UC Academic Family Friendly Policies: Sharing Best Practices
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Source: NSF, Survey of Earned Doctorates, taken from Webcaspar.
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The Pool Problem at UC Berkeley: Ladder Rank Faculty

*Data prepared by Angelica Stacy, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Equity, UCB. Potential UCB Applicant Pool is derived from NCES data on PhD degrees granted in 2000, cut to a selected group of top-ranked graduate institutions and cut to relevant disciplinary fields for UCB.*
The survey was designed to assess the effectiveness of UC’s existing family friendly policies for ladder-rank faculty (implemented in July 1988).* It was first conducted at UC Berkeley, Fall 2002, and was rolled-out in Spring-Summer 2003 to the other UC universities (except UCM), with President Atkinson serving as the first contact email signatory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th># of Surveyed</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4460</strong></td>
<td><strong>8705</strong></td>
<td><strong>51%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some questions were based on Robert Drago’s Mapping Project Survey Instrument (http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/facultysurvey.htm).
Everybody is Very Busy (UC Faculty, ages 30-50)

Univ. of California Faculty's Average Hours Per Week Providing Care, by Gender, Children, and Age at Survey

- **Women with Children**
- **Men with Children**
- **Women without Children**
- **Men without Children**

Age at Survey: Under 34, 34 to 38, 38 to 42, 42 to 46, 46 to 50, 50 to 54, 54 to 58, 58 to 62, 62 or older

Weekly Hours Providing Care: 0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50

UC Faculty Parents Experience Work-Family Conflict

*These questions were based on Robert Drago’s Mapping Project Survey Instrument ([http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/facultysurvey.htm](http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/facultysurvey.htm)).


"I have not brought children to work because I worry that my colleagues would be bothered"

"I tried to time new children to come during the summer break"

"I missed some of my children's important events so as not to appear uncommitted to job"

"I came back to work sooner than I would have liked after becoming a parent to be taken seriously as an academic"

"I slowed down or made sacrifices in my career in order to be a good parent"
Career Duties That Place Stress on Parenting

Percent of UC Faculty Experiencing a “Great Deal” of Stress in Parenting as a Result of Specific Career Duty
(“Not Applicable Excluded,” “Some,” “A little,” and “None” Are Grouped)

Biological Baby Births by Age of UC Faculty

Having Fewer Children Than They Wanted:
UC Faculty, Ages 40-60, by Gender and Number of Children

Percent who indicated "Yes," "I had fewer children than I wanted"

*This question was based on Robert Drago’s Mapping Project Survey Instrument (http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/facultysurvey.htm).
UC Faculty Members’ Awareness of Policies

Percent Who Knew about the Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Knew about all four?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Service-Modified Duties</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Clock Stoppage</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Week Paid Leave</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Leave</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of Family Friendly Policies and Sabbaticals by Eligible UC Assistant Professors*

*At the time of first child’s entry into household at assistant professor rank, post policy implementation (August 1, 1988 to present). The faculty member needed to be employed at UC at time of child’s arrival into the household and the policy had to be in place.

Major Reasons Eligible UC Parents Did Not Use ASMD

- "I was not the primary caregiver to the child" (Women: 27%, Men: 20%)
- "I did not need the time" (Women: 1%, Men: 10%)
- "I did not know about the policy" (Women: 46%, Men: 48%)
- "It might have hurt my chances for tenure or promotion" (Women: 26%, Men: 51%)

Percent Citing Factor As a Major Reason for Not Using ASMD

*These questions were based on Robert Drago’s Mapping Project Survey Instrument ([http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/facultysurvey.htm](http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/facultysurvey.htm)).
Usefulness of Proposed Family Friendly Policies/Resources? UC Faculty Parents* by Gender

- **Women with Children**
- **Men with Children**

A flexible **Part-Time Option** with pro-rated career timelines and parity

Emergency **Back-up Child Care** with copay by user

Readily Available **Infant and Child Care Slots**

Percent Indicating Policy or Resource Would be Very or Somewhat Useful to Them**

*Excluding UC Berkeley faculty who were not asked these questions.

**vs. Not Too Useful or Not Useful at All

Support for Proposed Family Friendly Policies/Resources? 
All UC Faculty* by Gender (with and without children)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=2202</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2106</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A flexible **Part-Time Option** with pro-rated career timelines and parity
| Emergency **Back-up Child Care** with copay by user
| Readily Available **Infant and Child Care Slots**

Percent Indicating They Are Very or Somewhat Supportive of the Policy or Resource**

*Excluding UC Berkeley faculty who were not asked these questions.

**vs. Not Too Supportive or Not Supportive at All

Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Accelerator Grant: Sharing Best Family Friendly Practices (UCB)

- University of California Academic Family Friendly Policy Survey, April 2008
- Shared Workspace (bspace)
- Summary Analysis of Survey Responses and Shared Materials
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Created By</th>
<th>Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>Karie FRASCH</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2008 9:57 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Faculty benefits.pdf</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Karie FRASCH</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2008 9:43 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR Academic Personnel Family Friendly Programs</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Karie FRASCH</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2008 9:44 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR Academic Personnel Leaves</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Karie FRASCH</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2008 9:57 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR Academic Personnel procedures work life.doc</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Karie FRASCH</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2008 9:56 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR Department Chair Forums</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Karie FRASCH</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2008 9:56 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR Department Chair Information</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Karie FRASCH</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2008 9:56 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR Department chair lunches</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Karie FRASCH</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2008 9:56 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR Department Chair Orientation</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Karie FRASCH</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2008 9:56 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR Family and Medical Leave certification.pdf</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Karie FRASCH</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2008 9:57 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Faculty Work-Life Brochures (L.A. and Davis)

2. Informational Materials Re. Using Family Accommodation Policies (Irvine and Riverside)

3. Creating a Family Friendly Department: Chairs and Deans Toolkit (Berkeley)

4. “Flexible Workload” Program (San Diego)

5. Faculty Advisors for Work Life (Davis)

Source: Angelica Stacy, Sheldon Zedeck, Karie Frasch, Marc Goulden, University of California Academic Family Friendly Policy Survey, April 2008. Funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.
Innovative Practices:
1. Faculty Work Life Brochures *(L.A. and Davis)*

- Attractive, printed brochures that highlight the family accommodation policies.

