

Work and Family and Labor/Management Collaboration*

by
Lea Grundy and Netsy Firestein
Labor Project for Working Families

Introduction

When many people think of how unions and employers solve problems, the images that come to mind are of strikers walking picket lines, of late-night sessions with hostile management and union representatives arguing across a table, of tedious grievance procedures, and lengthy, rigid contracts. These are the images of how unions and employers work together that are often in the media and are sometimes true to life. What these representations of unions ignore are the many, many contracts that are settled amicably and routinely without strikes or hostile negotiations. These images also ignore the reality of many unions and employers who try, sometimes successfully and sometimes not, to work even more closely in setting up joint labor/management initiatives on issues of mutual concern, such as health and safety, productivity, or job stability. In this paper we look at a particular kind of labor/management collaboration: joint initiatives on work and family issues.

In the last 25 to 30 years, working families in the United States have undergone drastic changes related to a changing economic order and the changing roles of large numbers of women in that economic order. For more and more working families, the struggle to balance work and family needs is constant. Inevitably this struggle has an impact not only in workers' homes, but on the job. This is the point at which work and family issues intersect with the national trend toward collaborative labor/management initiatives that has taken place during the same time period. No comprehensive study or quantitative research that we know of has been done on joint labor/management initiatives around work and family issues. Thus, our conclusions rely heavily on a set of seven case studies from the United States and Canada describing labor/management collaborations on these issues. The cases we present here are by no means scientifically chosen, but represent some of the most interesting, successful (and unsuccessful) cases of cooperative efforts we know of. We hope that the conclusions discussed here will present a starting point for future analysis of the effectiveness of joint labor/management initiatives on work and family.

Editor's Note: This paper is a study of the role of unions in several labor/management collaborations — more specifically, collaborations to establish joint initiatives on work and family issues. As such, it is based primarily on interviews with union representatives and does not purport to cover the issue from both the labor and management viewpoints.

In the first two sections of the paper, we briefly discuss the history and development of the labor/management cooperation movement in this country and touch on some of the ways in which unions in particular have been involved in work/family issues in the last 30 years. We then present the case studies, including unions from Canada and across the United States. Observations and analysis of the case studies center around four main themes: (1) How and why did the partnership begin? (2) What pressures compelled (or failed to compel) the union and employer to choose to cooperate? (3) How was the collaboration structured? (4) What was the role of staff in the joint initiative? Finally, we present general conclusions and the outlook for the future.

Workplace Reorganization in the United States or What Is Labor/Management Cooperation and Where Did It Come From?

During the 1970s and 1980s, U.S. businesses began to realize that they were unable to compete in the global marketplace as they had in the boom years of the 1950s and 1960s. In this period the profitability of big businesses in the United States began to falter. The weakening of the U.S. economic machine may have been due to any number of causes, including that the many large, mass production firms in the United States could not compete with smaller, more flexible specialized firms in other countries, which produced for rapidly changing international markets by taking advantage of technological advances. Neither could U.S. capital compete with firms in other nations that practiced mass production, utilizing large pools of low-wage workers (Storper and Scott 1999, 573).

In response, many U.S. companies began moving production overseas to take advantage of cheap labor forces. Other U.S. managers looked abroad for solutions to use at home. Many came to the conclusion that companies in other countries were besting their U.S. counterparts because they organized work differently. The standard model of production, which had been dominant in the U.S. for decades, focused on Henry Ford's assembly-line style of mass production, in which each worker was responsible for only one step of the production process. Most U.S. businesses subscribed to the scientific management principles of Frederick Taylor, in which all decision making about work

processes was left to an elite of educated managers who organized the daily labor of production workers in great detail (Nissen 1990, 9-12, 29).

Labor's response to this kind of work organization in many industries was to build large, centralized international unions. Unions often relied on pattern bargaining to take wages, benefits, and work standards out of competition. Many unions also developed strict work rules enforced through contracts and the grievance procedure to protect workers from management actions over which they have no control. Unfortunately, these strategies also contributed to the overall lack of flexibility of much industrial work in the United States. At the same time, unions have traditionally advocated for workers as human beings with personal and family lives, not just cogs in the mass production system. Labor successes on this front include the eight-hour day, the weekend, the provision of employer-paid health and disability insurance, and the institution of career ladders, education and training to offer workers a way to advance personally and financially. (Cobble 1993, 116-120).

Beginning in the early 1980s, many U.S. managers developed workplace reorganization strategies as solutions for improved productivity. Basic components of many of these strategies were imported from Japan, including a preference for enterprise unions or no union, management-controlled worker involvement in production, and employee involvement in improving efficiency (Nissen 1997, 11). The reorganization programs that developed have been numerous and varying in their degree of success. Bruce Nissen, editor of *Unions and Workplace Reorganization*, identifies the many management strategies as falling into six rough categories:

1. *Quality of working life (QWL) programs.* These programs attempt to create better morale, less absenteeism and greater productivity by helping workers feel better about their jobs through improving working conditions.
2. *Quality circles (QC).* Quality circles brought employees together to focus on improving product quality instead of looking at work/life quality for employees.
3. *Labor-management participation.* QWL programs merged in many cases with QC programs and emphasized the ideas of employee involvement and participation, including labor-management teams.
4. *Team production and "lean production."* These team strategies called for reorganized work, a reduced

number of job classifications, cross-trained workers with varying degrees of responsibility over production and staffing, and in the case of "lean production," the introduction of just-in-time delivery and continuous improvement of work processes.

5. *Total quality management (TQM)*. TQM programs tend to be marketing-oriented, with a focus on producing for, and communicating with, the "customer" and improving the quality of products for the customer.
6. *Reengineering/reinventing*. The concept behind these reorganization strategies is that as much work as possible should be contracted out, with those employees remaining in a business able to move flexibly among tasks (Nissen 1997, 14-15).

Most labor/management initiatives on work and family fall in the third of Nissen's categories. They represent a blending of quality of working life ideas and quality circle strategies, as union and management representatives ideally work together to improve support for workers balancing work and family needs.

The response of unions to the mushrooming of these programs has been inconsistent. Because labor's response to the changing work structures has often happened at the local level, at worksites spread out across the nation, it is difficult to make generalizations. Some international unions took public positions for or against, or cautiously undecided about, various styles of workplace reorganization beginning in the mid-1980s. (Nissen 1997, 16-18). Union opinions of cooperative labor/management initiatives such as those concerning work and family continue to vary, depending on the individual union and employer.

