the low-income people - - have you seen that? And they got a whole like public policy business community determined to try to reduce poverty in their community because they think it isn't good for tourism.

I mean, there's a business reason, just like there's a business reason for Ernst & Young to do this. But I think, you know, I will argue that in this world that we live in, we have to do education along with policies, private or public.

MR. HASKINS: Okay. Let's go to the audience. Raise your hand, I'll call on you, somebody will come bring you a microphone, which is kind of dangerous in Washington, but we do it anyway. Tell us your name and where you are, and then ask a brief question, not a long one, a brief question, please. Start right there on your right.

MS. PLAVNIK: Hi, I'm La Tosha Plavnik with the Consortium of Social Science Associations, and my question has to do -- is there any research on the different sectors in terms of men on how they take leave? My husband is a contractor for Unisys, and just in the past two months, they're all contractors, so they don't have any benefits. But three of the men have take unpaid leave for two weeks, and one has taken it for four, and so I don't know if that's just a high-tech thing, sector thing, or if you're seeing this in other sectors. So I'm just wondering about that.

MS. GALINSKY: I can answer that. The White House did a forum on workplace flexibility in March 2010, and as a next step to that, the Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, did forums around the country -- 10 of them -- that took a sectoral approach or a population approach. They looked at a small business, they looked at low wage employees to see what kind of access and what kind of use they have.

On our website, familiesandwork.org, you will find eight papers that look sector by sector or population by population at the access that different groups of employees have and whether or not they use it. And sitting kind of right down the row from you is a man in a green shirt, Ken Matos from the Families and Work Institute, who's the author of many of those papers, so look them up.

MR. HASKINS: Well, tell us the bottom line. What's the -- there is a lot of difference?

MS. GALINSKY: A huge difference by sectors. The service sector, professional sector that Maryella represents has a lot more access than -- Ken, do you want to comment? -- than manufacturing, for example.

MR. MATOS: There is a lot of variation, manufacturing and service, as you said. We even see differences within different low wage organizations. For example, hospitality, retail and tourism has a different flexibility profile than other low wage organizations. So retail, for example, people tend to stay in retail jobs much longer as opposed to hospitality jobs, and we think that may have a bit to do with whether or not they're

looking at the job as something to have while they do something else, or something that they do with a low skill profile for a long period of time.

MR. HASKINS: So the panel has answered the first question successfully, the answer is, yes, there's big differences across sectors. Next question.

MS. GALINSKY: And can I just make one more point, which is that even if you have similar kinds of employees, if employers perceive that there's a need for employees, like health care, where people really feel that there's a need for employees, they're much more generous than exactly -- employees with the same demographic profile in another industry.

MR. HASKINS: Yes, right here on your left.

MS. BERGMANN: Barbara Bergmann, American University. I haven't heard anything from the panel about the possible effect on gender equality of long paid parental leaves. I think, for example, 22 weeks is almost half a year, and surely when one thinks of hiring a young professional woman, one might worry that in the next two or three years, they're going to be two or three half-years gone. So -- and, of course, some of the European countries have even longer ones, one year, two years. I think that -- don't you worry about that?

MR. HASKINS: So what do we know about gender equality?
Go ahead.

SPEAKER: So very briefly, thank you, Barbara, for the question. I think that one of the things we're seeing is that the trick is for men to take this up. And so I think, Ellen, some of you might be able to speak to the data, but certainly in my office, there is every new father --

MR. HASKINS: Talk about a small sample.

SPEAKER: Well, we have hundreds of people, but in my -- virtually every man on the team has had a child, they're all taking their leave and taking the full leave that they're eligible for. That is, to me, that has been a -- that's a profound social change. So that is just one example, but we are seeing more and more men taking that leave, and I think that is the trick to the gender equality, although your note about the duration of leave is duly noted, and that is, of course, very important. You have to find the right balance, because if women are out too long, then there is a greater penalty, but --

MR. HASKINS: And, Maryella, you said that that's experienced at Ernst & Young, too, a lot of men are taking advantage of it. Is that correct?

MS. GOCKEL: Yes, nearly every man --

SPEAKER: Are they taking half a year?

