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Executive Summary

This report was developed to evaluate the initial impact of Pilot Factory Child-Friendly Spaces (FCFS), a program developed and implemented by CCR CSR in the summer of 2016. The quantitative evaluation was conducted in four out of five project factories involved in the program, with a total enrollment count of 102 children. The impact assessment focuses on the quantitative analysis, which compares the results of baseline and final evaluation surveys with randomly selected workers in participating factories. The assessment also draws on interviews with beneficiaries and factory management.

By comparing the baseline and final evaluation survey results, the assessment found a very high level of acceptance and satisfaction towards the program among beneficiaries, including children, working parents, and the factory management.

Significant improvements were observed in worker-management relationships and workers’ satisfaction with the factory, as were proxies for retention. What’s more, the worker survey and interviews with parents, teachers and children confirmed that children attending the centers became more active and outgoing. Parent workers who participated in the program reported significantly higher levels of trust in management and satisfaction with the factory, and they planned to stay in the factory longer.

The assessment concludes that there is a strong need among working parents to continue the program and expand its scale. In the final assessment, 81% of beneficiaries said they would certainly bring their children to FCFS, a 47% increase from the baseline survey. The assessment also showed that workers unfamiliar with the ideas and concept of FCFS showed certain reservations towards the idea, but increased familiarity was strongly linked to greater acceptance and increased the expression of need and support for the centers.
I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Many working parents are separated from their children and are only able to visit home once a year. This results in a significant strain on parent-child relationships, parents' well-being and children’s development. Numerous studies have shown that the trauma of being left-behind by parents weighs heavily on children, affecting everything from their communication skills to school performance to mental health to outlook on life. Similarly, separation affects the parents too. Between May 2014 and March 2016, CCR CSR conducted 30 in-factory trainings aimed towards parents with left-behind children. According to the pre-training survey, only 19% of workers thought of themselves as adequate parents and one in three found it difficult to communicate with their child/children. When parent workers receive no support from their employers, these feelings of inadequacy can play out in their attitudes towards work, effecting their morale, loyalty to the factory and productivity.

The tendency to leave children behind is still prevalent in China today. Many of these children are looked after by their aging grandparents in faraway towns and villages, with few or no opportunities to visit their parents at their place of work. However, while there is a growing trend of parents bringing their children with them when they migrate for work, many struggle to find suitable childcare solutions, especially during the long summer break. As a result, an unknown number of children roam around workshop floors and factories during the summer months, as witnessed by CCR CSR first-hand during an unrelated supply chain assessment.

---

2 "They Are Also Parents: A Study on Migrant Workers with Left-behind Children in China", CCR CSR, 2013
To address these challenges and to support working parents, CCR CSR conducted a pilot program in the summer of 2016 in five factories with the support of two clients. The factories are located in four coastal provinces in China.

The goal of this pilot program was to establish Factory Child-Friendly Spaces in each selected supply chain factory during the summer school vacation to provide the children of migrant workers with a safe, inclusive space to play, interact with others and to take part in joint parent-child activities. Further, the program aimed to offer an opportunity for all to learn to strengthen relationships. The pilot program was also expected to set a best practice in supply chain factories, with the anticipation that more factories will be encouraged to roll out FCFS during summer months in the coming years.

1.2 Survey Context and Objectives

CCR CSR carried out baseline and final evaluation worker surveys respectively in four factories in 2016 before and after implementing Factory Child Friendly Spaces over the summer months. The surveys aimed to identify the needs of parent with regards to childcare during the summer vacation and any possible activities they would like to do together with their children. It also sought to capture the impact of such factory-based spaces and activities on their children, on their relationship with both their children and factory management; any changes in their loyalty to the factory; and other indicators that might imply changes in worker satisfaction and retention.

Among the four surveyed factories, two factories were medium-sized with 1500-2500 workers and with enough space to accommodate up to 35 children. Meanwhile, the other two factories were much smaller (100-200 workers) and could accommodate eight to 15 children. The two medium-sized factories used FCFS as a type of summer camp for the children of migrant workers, while the two smaller factories set up FCFS as daycare solution for the children of workers whenever or if a need arose.