It was not until 1994 that the AFL-CIO published a position paper on the work reorganization trends sweeping the country: "The New American Workplace: A Labor Perspective." In this document, the AFL-CIO noted that most workers are still laboring in traditionally structured workplaces despite all the talk of the workplace of the future. Left to its own devices, the AFL-CIO argued, management is not likely to really share power. Therefore it is incumbent upon unions to try to set up programs of real power sharing with those employers ready to reciprocate from a position of mutual respect. Real power sharing, according to "The New American Workplace," cannot merely consist of top-down efforts by management to involve some workers in

decision making. Rather, the AFL-CIO called for a combination of "*individual participation* through restructured work processes, with *collective representation* through restructured decision-making processes, from the shop floor to corporate headquarters" (AFL-CIO 1994).

What does this mean for the work and family needs of rank and file union members? The answers are as various as the histories and attitudes of the nation's many local and international unions. Some unions have been wildly successful in collectively representing the individual needs of their members in collaboration with management. Others have been less successful, whether due to internal pressures or management recalcitrance. For many unions attempting to use joint labor/management strategies to address their members' work/family needs, it is just too early to tell what the results will be. This article looks in detail at the cases of a number of unions in the United States and Canada that have tried to use labor/management cooperation to advocate for their members as real people with family needs.

Work/Family Issues or What Do Unions Have to Do with Child Care Anyway?

From the earliest days of the labor movement in this country, unions have struggled to improve conditions for working families, using strategies including strikes, legislation, the efforts of women's committees, and court battles for the enforcement of laws. One of the most important strategies unions have used is collective bargaining.

Labor unions today are reaching out to the many men and women who work in unorganized industries and for nonunion employers. With the real value of wages falling over the last few decades, many women entered and stayed in the labor force while continuing to care for their families. Women now make up nearly half the United States workforce, and women with children are one of the fastest-growing groups of workers in the country. Unions recognize this reality and, as the labor movement becomes increasingly focused on organizing, family issues as well as bargaining and legislative issues are becoming organizing issues.

Unions have successfully bargained to create solutions which will help members balance a wide variety of work and family needs. Some of the issues which unions have dealt with successfully are:

- ❖ *Child care.* Child care is needed not only during regular work hours for healthy children, but also after school, in emergency situations, for sick children, on vacations and holidays, and during extended and off-hours for parents who work irregular shifts. Family leave and alternative work schedules also help working families with their child care needs by making parents available to care for their children.
- ❖ *Elder care.* Working people are often responsible for supporting and nurturing parents, spouses, and other elders. Elders often need someone to drop in for a visit or telephone; help them with personal care; do housework, shopping, or errands; or handle legal or financial problems and decisions. A growing elderly population and changes in the workforce in the last few decades have created an increasing need for elder care.
- ❖ *Family leave.* Family leave, including parental leave, allows parents to care for newborn, newly adopted, or newly placed foster children. Family leave can also be used to care for sick children or other family members or to cope with other family emergencies. Short-term leave allows working people to take leave in increments as short as an hour or two to deal with family needs, such as attending a parent/teacher conference or taking a child to a medical appointment. While parental and family leave is often unpaid, unions have bargained for paid leave as well.
- ❖ *Alternative work schedules.* Alternative schedules include work schedules that allow working people to manage day-to-day family needs while continuing to work. Alternative schedules may be accomplished through flextime, compressed workweeks, telecommuting, or arrangements such as job sharing or part-time work with benefits.

As we interviewed unions on the joint labor/management initiatives they are involved with relating to work/family issues, a number of common themes emerged as to why unions may be choosing to collaborate now more than in the past. Some of these themes include:

- ❖ *Economic changes* happening in this country since the 1970s have been pushing more women into the workforce to provide second income for their families. The combination with kids at home and an aging population that also needs care has put many more families under pressure

to balance work and family issues than before the 1970s.

- ❖ Increasingly, these pressures on working families are being seen as union issues, especially due to *growing female membership of many unions.*
- ❖ Because work and family issues are gaining such relevance in many unions, they are also beginning to be seen as *organizing issues* on which unions can build their membership.
- ❖ Work and family issues are also seen as labor issues by many unions as they relate to a traditional union view that *people should be seen as whole human beings*, who are members of a community larger than their workplace community and responsible for families.
- ❖ Work and family issues have been growing in importance for both unions and managers because of their *connections to issues of productivity, absenteeism, morale, and turnover.*

In some cases, both labor and management see the need to work together to solve these problems — the idea being that if the two sides can cooperate to increase productivity and profits, both sides will be better off.

The Case Studies

Although much research, both scholarly and anecdotal, has focused on the successes and failures of cooperative labor/management initiatives, little or no work has been done specifically on the use of such initiatives to deal with work and family issues in workplaces. Thus, our investigation of how such initiatives are working for unions and the workers they represent is based primarily on a series of in-depth interviews conducted with union representatives and some management representatives of workplaces that are currently the site of cooperative efforts on these issues or have been in the past. The cases here are organized in roughly chronological order, depending on when the labor/management initiative first began. The unions and employers profiled include:

- ❖ Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) and Canada Post Corporation (1983),
- ❖ Harvard Union of Clerical and Technical Workers, AFSCME (HUCTW) and Harvard University (1988-89),
- ❖ Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Local 8-149 (OCAW) and multiple employers (1989),

** This New York City union is generally known and referred to as 1199.

- ❖ 1199 National Health and Human Service Employees Union, New York City (1199)** and Contributing Employers (1989),
- ❖ Communications Workers of America (CWA) and Bell Atlantic North (1990),
- ❖ Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union Local 2 (HERE) and San Francisco Multi-Employer Group (1994),
- ❖ American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) and the Social Services Administration (1997).

Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) and Canada Post Corporation: Both Parties Have to Work to Make It Work

As the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) moved into the 1980s, work and family issues became increasingly important for the union for two reasons: First, women began to be more active overall in the union; second, the postal workers struck in 1981 for paid maternity leave—and they won. The strike set a standard for workplaces and unions throughout Canada as CUPW won 17 weeks of maternity leave paid at 93 percent for postal worker employees. This victory raised the importance of work and family issues for union members and union leadership. By 1983 the union had decided to make child care a priority, putting policies about child care in the union constitution. These policies included: (1) opposition to cutbacks and support for 24-hour child care as a responsibility of government, and (2) opposition to for-profit child care generally.

The union's first bargaining victory to address child care as a priority was in 1987, when the union and Canada Post agreed to do a joint labor/management study of child care needs in all the different bargaining units at Canada Post. Canada Post represents 50,000 members, including both those who process the mail and letter carriers. CUPW's original demand in 1987 had been for comprehensive care for members' children under the age of 14 when not in school during working hours. The employer refused this proposal after costing it out at \$13 million. Instead, through arbitration, the two parties eventually agreed to do the joint study, funded by both sides.