MS. GOCKEL: Well, the women get 22 weeks, right, of job guaranteed time off, so a little less than half a year. But in Canada, our women get a year off and they are not replaced, if you will, because that's just the way we're going to do business.

MS. BERGMANN: Well, you know, also --

MR. HASKINS: But wait, the point -- but in response to her point, women have longer leave than men, in your company policy?

MS. GOCKEL: Yes, women have longer leave than men.

MR. HASKINS: And take it, not necessarily the whole thing, but they take it?

MS. GOCKEL: Yes.

MR. HASKINS: So Barbara's point is that, do you ever think about this when you hire somebody and say, well, we better get a man here because we're going to have to have a woman?

MS. GOCKEL: No.

MR. HASKINS: Never?

MS. GOCKEL: Never, that's the bottom line. The reality is we want --

MR. HASKINS: I think the law requires you to say that, but -

-

MS. GOCKEL: Exactly. But the reality is --

SPEAKER: Who's in accounting schools.

MS. GALINSKY: Yes, I was going to say --

SPEAKER: Barbara, look who's in accounting schools, 67 percent women.

MS. BERGMANN: You know, also I have to say that the idea that a birth gives the six weeks disability, my own experience is two days is more like it.

MS. GOCKEL: I want to say something about men, and I think --

MR. HASKINS: Wait, Jane is trying to get in here --

MS. WALDFOGEL: No, go ahead, no, let -- go ahead.

MR. HASKINS: All right.

MS. GOCKEL: Jane, you want to talk about it?

MS. WALDFOGEL: No, go ahead.

MS. GOCKEL: No, talk about the penalties.

MS. WALDFOGEL: I was only going to say that we were talking earlier this morning about what's going on in terms of the broader scheme of gender differences, and the advantages that women now have in terms of their success and higher education in particular.

So, you know, we're in a world now where I don't think employers can just write off hiring women, they need the women for the workforce of today and the future, and so they can't just write them off, even if all women are going to be taking six months leave while men take only say six weeks, but it is a legitimate concern.

MS. GOCKEL: And it goes to the inclusive nature of any organization. You want difference in the workplace. Look at this group of

people out here. If you look among you, I have a curious question, how many of you are Gen Y?

SPEAKER: They're not -- they don't even want to put their hands up.

MS. GOCKEL: I would venture to say the vast -- many of you out here are, and so look at the difference. You want to increase the diversity of thought in an organization, so you would never just preclude hiring half of the workforce, it doesn't make sense from a business perspective.

SPEAKER: Although, I mean -- and Ernst & Young is, what, 60 percent Gen Y or what?

MS. GOCKEL: Yeah, that's why I was asking the question. By the end of 2012, 60 percent of our firm --

MR. HASKINS: But would someone define Generation Y?

MS. GOCKEL: The baby boomers in the room, that's Gen Y for an afternoon.

SPEAKER: What's Gen Y?

MR. HASKINS: I didn't even know we were past C yet, all right, you know. Yeah, what are the birth years that you're --

SPEAKER: Say it again, ma'am.

SPEAKER: 1982 -- 2000, it's been a lot.

MR. HASKINS: Born in those years?

SPEAKER: Yeah, born in those years.

MR. HASKINS: Okay.

SPEAKER: And actually, the next generation is Gen C, because it's connected, community, and there's one other C, so.

MR. HASKINS: Okay. Another question from the audience.

SPEAKER: Can I -- I just want one quick comment, which is that men are experiencing more work-like conflict than women. This is the frontier in the work-like field.

MR. HASKINS: Right there on your right.

MS. ROCK: Edna Rock with the World Organization for Early Childhood Education. One of the things that I haven't heard much about, but 15 or 20 years ago we would have heard a lot about, is employers afforded child care, and that was a huge move, whether it was to have on-site centers or to support vouchers or to support resource and referral services. So I would like to have you talk about employers of ordered child care. And one thing is how the move toward pre-K and public schools and public charter schools has effected that.

SPEAKER: So the move towards universal pre-K is, you know, one of the real success stories of social policy in the United States, and I would have said 4 or 5 years ago that, you know, 4 or 5 years in the future, we were going to be at 100 percent universal pre-K, because it was sweeping the states.