- UCLA provides information on FMLA, CRFA and a brochure on stopping the clock.

- Davis’ brochure also has a list of work life resources on campus with web links.
Innovative Practices:

2. Informational Materials Re. Using Family Accommodation Policies *(Irvine and Riverside)*

- Irvine and Riverside have one-page written summaries that provide information and links to Academic Personnel procedures.
- Riverside’s page has clear steps to follow and a transparent process for requesting and approving leaves.
- Irvine has links to each of the forms that are relevant to family accommodations, as well as a page of instructions.
**Innovative Practices:**

3. Creating a Family Friendly Department: Chairs and Deans Toolkit *(Berkeley)*

- Includes practical information for department chairs and deans to assist in implementing family friendly policies, sharing resources, and reinforcing cultural practices to assist all faculty.

- Includes sections: Why should departments be family friendly, tips for creating a family friendly department, summaries of family accommodation policies and laws, legal information, best practice case examples, and resources.

- Available as a booklet (order from UCB) or downloadable PDF *(http://ucfamilyedge.berkeley.edu/toolkit.html)*
Innovative Practices:
4. “Flexible Workload” Program (San Diego)

- San Diego has a part-time program for academic appointees at the assistant professor level called “Flexible Workload.” This program allows appointees to take a reduced workload (no teaching or most service, but full scholarly responsibility) for up to two years to accommodate family responsibilities.
Innovative Practices:
5. Faculty Advisors for Work Life (Davis)

• The goal of this program is to help publicize and inform the faculty about the programs, policies, and resources associated with work life.

• The group of advisors represents various academic units on the campus.

• The advisors share their experience of being a faculty member who continues to integrate work and personal life.

• There is a webpage with biographies and photos of the advisors (http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/worklife/biographies.cfm)
Seven Possible Areas to Expand:
Recommendations Based on the UC Academic Family Friendly Policy Survey, 2008

1. Informational Brochures
2. Family Accommodation Forms
3. Central Funding
4. Communication with Review Committees
5. Part-Time Use Sample MOUs
6. Training for Department Chairs
7. Data Collection, Analysis & Dissemination

Source: Angelica Stacy, Sheldon Zedeck, Karie Frasch, Marc Goulden, University of California Academic Family Friendly Policy Survey, April 2008. Funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.
Possible Areas to Expand:

1. Informational Brochures

- Brochures are an important way of communicating information to prospective and current faculty.
- Each campus should have clear brochures to advertise and promote the family accommodation policies and programs (including those unique to the specific campus).
Possible Areas to Expand:
2. Family Accommodation Forms

- Having forms for academic appointees to complete when requesting leaves for caregiving reasons makes the use of accommodations feel more like standard practice (as compared to requiring appointees to write a memo requesting the use of the policy).
Possible Areas to Expand:

3. Central Funding

- Centralized funding should exist at each campus. Forms are helpful to use for data collection purposes (e.g., see the form used by Davis)
Possible Areas to Expand:
4. Communication with Review Committees

• Campuses should consider communicating with review groups about the use of family accommodation policies. Most do not give information to ad hoc or senate review committees, or to external reviewers (see Davis language for some types of reviewers)
Possible Areas to Expand:
5. Part-Time Use Sample MOUs

• Three campuses (Irvine, San Diego, and Berkeley) have sample templates for the use of the part-time appointment and reduction in the percentage of time of an appointment to accommodate family needs.
Possible Areas to Expand:

6. Training for Department Chairs

• While most campuses are providing training for department chairs either through orientations, workshops, or brown bag sessions, most chairs are not receiving information on legal issues.

• The *Chairs and Deans Toolkit* could be used or adapted for this purpose.
Possible Areas to Expand:
7. Data Collection, Analysis & Dissemination

• All campuses are collecting data on use of at least some of the family accommodations (but important to track use of each policy, as well as centralized funding)

• No campus offered readily available data summaries on policy use – these could be reviewed and disseminated to various constituents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource/Benefit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption reimbursement benefits</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care assistance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder care assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency/back-up child care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel related dep. care reimbursement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation assistance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal/partner hiring assistance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal/partner hiring policies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complex Issues

• There are differing views on how to interpret accommodations for a woman who has a baby just prior to beginning an appointment.

• There is inconsistency in how academic appointees at the associate level apply for and receive deferrals of personnel reviews.

• The assessment of productivity under ASMD, stop the clock, and the combination of both.

• The amount of ASMD teach relief varies campus-by campus for certain groups of individuals who use the policy.
### Complex Issues: Amount of Teaching Relief

Typical amount of teaching relief for the following groups (*3 campuses do not have a typical amount of relief*):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Full relief</th>
<th>Partial relief</th>
<th>No relief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladder Rank Faculty (LR) – birth mothers during term of childbearing leave</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR faculty – birth mothers during the second term</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR faculty – other caregivers</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other faculty (primarily teaching) – birth mothers during term of childbearing</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other faculty (primarily teaching) – birth mothers during second term</td>
<td>1 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other faculty (primarily teaching) – other caregivers</td>
<td>1 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Steps

• Additional analysis of survey data and materials
• Building-out of *bspace* shared work space (including the development of some summary materials)
• Communication to the campuses regarding how to use the site