The study began in 1989 and found a high level of concern among members about inadequate child care. In particular, union members needed backup

care—care when working night and evening shifts, emergency care and care for sick kids, affordable care, and care for kids with special needs. With the results of the study in hand, CUPW began bargaining again in 1989, this time with a demand for a child care fund financed by Canada Post at the rate of one cent per hour by union members. The union felt this was a reasonable demand as the Canadian Autoworkers had already set a precedent by negotiating such a fund. The result of this round of negotiations was creation of a fund to be fully paid for by the employer, which cannot exceed \$2 million at any time. There is a catch to how the size of the fund grows. Canada Post contributes \$200,000 to the fund every three months, but need not do so if monies have not been spent out of the fund. "The less that was spent, the less management had to contribute," says Jamie Kass, child care coordinator for Child Care Fund of CUPW. Although the union did not favor joint administration of the fund, the parties agreed through arbitration that the fund would be administered by a joint committee. This committee consists of two members from the union and two from management, all of whom had to reach consensus in order to spend any dollars from the fund.

According to Kass, it was at this point that the joint project really began to run into trouble. The problem, says Kass, is that management saw child care as a "quality of work life" issue: a TQM project or a way to reward high-performing employees. The union, on the other hand, was totally opposed to TQM projects and saw the provision of child care as a right for all workers, not as a reward for good behavior. The union wanted to begin work on concrete projects immediately, while the employer wanted to do more studies. In the end the two sides did agree to do another study "in order to move toward action," says Kass, but this study didn't turn up any new information.

From 1991 to 1995, when the parties negotiated a new contract, nothing concrete had been accomplished by the child care committee and the committee had spent only \$100,000 of \$2 million—despite 25 joint meetings. During this time, the union had been proposing information and action centers to do child care resource and referral. These centers would also have provided child care advocacy, because the union still hoped to have a broader social policy impact by pushing government-provided universal child care. The employer, on the other hand, wanted to provide honorariums or subsidies

to employees, often based on performance criteria ("giving out candy," as Kass describes it). The only program Canada Post was interested in was sick child care, which was not a high priority for the union, since the union contract already allowed for special leave with pay for members to stay home for a "household emergency" such as a child's illness.

Given this state of affairs, the union proposed in negotiations in 1994 that it should have complete control and administration of the fund. This was agreed upon in 1995. Since then, says Kass, "We've learned a lot. It's not as easy to go out and start child care projects as we thought, but once we had the ability, we could do it." Although some of CUPW's members still wanted cash subsidies from the fund, union leadership realized that with members nationwide, they would never be able to give large enough monthly subsidies for members even to "buy a box of Pampers." Instead, the union decided to focus on pilot projects aimed where help was needed the most: among shift workers, workers with preschool age kids, and workers with special needs kids. The union also supported the creation of new quality, affordable child care spaces. CUPW still wants to have some impact on public social policy, knowing that it will never be able to support even a small percent of its members on a fund of this size. Thus, through needs assessment and pilot projects, the union hopes to push government to identify important issues for working parents and put programs in place (Kass, 5/4/98).

Harvard Union of Clerical and Technical Workers (HUCTW) and Harvard University: Continuous Negotiations

Union/management cooperation achieved new heights in the story of the collaborative efforts between the Harvard Union of Clerical and Technical Workers (HUCTW) and Harvard University. In early 1989, HUCTW had just won an historic victory — organizing 3,700 employees of prestigious Harvard University in Massachusetts. After surveying its members, HUCTW identified nine main issue areas as bargaining priorities for their first contract. Since women comprised 83 percent of the union's membership, work/family issues, including child care, were naturally high on this list of priorities. Getting funds to ease the financial burden of finding child care was important. Real progress on work/family issues also would

mean changing the way work was structured at the university to allow more flexibility in scheduling, to encourage teamwork, and to have fewer work rules.

With this in mind, the union was determined to make negotiations for the first contract — and the contract itself — participatory and flexible. Instead of the common adversarial style of contract negotiations, the union and the administration agreed to set up nine bargaining "tables" to help them work together to resolve each of the nine issues, including child care. Cooperation is sometimes more easily said than done, however. At the table dealing with work/family issues were some high-level managers who did not themselves have children and who were opposed to providing financial support for child care. They claimed that it was unaffordable and that the university should not be "in the business of child care." For these managers the question of providing child care was not only an economic issue, but also a "control" issue, according to Kristine Rondeau, HUCTW organizer. Luckily, other managers on the committee with families had themselves experienced the balancing act between work and family needs. These managers allied themselves with union members at the bargaining table.

Meanwhile, the union continued the kind of activism that had helped it win the election. It held "baby picket lines" regularly — members would turn out at lunchtime with their children to draw attention to the need for child care. "We tried to paint a picture of the whole worker, to say 'you can't take us out of context'," explained Rondeau. "It was about the quality of work and life for ourselves and our children." Similar tactics were used in subsequent contract negotiations as well, when the union struggled to expand early gains. HUCTW organized no fewer than 74 actions in the course of negotiating its second contract.

Ultimately the pressure from within the team at the work/family bargaining table and from the actions on campus worked. Everyone at the bargaining table agreed that there are big changes in the United States today that are pushing both parents into the workplace--and that these changes need to be addressed. HUCTW and the university agreed to set up a child care fund that provides cash grants to members based on need to pay for licensed child care providers. The fund was quite small at first — only \$50,000 annually as part of the overall economic package — but the work/family bargaining table agreed that "little help is no help" and worked

hard to give members \$3,000-\$4,000 per semester. The fund has grown to \$175,000 annually and also provides grants for after-school programs for members.

Another remarkable accomplishment of those first negotiations was the creation and implementation of the Joint Council (JC) structure. Under the contract each worksite throughout the university was required to set up a cooperative labor/management JC with equal representation from union members and management and with union and management co-chairs. The role of these JCs is to engage in continuous bargaining on any issue having an impact on the staff, which would commonly be outlined in specific work rules in a contract. If a JC fails to resolve a particular worksite issue by consensus, the issue may then be referred to a campus-wide university JC, which can then call on a mediator if still unable to resolve the issue. Similarly, problems that would be resolved through a grievance procedure in most union contracts are referred to worksite local problem-solving teams (LPSTs). The LPSTs can in turn refer truly sticky problems to a university PST. At the same time that the union and management were creating this collaborative structure, they were also reworking the personnel manual to make it less rigid — to integrate flexibility to individual situations and needs throughout. One result of how the joint problem-solving structure and flexible policies affect work/family issues is that HUCTW staff members are unable to recall a single incident in which a new mother was unable to take the maximum amount of time off from work after the birth of a child, whether or not she had accrued vacation, sick leave, or other time. According to HUCTW, labor and management are always able to solve problems cooperatively (Hurd, 1993, 328-329; Rondeau, 1/29/98).

Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Local 8-149 (OCAW) and Multiple Employers: Member Involvement Is the Key

OCAW Local 8-149 is an amalgamated local representing 26 different employers in New Jersey and New York, including private pharmaceutical and chemical companies, public employees in water treatment, and a number of nonprofit organizations such as the White Lung Association. In 1989 union leadership began to survey members at the various institutions on issues regarding member participation in the union as well as bargaining priorities.

The survey was accomplished through a series of weekend seminars. Members were invited to attend one of these and to bring their spouses and children. It was at these seminars that members began to talk about the stresses of managing work and family. Based on this discussion, union leadership appointed a study committee and contacted an outside consultant to set up a process for involving members in resolving work/family issues at the various worksites.

OCAW depends heavily on employee health and safety committees on the job, both as a focus for organizing and to take care of members' health and safety needs immediately at the worksite. The union wanted to set up a similar program on work/family issues to deal with issues that arise for members in an ongoing way. The first move was for the members to elect work and family representatives in all the shops represented by the local. For these representatives the union provided training on peer counseling and on work/family issues in general. Then the union set about systematically persuading the various employers to recognize these work/family committees in contract language and put management representatives on each committee.

This was the point at which OCAW ran into difficulties with implementing a collaborative model of labor/management relations. Many companies resisted recognizing the union committees. Other employers were willing to recognize the committees, but then their vision of how work and family policy should be designed and implemented turned out to be very different from that of the union. For instance, the union wanted to create the committees and be recognized so that employees would have a voice in defining work/family policy. Many of the employers, on the other hand, preferred a "service" model such as an employee assistance program (EAP), through which an outside organization provides services to employees.

Today OCAW has a network of work/family activists in the various workplaces, and its committees are recognized in 7 of 26 contracts. Unfortunately, the campaign has lost some momentum recently as the union has had to cut back on staff, and there is no longer full-time staff support to keep moving organizing along on work/family issues. These work and family activists continue to engage in peer counseling and advocacy with management. Ideally, these committees have monthly meetings and try to identify solutions to common concerns among the members. For example, at one

workplace management had an "emergency only" phone call policy. Thus, women on the packing line who had latchkey kids at home were often anxious in the afternoons because they could not use the telephone to find out whether their children had gotten home safely. Working with management representatives, union members came up with a plan by which children would call in to a single supervisor during the afternoon hours. The supervisor would then let mothers know that their children were home.

The most important lessons learned from the experience, according to union president Mark Dudzic, is that it is very important to continuously integrate work/family issues into the activities of the union. It is also critical to hear from union members what their needs are and then to try to come up with solutions together, rather than imposing a set of services from outside. According to Dudzic, corporations are often resistant to accepting solutions that empower working people to be part of solving a problem. "Despite all their rhetoric (corporations are) much more ready to hire outside people to set up solutions, even if it costs more money," says Dudzic (Dudzic, 4/27/98).

1199 National Health and Human Service Employees Union, New York City, and Contributing Employers: One Union — 184 Labor/Management Committees

As 1199 was preparing for contract negotiations in 1989, union leaders insisted that child care as an issue should be put on the contract survey sent to members to identify their priority issues. Many 1199 members, in meetings and conversations with union leaders, had been complaining about the lack of services for child care in their communities due to underfunding of the public school system and crumbling parochial schools. Also, the union was constantly dealing with workers for whom it had to file grievances to defend them for arriving late to work, leaving early, or otherwise responding to household issues. When the surveys were returned, a significant percentage of members identified child care as a priority for themselves and their families; in 1989, the union won language in the contract calling for the establishment of a child care fund.

The fund established in 1989 was set up as a trust fund to provide members with the benefits they had gained through collective bargaining.

Under ERISA laws such a trust fund must have a Board of Trustees comprised of equal numbers of labor and management representatives. The representatives who sit on this board made a decision early on that they would use a cooperative approach in meetings of the board as opposed to using an adversarial or "bargaining table" approach. This cooperative approach is mirrored in the 184 labor/management committees organized at the 184 worksites that now contribute to the fund, as provided for in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the union and the employers, and in their ERISA-required plan.

When the trust fund and the labor/management committees were first implemented in 1992, there were only 17 contributing institutions. This number grew to 184 by 1998 under the guidance of the child care fund staff and an outside consultant who helped identify interested individuals to sit on the committees, conduct needs assessment surveys, and make recommendations about priority needs for the Board of Trustees. Each of the committees has its own character. There are committees comprised of only two members—one labor and one management — and there are much larger committees; there are committees representing nursing homes with only 15 patients and there is the committee representing Beth Israel Medical Center. Some committees meet very regularly and others meet only once a year. The staff of the child care fund still works with the committees on program development, training, and choosing which programs to fund each year at their worksite from a menu of programs approved by the trustees.

The successes of the fund have also been its greatest obstacles. Rapid growth (up from 17 to 184 institutions in only six years) has meant constant revisiting of policies and procedures and some difficulty in managing the programs of the fund. There is now a total of 39,000 parents at the 184 participating institutions. Although they are scattered throughout the city and have many different needs, they are all members of one union. The joint fund and the cooperative labor/management process are doing their best to create a model under which the needs of all will be represented (Joyner, 4/22/98).

Communications Workers of America and Bell Atlantic North: Funding Is Important

In 1989 the Communications Workers of

America (CWA), together with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), had just finished a 17-week strike against the Bell Atlantic Company (formerly NYNEX). Coming out of the strike, CWA won excellent advances on health benefits, established a labor/management committee to look at work and family needs, increased child care leave from 6 months to 12 months, established members' rights to take 24 months of family care leave over a 10-year period, and created a Dependent Care Assistance Program. Despite these successes, union leaders were disappointed because in CWA's negotiations with AT&T that year the union had won a family care fund--but they hadn't won such a fund at NYNEX.

According to Donna Dolan, international representative for CWA, "everyone was disgruntled" at that time. Management was displeased because it had lost the strike. Union leaders were disappointed because they hadn't won a child care fund. And union members were unhappy because they had lost 17 weeks of pay. Determined to raise morale, the union went back to the bargaining table. In December of 1990, CWA negotiated an unprecedented midterm agreement on work and family issues. With the assistance of consultants from the Families and Work Institute, the parties shaped an agreement establishing a \$3 million Dependent Care Development Fund modeled after the fund which had earlier been set up with AT&T. Its function was to give grants to improve and expand child and elder care in the communities of applying employees.

The agreement did in fact raise morale, especially because it came in the context of the Persian Gulf War. At that time employees serving in the armed forces were accruing seniority for all their time spent on military leave. New parents, on the other hand, were only able to accrue up to 30 days of seniority while on child care leave. As well as establishing the fund, the December 1990 agreement gave new parents the right to accrue up to a year's seniority while caring for their children, which improved new parents' morale considerably.