I think it's now a quarter of four year olds are enrolled in some kind of universal pre-K state funded, supported by their local school system,

either delivered in the local schools or supervised and monitored by the local schools, delivered out in private programs that parents choose. And then the budget crunch, you know, hit, but I think we'll be there with the universal pre-K.

We've been talking about when benefits are distributed by employers, they're going to be inequitable, it's just the way it's going to be. The employers, they're going to offer a lot of support for child care, are going to be the more high end employers, it's going to vary by sectors. So I think if we're concerned about the kids from low income families, the disadvantaged kids who really need the preschool the most, I think we have to be looking for the public sector to be doing it. So that's why I, at least, talk less now than I used to about employer supported child care, because I think that's really what the public sector should be picking up.

And what employers can be doing is the kind of flexibility initiatives that we've been talking about, linking people to public benefits, as Ellen was talking about. But I personally don't see as much of a role for employers in providing child care directly.

SPEAKER: And employers still do all of that, the high end employers, but there's this consistency and inequity that then comes to bear that many of the low income kids don't get.

SPEAKER: I think a lot of us are worrying about zero to three year olds.

MR. HASKINS: The next question, here in the back.

SPEAKER: Hello, my name is Florence (inaudible). I'm an economist at the Inter-American Development Bank working on early childhood development issues, but I'm here with another hat, which is, we are working on a proposal for work life balance. In the Inter-American Development Bank, we -- last year we installed the lactation room. There was a long fought battle, and the thing -- my question is to Maryella about -- to the families, about how the gender composition of the workplace affects these, because in our small survey, we found that places where there are less women have more friendly policies because they want to keep them. The IMF, very few women, they have very generous policy -- the child policies have a lactation room for 10 years. So how is the research going on that direction, the gender composition and work-life balance policies?

MS. GOCKEL: I'm actually glad you brought up lactation. We've had lactation rooms for years. What we did implement a couple of years ago was breast pumps for both women and the spouses or domestic partners. So when a male shows up with a breast pump from Ernst & Young for his spouse, he is like the best guy in the whole world. So again, to Heather's point, when men use a benefit that was originally created to help women, it helps levels the playing field and it allows both the men and the women and the families to succeed. I started with Ernst & Young in 1980, and I was one of, probably in my class of 80, 20 perhaps women, so I --

SPEAKER: Out of?

MS. GOCKEL: Out of 80 in my starting class in New York. So I know the feeling of being one of very few women early on, keep at it, because things change, and women will progress in organizations that are interested. If you're already looking at work life and flexibility and lactation rooms and things like that, you are on the right track.

MR. HASKINS: Ellen.

SPEAKER: We do a national study of employers, and we look at the predictors of which employers provide which kinds of child care assistance, elder care assistance, flexibility, et cetera. We're in the field right now with our 2011 study. We find that when there are more women in senior decision-making roles and more people of color in senior decision-making roles, there are more work life programs and policies. I don't know what the chicken or the egg is there, obviously, whether the kind of company that would have more women are more likely to be progressive or the women bring in the policies, but we do find that.

MR. HASKINS: Next question, on your left in the back.

MS. LINDEMANN: Hi, I'm Andrea Lindemann with the Center for Law and Social Policy, CLASP. And I felt obligated to confirm Heather's numbers --

MS. BOUSHEY: Thank you.

MS. LINDEMANN: -- that Eileen Appelbaum's study leaves that pay did find 9 out of 10 employers didn't see any noticeable negative

affects of the California Leave Bill. And then also I wanted to briefly respond to Ron's NFIB point, and then I have a question for Maryella.

MR. HASKINS: Let's do it quickly, okay.

MS. LINDEMANN: Got it. The NFIB point, I think Heather brought up the turnover cuff, which is absolutely critical, it is how can businesses afford not to do this. And we -- it's our role as advocates also to help them make smart business decisions, and saying it costs too much is -- it's too blanket of a response, I'll leave it at that.