1.3 Methodology

This report describes the results of the quantitative survey of 446 factory employees (baseline and final evaluation combined), complemented by additional analysis of on-site interviews and observations by CCR CSR staff.

a) The Survey Design and Sampling

The baseline and impact survey consisted mostly of multiple-choice questions to capture quantitative data about the needs (baseline) and experience (final) of working parents regarding FCFS.

The two medium sized factories mentioned above manufactured toys, and the two smaller ones produced shoes and garments. A total of 220 parents with children under 16 participated in the baseline survey (Table 1). 68% of them were female workers representing the total number of working mothers in the factories. The ages of workers ranged from 20 to 60 with an average of 35; and about half of the workers (53%) were migrant workers.

In order to obtain more objective feedback on the impact of the program, we decided to include both the beneficiaries in the final evaluation sample and also the non-participants of
the program. Thus, we included all participants (one spouse from each participating family) in the final evaluation survey and randomly selected additional parent workers from non-participants.

The final evaluation took place in the same four factories as the baseline survey. A total of 226 parents with children under 16 participated in the final survey (Table 1). 69% of them were female workers representing the total number of working mothers in the factories; the ages of workers ranged from 18 to 47 with an average age of 33; and about half of the workers (48%) were migrant workers. 68% of the surveyed parents in the final evaluation did not participate in the FCFS program. This allowed us to understand those parents’ opinion on the FCFS project and understand why they did not participate in the FCFS project.

### Table 1: Sample Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average, min, max age</td>
<td>35, 20, 60</td>
<td>33, 18, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Worker</td>
<td>117 (53%)</td>
<td>108 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCFS Participation</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Participants of FCFS: 72 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150 (68%)</td>
<td>156 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70 (32%)</td>
<td>70 (31%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Interviews & On-site Observation

CCR CSR staff conducted 14 on-site visits and conducted a total of 93 individual interviews during (on-site) visits by CCR CSR staff.

### Table 2: Interview Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factory</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Relevant Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the baseline visits, we asked the parents about their needs and expectations of FCFS, the factory management and relevant staff’s operation plan, the allocation of potential staffs for FCFS and their concerns and attitude towards the establishment of FCFS. During the monitoring visits, we collected the parents and children’s feedback on FCFS and areas they thought could be improved. We also asked the factory management and FCFS teachers about the challenges they met during the establishment and operation of FCFS. During the final evaluation visits, we collected all stakeholders’ feedbacks on FCFS and their expectations regarding future program development. Due to the disparity in size of the factories and their programs, we did not make any systematic quantitative comparison between them. However, we will discuss some factors that might explain the differences in terms of impact and gaps that we identified through our on-site observations.
II. SURVEY RESPONDENTS

A vast majority of workers in both the baseline and final evaluation surveys grew up in the countryside, and very few came from cities (Chart 1).

The education levels of workers were significantly lower than those in electronics factories\(^3\), with most respondents graduating from middle school (Chart 2).

\(^3\) Compared to the education levels in “Staying On: A Study On Young Workers In The Electronic Industry” and “Can WeChat Provide Learning for Migrant Factory Workers?” – http://ccrcsr.com/resources
III. SATISFACTION LEVEL

3.1 Satisfaction with the Program

Satisfaction rate of FCFS among the beneficiaries was as high as 99%.

The satisfaction rate of FCFS was exceptionally high. 99% of program participants reported being satisfied with the program, and of those, 57% said they were “very satisfied” (Chart 3). The level of satisfaction with FCFS was not significantly linked to the age, gender, length of service or migration status of the participants; nor was it linked to the age of participating children. However, it was significantly correlated with whether or not workers had left-behind children. Chart 4 shows that the participants with left-behind children were the most satisfied group in the program, indicating the importance of such a program for migrant parents and the strong urge for parents to be reunited with their children during vacations.

Chart 3: In general, how satisfied are you with the program?

Very satisfied 57%
Satisfied 42%
Undecided 1%

Chart 4: Satisfaction with FCFS vs. left-behind children

- 69% left behind
- 50% didn’t leave children behind
- 4% undecided
3.2 Future Participation and Expectations

In the final assessment, 81% of beneficiaries said they would certainly bring their children to FCFS, a 47% increase from the baseline.