A regional joint committee of CWA local union presidents and high-level managers convened to oversee the Dependent Care Development Fund and work/family projects associated with it and to decide how to spend fund dollars. The fund also has relatively heavy staff support. At Bell Atlantic North three full-time managers, one full-time union representative, and three other part-time union

people staff and administer the fund.

In the 1991 negotiations the size of the fund increased to \$6 million. In 1994 the parties bargained for a separate subsidy fund for dependent care, the Dependent Care Reimbursement Fund, amounting to \$7 million for the term of the contract (1994-1998). By 1998, 687 members were participating in this subsidy fund.

While joint committees had often been established coming out of bargaining even before the 1989 strike, these committees usually met quarterly and never accomplished very much. The work and family committees, however, were more successful. They met more regularly--monthly rather than quarterly. They also established subcommittees with responsibilities for different issues, such as work flexibility, which has come up as a priority issue at AT&T and Bell Atlantic North. The joint work and family committees also make joint recommendations directly to the bargaining committees of both labor and management before negotiations.

CWA has accomplished a great deal in terms of winning funding for the child and elder care projects it wants to work on. However, the greatest frustration is still not being able to fund all the things the union would like to do, according to Dolan. "Funding is very important," she says, "and things work out much better when the union and management have their eyes on the same goals." Dolan also believes that ongoing cooperative activity is important to achieving work and family goals: joint discussions on work and family issues should take place before negotiations so that labor/management committees can make joint recommendations for the bargaining process. And after bargaining there should be joint day-to-day administration of work/family programs (Dolan, 5/8/98).

Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union (HERE), Local 2, and the San Francisco Multi-Employer Group: Cooperation Shows Up in the Bottom Line

In 1994, the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union Local 2 (HERE) was preparing to go into contract negotiations with the many San Francisco hotels employing their members. The union surveyed the members to identify priority issues for bargaining and found that for people in all job descriptions, on different

shifts, and across cultures, child and elder care issues were a top priority. Working with the Labor Project for Working Families, union president Michael Casey decided to address the issues head-on in negotiations.

The union came to the bargaining table from a position of strength in 1994, having just won a four-year organizing campaign in a major hotel the previous year. Also, the union had a reputation of activism, including strikes, boycotts, and demonstrations. Says Casey, "We have a partnership because the employers realized it would cost less money to cooperate. They realized that if they achieved labor peace, it would show up in the bottom line."

So when the hotels opened negotiations with a set of complaints about employee absenteeism and low productivity, the union countered by pointing out that such problems are often directly related to workers' difficulties balancing work and family needs. The union challenged the employers to prove their commitment to increasing productivity and decreasing lost time by actively supporting workers' work/family needs. The result was the negotiation of a child and elder care fund to which each employer would contribute five cents per worker per hour worked. The hotels agreed and the Local 2/Hospitality Industry Child and Elder Care Plan was born.

The union and the employers also established a joint labor/management committee to oversee the fund in the 1994 contract. This child/elder care committee and other joint committees in which HERE participates usually have twice as many union members as management members as a matter of practice. The reason for this, according to Casey, is that the workplace tends to be so employer dominated that there is a need for more union members on the committees to help union members feel confident enough to participate. Decisions are made by consensus--never by voting. The child/elder care committee makes joint recommendations to the Board of Trustees. On the Board of Trustees, there are equal numbers of union and management representatives. The child/elder care plan employs one staff person and the Labor Project for Working Families serves the plan as a consultant.

Although there has been some "natural pushing and pulling" between labor and management, the effort has been a truly cooperative one, according to Lisa Jaicks, the staff person who coordinates the plan. Casey suggests that this is because once the existence and size of the fund had been negotiated,

it was then in the best interests of both sides to cooperate in using it wisely. According to Casey, each side brought particular strengths to the process: the employers' strength is in managerial skills and finding the bottom line. The union contributes an ability to identify its members' needs. For instance, while there have been conflicts at the trustee level in how to spend money, management representatives' more modest goals have generally balanced the union's more aggressive use of benefit.

After completing a needs assessment of the union's 7000 members, the committee saw that the members' greatest need was for money. Many of them use informal care providers for their children and elders and are always in need of cash to pay them. Keeping this in mind, the committee realized that the best strategy to address members' needs was to provide child and elder care subsidies, but that the amount of money in the fund must be enough to make a real difference. The contract was reopened in 1996, and the union and the hotels agreed that the employer contribution would rise to 13 cents per worker per hour worked.

According to Casey, the greatest lesson learned from the collaborative experience is that you really can never have too much money for the kind of benefits the plan provides. Even though the employers are contributing at a rate as good as, or better than, anywhere else in the nation, it is only a drop in the bucket compared to the rising cost of quality child and elder care. The greatest obstacles the two parties to the collaboration face have little to do with their relationship with each other and everything to do with the difficulties of finding appropriate care and services for union members. Quality child and elder care are hard to find for anyone, and for hotel workers who work around-the-clock shifts, it is nearly impossible, even with a subsidy (Casey, 3/19/98, 5/18/98).

American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) and the Social Security Administration (SSA): Reinventing Government

In mid-September 1997, the Family Friendly Work Arrangements Factfinding Workgroup at the federal Social Security Administration (SSA) started researching best practices in family-friendly work arrangements. The efforts of this joint labor/management work group were mandated under a charter written by the National Partnership Council within

Social Security. This council was in turn set up in response to Vice President Al Gore's "Reinventing Government" movement, which encourages unions and management to be joint decision makers in federal workplaces. The fact-finding work group that convened was composed of representatives of the various worksites of the SSA, and the National Partnership Council is composed of both labor and management representatives.

The first move of the work group was to try to set up criteria for defining a "family-friendly" work arrangement and identifying issues on which they should focus their efforts. This in itself was a challenge, according to Joan Flaherty, an AFGE member of the group, because the union and management had different ideas about how to define the various criteria and which issues were important. For example, the two sides tussled over the meaning of the phrase "budget neutral." The union wanted to define a work arrangement as "budget neutral" if it helped members feel better about work/family needs, but management rejected this definition.

The work group then tried to identify best practices in work/family issues in private industry and in the federal sector, especially policies already available within the SSA which could be more broadly implemented. One of the main research tools the work group used was a series of surveys, including (1) a survey of union officials and SSA managers to see what they knew about existing policies and to identify needs; (2) a survey of agencies and private-sector organizations on existing programs; and (3) a random sampling of employees to identify needs, in which they found that the number one issue was retirement planning. The issues they looked at overall included: child care, communications between the union and managers to make people aware of available benefits, community involvement and volunteerism, EAPs, elder care, financial planning, career planning services, health, fitness and wellness, leave policies, telecommuting, transportation (subsidies/parking), and work schedules.