And so I'm glad to see Maryella here telling us how these practices can be implemented. So my question is, how do we -- when we have wonderful employers like you, how do we bridge the gap between practice and policy? So I have -- since we're mixing it up this morning, I have a tough question which I hope you'll take in light of the discussion, which is, in New York City, there is a paid sick days bill which had a veto-proof majority and was tabled by Speaker Quinn. And the main opponents of that bill was the Partnership for New York City composed of a number of large businesses who are -- I assume, many of whom are -- like you, doing the right thing, and I know Ernst & Young is a member of that group. And so without requiring, you know, we don't have to get into weeds, but I want to use that as an example of, how can we make these policies more palatable and more appealing to businesses like you who are really leading the way as example setters?

MR. HASKINS: Maryella, go ahead.

MS. GOCKEL: I think it's a great question in that if we include business on the front end of writing some of this legislation, it will help tremendously on the back end, because then we will have input. So, for example, Ellen mentioned the White House Summit in 2010. Our CEO actually went. He happened to sit next to Ellen. And I think -- so if you involve business early on, you won't have the kinds of issues where then, at the back end, you're saying, well, that's not going to work, that's not going to work, and that's not going to work. Does that help?

SPEAKER: We went yesterday. I'm here with the Conference Board's Work Life Leadership Council, and we have some members in the audience, and we went both to the White House yesterday to talk about what they're going to do next and then we went to Congress to talk about the bill, the right to request bill, and get business input on that. So I think that that's really important that we don't live in this totally divided world, that people have conversations. It doesn't mean they'll necessarily support it, but it's really important to make it -- to listen to business about what works and what doesn't work.

MR. HASKINS: Last question, right here.

MR. DANZER: Matt Danzer from World at Work. Given the discussion that we just had on legislation and involving business and the first question we had on different sectors having different flexibility profiles, should the laws that we're looking to pass take the differences between the different sectors into account to kind of bring people on board saying,

you know, if you're a hospitality industry, you're going to have different -- your workers are going to have different flexibility needs than someone who's at an accounting firm, and should we try to take those into account when we're mandating some of these flexibility policies?

MR. GALINSKY: So I want to take a quick answer at that. I mean, so if you sort of think there's three buckets of kinds of policies that are on the table right now, paid sick days, which doesn't seem like there should be a sectoral difference for paid family leave, which, as Jane pointed out, that the plans are to have this be sort of a tax based, people pay into a fund, it's not paid for by the employer. That also seems like something that shouldn't have a sectoral difference.

But this right to request legislation that people are talking about would give workers the right to ask their employer for some workplace flexibility in terms of hours and scheduling -- hours and/or scheduling, and that has been designed. It's in -- if it's implemented in the UK and in New Zealand, it's been designed to have that kind of flexibility. So it sort of says to the employee, you have to come up with a plan, the employer has to listen to your plan, respond to it, and then you all have to work it out, which I think is targeted at exactly that question. The workplaces all function differently. There's a place where -- like especially when you're talking about the health and well-being, that may be very different than the on-the-job scheduling flexibility, that would be my response to that.

MR. HASKINS: Anybody want to add to that?

MS. GALINSKY: Only to say on right to request, that as Heather mentioned, it was implemented in the UK. The first year that it was implemented, a million parents came forward and requested changing their work hours to be more flexible. Of those million requests, more than 90 percent were granted right off the bat by employers.

So this suggests to me that there was this pent-up demand and this was a win-win. This was something where employees too afraid to ask for it, they were afraid there was going to be repercussions. Once they were empowered by the law, they made the requests, the employers granted them, and the government has since surveyed employers and said, how's it going. It was originally just for families with young children.

The main concern from employers was that it was inequitable because it was only for families with young children, and they asked, why can't we extend it up to school-age kids, because as we discussed, you know, the issues don't go away once the kids go to school. So the government that implemented the labor government made a pledge to extend it up to families, all families with kids, and the conservative government and liberal Democrats who are now in said absolutely, we're going to honor that, and so it's now being extended to all parents. So it's a great example of a place where flexibility can make a huge difference, and it's not problematic for employers, and it's of great benefit to the employees.

MR. HASKINS: So please join me in thanking the panel.
And let me thank the members of the audience, as well. You've been a
terrific audience, nice questions, and we'll see you soon. Have a good
day. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012