The charter mandating the work group's efforts set a deadline of March 1998. However, as of April 1998, the union was still working on its recommendations, and management had submitted a set of recommendations separately. By fall of 1998, it was apparent that the labor and management representatives were not able to reach consensus on their recommendations. At that point, the National

Partnership Council stepped in.

The National Partnership Council convened a second labor/management work group of individuals who had no prior history with each other at the bargaining table. The charge of this second group was to take up where the first had left off and to try to merge the separate labor and management recommendations. This group successfully reached consensus on almost all of the issue areas laid out by the original team and submitted joint recommendations on December 8, 1998. These joint recommendations were forwarded to the National Partnership Council, which will then forward them to Kenneth Apfel, commissioner of Social Security. Ultimately, any decisions about implementation will be up to the United States Congress.

One of the most important achievements of the work group, according to Flaherty, was that it opened discussion on a lot of issues that management had not previously seen as family friendly. Among the lessons learned were that sorting through the available information was a challenging task, especially because there is little quantitative research on the subject. Another major challenge was that the members of the work group were so used to negotiations-style interactions that it was hard for them to see themselves as a cooperative work group (Flaherty, 4/22/98).

Observations and Generalizations from the Case Studies

While every union/employer pair in the case studies has a unique story, there are a number of broad generalizations which may be drawn from them. We focus these generalizations around the following questions:

1. Which was the initiating party and what were the reasons for working cooperatively on work/family issues?
2. What was the impetus to cooperate instead of interacting adversarially?
3. What kind of structure did the parties set up to manage their work and interactions with each other?
4. Is there a staff to facilitate the joint effort and, if so, what impact does the staff have?

Which Party Initiated and Why?

In six of the seven collaborative work/family initiatives discussed here, the union was the initiating party. The only exception to this was AFGE. In the case of AFGE and the Social Security Administration, the initiating party was neither the direct management of the SSA nor the union. Although the union had done an anecdotal survey and found that members were very eager to respond on issues relating to work/family needs, the real initiative came from the Clinton White House in the context of Vice President Gore's Reinventing Government movement. The Clinton Administration has encouraged partnerships between unions and management throughout the many agencies of the federal government. Behind this encouragement of partnerships, according to Flaherty of AFGE, is the reinventing or reengineering model of workplace reorganization discussed earlier in the paper. The focus of this model is on "customer service" and on giving those employees who directly serve customers the power to decide how best to provide that service. For the federal government, employees are defined as "internal customers," and thus individual agencies are granted power to decide how to serve them best.

Among the seven workplaces studied, three distinct reasons for focusing on work/family issues appeared. The most common reason by far was that the issue emerged as a priority among union members and was then communicated to management through the union structure. Six of the seven workplaces profiled had this experience: CWA, HERE, OCAW, 1199, HUCTW and CUPW. For CWA, HERE, OCAW, and 1199, work/family issues became a priority during surveys conducted in preparation for contract negotiations. Individual members of these unions also raised work/family issues at different times during the life of their contracts as they confronted particular challenges in balancing work and family needs. For 1199 there was also a history of championing social justice issues as a union, so working to solve members' family needs was a natural fit. HUTCW identified work and family issues as a bargaining priority when negotiating the union's first contract with Harvard University, but the importance of work/family issues to the union's largely female membership had been clear throughout the organizing campaign and was, in fact, one of the winning issues for the union. In the case of CUPW, work/family issues also came to the fore as a bargaining priority due to growing activism among the female members of that union. CUPW,

in fact, made work/family issues a national union priority by putting policies on child care in their constitution in the wake of a successful 1981 strike for paid maternity leave.

What Was the Impetus for Cooperation Instead of Adversarialism?

Because the traditional model of workplace organization does not typically involve unions and management working together cooperatively on many issues, we looked at the reasons why the different union-management pairs chose to collaborate on work/family issues. The most common impetus for cooperation between the parties in the seven workplaces was consistent pressure from a union that approached management from a position of strength. In six of the seven workplaces, those represented by HUCTW, CWA, CUPW, HERE, 1199 and OCAW, the union pushed for the collaboration either after a significant victory or in the context of ongoing strength in relation to the employer. For HUCTW, working jointly with the administration of Harvard came in the context of the first contract negotiations after a union victory that capped a 10-year organizing campaign. The administration and the union had agreed generally going into negotiations to use a cooperative model of bargaining. In addition, HUTCW's members were still well-organized and highly mobilized in 1989 from the long organizing campaign. Union organizers continued to use regular demonstrations and activities to press management to come to agreements on work/family issues. According to Rondeau, the union organized 74 demonstrations on work/family issues, especially on child care, while negotiating its first contract.

CWA and CUPW both entered into a cooperative process on work/family issues after a successful strike. In the case of CWA and Bell Atlantic, the 1989 strike had lasted 17 weeks and ended with the union winning on health insurance and family-care benefits. However, union leadership was acutely aware of a need for the union and management to achieve something positive together to balance the bitter feelings left between the two sides after the strike. Union leaders also wanted to achieve some sweetener that would improve the morale of workers who had lost 17 weeks of pay. The result was the midterm settlement creating the Dependent Care Development Fund in 1990. CUPW also came to the bargaining table in 1989 from a position of strength when it negotiated its child care fund. Two of the key factors contributing to

its strength were that in 1983 the union had won a strike guaranteeing 17 weeks of maternity leave paid at 93 percent for postal workers and that throughout the 1980s female membership in the union was on the rise.

Similarly HERE came to the table after winning a long battle to organize a major San Francisco hotel. HERE also represents the majority of hotel workers in San Francisco. Although 1199 had no recent, specific victory to demonstrate that union's strength when it initiated a collaboration with management, like HERE, it entered negotiations from a general position of strength. Both unions represent a significant percent of workers in a service industry and in a particular geographic area: while HERE represents the majority of hotel employees in San Francisco, 1199 represents a significant proportion of New York City health care workers. Thus both unions were able to apply steady pressure on management to take a partnership seriously and to encourage management to also take seriously the family issues they raised. The result: both unions negotiated labor/management Taft-Hartley trust funds with enough resources to make it feasible to provide family care benefits directly to their members.

The story of OCAW is similar. Constant pressure provided by full-time paid union staff and organized members provided an impetus for 7 of the union's 26 employers to recognize union work/family committees and provide them with management representatives. However, the union has had a decrease in membership in the past few years. With decreased membership have come reductions in union staff, and there is now no one to keep steady pressure on management to recognize and participate in work/family committees. The result: there is less ongoing activism on work/family issues and less support from management. For example, in 1996 Barr Laboratories tried to take away the previously recognized joint work/family committee and replace it with a management-dominated EAP.

AFGE is the exception to the pattern of collaboration being initiated by, and pushed into reality through, union pressure. This labor/management initiative came into being due to pressures external to both the union and management. The initiating force behind a partnership between workers and managers was external: it came from the office of Vice President Gore. This external pressure has also been the force behind the movements AFGE and the Social Security Administration have taken toward making the partnership a reality. While it is still too

early to tell how successful the collaboration will be, the fact that the two parties were not able to submit joint recommendations to the National Partnership Counsel suggests that they may not yet be sufficiently committed to the concept of cooperation.

How Is the Joint Initiative Structured?

In five of the seven initiatives studied here, arrangements for cooperation between union and management on work/family problems are provided for in a collective bargaining agreement. These include: HUCTW, 1199, HERE, CUPW and CWA. However, the way in which collaboration is provided in the contract varies somewhat from union to union and workplace to workplace. For instance, cooperation on child care and family issues is covered in the HUCTW and Harvard contract as part of a broader agreement to engage in continuous collective bargaining and problem solving. Many details of the benefits the parties have agreed upon are outlined specifically in the contract as well, but most important, the parties have agreed generally to work together on work/family issues.

A different kind of structure is represented by the collaboration set up by 1199. The union and management have equal representation on the Board of Trustees set up to manage the negotiated trust fund for dependent care, because such representation is specifically required under the ERISA laws that govern Taft-Hartley trust funds. In yet another example, CUPW is cooperating with Canada Post in a joint committee set up to govern the trust fund that the union won, but the reason for their cooperation is that it was required under a settlement arrived at through arbitration.

Cooperation between the union and management on family issues is not as clearly delineated at OCAW and at AFGE. OCAW has encountered a great deal of resistance from the employers it represents in cooperating on work/family issues. As a result, although the union has set up a network of member activists who make up informal work/family committees at all of the union's worksites; only 7 of the union's 26 employers have recognized these committees formally. Where the employers have recognized the committees, the union also has negotiated for management representatives on the committees. Otherwise, OCAW's committees have union representation only. For AFGE, the Family Friendly Work Arrangements Factfinding

Workgroup is provided for in a charter written by the Social Security Administration's Labor-Management Partnership Council. This charter is separate from the union's contract, however, and the union is free to go back to traditional bargaining at any time.

Is the Joint Initiative Staffed and Does Staffing Make a Difference?

A question that often arises in cooperative labor/management projects is: who will do the work? Pushing forward any kind of change in workplace organization or policy is always a challenge, especially in regard to work and family issues, where changing policies may mean changing the whole culture of the workplace. Should the daily work needed for success in such initiatives be done by the members of the committee? Should it be done by union staff or management employees? Or should it be done by a staff hired specifically to work on the projects of the committee? Unlike some of the other questions we looked at, the answers to this question varied widely from union to union and employer to employer.

The unions and employers profiled here, except for AFGE, currently have, or have had in the past, staff to work specifically on work/family issues. This staff is provided in a variety of ways. For example, CWA and Bell Atlantic North have a jointly provided staff of seven people to administer their joint fund. The committee includes three full-time management people and four people from the union, including one working full time and three others working part time.

CUPW and OCAW, the unions with the least responsive employers, have provided union staff to work on their work/family issues. CUPW originally had a joint committee with management to actually "do the work," but management accomplished so little that the union perceived management participation to be holding back progress on work/family issues and so bargained for unilateral union control of their child care fund. The fund is now fully administered by union staff. OCAW had always provided union staff to advance the activities of their various worksite work/family committees. Since the union has lost its staff dedicated to this work, activity in the committees has slowed down considerably.

HERE and 1199 use staff employed directly by their trust funds. At Harvard, the union and man-

agement are constantly working to change the culture of the workplace to one in which problems and issues, including those having to do with work and family, are resolved by worksite committees comprised of both employees and front-line managers.

Only AFGE has no staff specifically dedicated to working on the labor/management collaboration. In the case of AFGE, the committee members themselves do the work, with much of the responsibility devolving on some of the more personally motivated committee members. The committee members do have the right to carry out the work of the committee on paid time.

Conclusion

Lessons Learned

A number of consistent issues emerged from our interviews on labor-management committees. It is important to note that since we interviewed primarily the union representative in each initiative, we got only the union perspective. As a result, we do not claim that this is an absolutely objective account of labor-management efforts. We have, however, been able to extrapolate some common issues for the labor unions involved:

- ❖ *Union Strength.* Successful initiatives seemed to exist where there was a strong union activism. In a number of cases, establishment of a committee or a work/family fund followed a successful strike. In most cases the union membership was well organized and active and the union's participation was from a position of strength.
- ❖ *Involvement by the Union.* Impetus for the union to get involved in work and family issues most often came from the membership. In many cases, the issues emerged in the collective bargaining process, when members were communicating top priorities.
- ❖ *Structure.* The structure and day-to-day workings of committees were significant in terms of success. Getting started was always a difficult issue. It needs to be clearly understood when committee meetings are held, how often the committee meets, who chairs the meetings, and the goals and responsibilities of the committee.
- ❖ *Funding.* Funding and staffing are critical issues. In almost every case, funding for the committee

and funds to implement a benefit positively affected the outcome. Often, when committees are set up with no clear funding to implement recommendations, there is no progress and participants are easily discouraged. Also, having paid staff to work with committees was usually extremely helpful in moving the process forward.

- ❖ *Collective Bargaining Agreements.* In most of the case studies, the committee grew out of a collectively bargained agreement. Without some type of contract, there is a tendency for these initiatives to fade away when there are problems or when management pulls back.
- ❖ *Shared Experience.* The shared experiences of work/family problems by both labor and management participants seemed to lead to greater communication.
- ❖ *Industry Type.* The type of industry seemed to have an impact on success. In sectors with rigid hours of work, or work on a production line, flexibility and other issues related to hours of work were more difficult to deal with.
- ❖ *Movement from an Adversarial to a Cooperative Relationship.* Changing from traditional, adversarial bargaining to labor-management collaboration on work/family issues was sometimes difficult, essentially because the individuals involved had to change their mode of interaction with each other.
- ❖ *Labor/Management Context.* Though it was not explicitly stated in most interviews, many of these model programs existed in a context of "larger" labor-management collaboration. That is, the work/family initiatives usually existed under an umbrella of labor-management efforts. This often means that there is an organizational and union commitment to labor-management efforts. In many cases, union and management received training on working together in a problem-solving collaborative mode.
- ❖ *Worker Involvement.* For the union, labor-management work/family committees can be a way to get union members more involved, build leadership skills, and empower workers to have a voice in their workplace.
- ❖ *Variation in the Skills of Committee Members.* Sometimes there was a wide range of skills within committees. In some committees, the skills and training of union members differed markedly from those of management, with union mem-

bers occasionally lacking such skills as literacy, writing, facilitation, strategic planning, analysis, and typing. In some instances, the different skills union and management committee members bring to the table may complement one another and lead to successful collaboration. In others, disparate skills may lead to power imbalances and, possibly, the failure of the partnership.

Thoughts for the Future

In many cases work/family initiatives have become a list of benefits or policies that an employer offers — or for which a union negotiates. Often these are very innovative and exciting. We know the list — resource and referral, child care at the workplace, flexible work schedules, family leave, elder care services, sick and back-up care, and so on. However, these are some of the things we heard in our interviews regarding workplaces that have some of the best labor-management initiatives in the United States and Canada.

- ❖ A woman quit her job because she didn't know she could take paid leave.
- ❖ Hourly workers don't utilize a child care fund because they are required to use licensed care rather than the informal network of family and relatives that they rely on.
- ❖ Shift workers don't use a 24-hour child care center because they want their kids at home in bed at night, not at a center.
- ❖ Workers who take paid family leave to deal with sick children are often given a hard time by both supervisors and co-workers.
- ❖ Non-English speaking workers are not utilizing a resource and referral program even though translation is available.

There is still a long way to go in finding good solutions for working people's work/family concerns. Work/family issues for families are an ongoing, changing, moving target. As one union leader put it, "There are no super solutions to work/family problems." These problems require changing solutions that reflect the constant changes in our family and work lives. In order to make this work, workers themselves need to be involved in developing the solutions.

This paper looked at several labor/management efforts that address work/family issues. While some offer incredible benefits, the most exciting

examples for dealing with work/family issues were not necessarily those that provided the most extensive benefits, although some of these are excellent models.

Many committees did surveys, came up with good ideas, and then focused on developing particular benefits or programs. The work of the committee then became implementing the benefit, finding a vendor, doing outreach, and so on. The most exciting examples we found were those committees that viewed work/family as an ongoing process and that saw the committee as a way for workers to have a voice in work/family issues and/or a way to involve workers in their workplaces. The function of these committees was to listen to employees' concerns and come up with solutions, usually within a set of work/family guidelines and policies. These committees tended to be decentralized in various departments or workplaces. The committee had a clear role in coming up with solutions to work/family problems, and the employees felt empowered by their role. Labor-management committees should be integrated into the life of the workplace and act as an ongoing sounding board for work/family issues. They can then respond to issues that emerge on an ongoing basis.

These ongoing efforts at labor-management collaboration are difficult to accomplish. It takes strong leadership and commitment from both management and labor. For management, it takes trust in its workers, a commitment of time for the employees to be involved, and often a financial commitment as well. For the union it also means trust in the workers as well as making work/family issues a high priority for union energy, focus, and involvement.

Labor-management initiatives are an important vehicle for dealing with work and family issues in unionized workplaces. In fact, it is hard to see how work/family programs can succeed in union workplaces without the strong support of the union. The best programs involve workers in developing work and family solutions. The best programs are responsive to the needs of workers in an ongoing way. However, they will not be effective in all workplaces.

Based on our experiences and the cases discussed

here, certain factors need to be present in order for these initiatives to succeed. When an employer is planning to address work/family issues, it is critical to bring the union in as a full partner from the beginning. One union leader recently described the problem with a particular employer: "Management says that they want a labor-management partnership, but they won't involve the workers in any real discussions. It is all lip service." There must also be a strong commitment from both union leadership and management. Funding for initiatives is critical, usually negotiated as part of the collective bargaining agreement. Because most labor-management dealings have been across a bargaining table, committee members need training on collaboration and problem-solving skills. Trainers should be agreed upon by union and management and should be experienced in union settings. The role and responsibility of the committee should be clearly defined and understood by all members. The committee should play an active and ongoing role in family issues at the workplace.

Labor unions have a critical role to play in helping businesses understand work/family issues and in developing workplaces that are truly family friendly. The development of such a workplace is a process into which workers must be fully integrated. Unionized workplaces are an ideal place to model real participation of workers in creating work and family solutions for several reasons. Unionized workers on a workplace committee represent an elected organization of workers, the union. There is less fear of reprisals from management, as committee members are union members with grievance procedures and a binding contract. Committee members from the union side are delegated by the union and not handpicked by management. The union provides a structure to which committee members are accountable. The committee, in a union setting, is usually an established entity and cannot be dissolved or disbanded at will.

Though there is enormous potential for labor's role in work and family issues, there has been little discussion and few studies of these issues. This is an important area for dialogue, study, and further efforts. We have tried in this paper to highlight

some of the best examples of labor-management partnerships on work and family issues and examine their experiences. Work and family is an issue of common concern to both workers and employers. Unlike some other areas, it often lends itself to collaboration between labor and management. We hope these discussions will open up ways to foster more labor-management participation in the work/family arena.

References

- AFL-CIO. *The New American Workplace: A Labor Perspective*. Washington, D.C.: AFL-CIO, 1994.
- Cobble, Dorothy Sue, ed. *Women and Unions: Forging a Partnership*. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press, 1993.
- Casey, Michael. Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union Local 2. Personal interviews, 3/19/98 and 5/18/98.
- Dolan, Donna. Communications Workers of America. Personal interview, 5/8/98.
- Dudzic, Mark. Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union, Local 8-149. Personal interview, 4/27/98.
- Flaherty, Joan. National Human Rights Committee Coordinator for Women's Issues. American Federation of Government Employees. Personal interview, 4/22/98.
- Hurd, Richard. "Organizing and Representing Clerical Workers: The Harvard Model." In *Women and Unions: Forging a Partnership*, edited by Dorothy Sue Cobble. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press, 1993.
- Jaicks, Lisa. Local 2/Hospitality Industry Child and Elder Care Plan. Personal interview, 1/22/98.
- Joyner, Carol. 1199 National Health and Human Service Employees Union, 1199/Employer Child Care Fund. Personal interview, 4/22/98.
- Kass, Jamie. Canadian Union of Postal Workers. Personal interview, 5/4/98.
- Nissen, Bruce, ed. *Unions and Workplace Reorganization*. Detroit, Mich.: Wayne State University Press, 1997.
- Rondeau, Kristine. Harvard Union of Clerical and Technical Workers, AFSCME, AFL-CIO. Personal interview, 1/29/98.
- Storper, Michael, and Allen Scott. "Work Organisation and Local Labour Market in an Era of Flexible Production." *International Labour Review* 120, no. 5 (1990).
- Walker, Fran. Representative for American Federation of Government Employees Council 220, National Council of Field Council Locals. Personal interview, 5/10/99.