The results clearly show that those who participated in the program were very likely to bring their children again (Chart 5) and were also strongly interested in parent-child activities (Chart 6). The results are not as clear-cut amongst the non-participants, but a larger group voiced interest in parent-child activities in the impact assessment.

Chart 5: If there is FCFS in the future, will you bring your children over during the summer?

Chart 6: If in the future, the factory organizes parent-child activities during the summer vacation, will you be interested in participating together with your child?
Of those who participated in the program, willingness to participate in FCFS and parent-child activities in the future were not significantly correlated with their age, gender, length of service, age of their children or whether or not they had left children behind. However, it was significantly correlated with their migration status: migrant workers tended to be more certain about bringing their children to FCFS in the future (Chart 7) and participating in parent-child activities (Chart 8). This indicates that migrant workers have a strong need for such a daycare center, particularly since they live far away from their families who would normally support them in looking after the children.

FCFS can be set up as (1) vacation, (2) daycare, (3) after school or (4) ad-hoc centers. The most popular type of center for working parents before and after the FCFS program was one that accommodated children during vacations and holidays. It is interesting to mention that before setting up the FCFS, 43% of the working parents thought that none of the four types of centers were helpful. However, after the FCFS program this percentage dropped by 39% for participants, and by 18% for non-participants, with only respectively 25% of respondents saying that none of the four center types would be useful (Chart 9). When asked about the most important elements of the FCFS center before and after the FCFS program, besides the obvious “safe place for children”, the majority of parents agreed that “opportunities for children to do and get support for their homework” would be an important element of FCFS (Chart 10). FCFS is designed to include children up to the age of 13 and homework support is available to all those who need it. The FCFS therefore addresses an important need and this is particularly the case for those with long working hours and/or low education levels.
Chart 9: Which type of center would be most useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Final-Non Participants</th>
<th>Final-Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where children can stay during vacation and holidays</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where children stay all day during work hours</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where children can come regularly after kindergarten/school until end of workshift</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place where children can go sporadically whenever there is need</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 10: What elements do you think would be important to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Final-Non Participants</th>
<th>Final-Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for children to do and get support for their homework</td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place where I am sure my child is safe</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional teachers who look after the children</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place where my child is participating in meaningful activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening times that are the same as my working times</td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. IMPACT OF FCFS
4.1 Impact on Children

63% of parents said their children became more active and thoughtful after coming to the center.

“My wife and I brought our son with us when we came to work here. He is now four and a half years old. In the past, we left him at home to play with another older kid. This year, he came to the FCFS. He learned a lot of Mandarin here. You know, we are not Han people. He also learned painting. He loves dancing very much. His manner is better than in the past too. I felt that he can understand us more and would listen.”
- A father

Most participants of the program reported significant positive changes because of FCFS. For example, the majority (63%) said their children became more active and thoughtful since coming to the center; and 60% said they stopped worrying about their children at work (Chart 11).

Chart 11: “What changes happened after you brought your children over?”

One of the participating factories had many migrant workers from Yunnan Province. Most of these workers left their children back at home. Once they were informed about the FCFS, many made immediate arrangements to get their children to the factory. Many of the children were very timid when they first arrived because it was their first time leaving their hometowns. The factory organized a wide range of daily programs for parents and children to do together such as martial arts, dancing, planting flowers and a trip to a dragon fruit field. During the final on-site observation, CCR CSR staff found children to be much more
outgoing and active than before, which was confirmed by their parents and the teachers of the center. This highlights the fact that when factories invest more in organizing fun activities, the positive impact of the project will be maximized.

"Some children who were too shy to speak in the beginning, are now confident to greet even visitors from outside of the factories and more sociable. Some children from Yunnan came to speak better Mandarin, and a three-year-old boy can now even understand some Mandarin when we talk with him directly instead of through other kids who speak his language. Most of them have better hygiene habits and learned to follow our rules."

- Head teacher of a participating factory

4.2 Impact on Worker-Management Relationship

The surveys indicate that the beneficiaries of the program have significantly higher trust in the management compared to the baseline parents and non-participants of FCFS. Chart 12 shows that 68% of the beneficiaries absolutely trust the management, which is 15% higher than the baseline and 19% higher than the non-participants in the final evaluation.

Chart 12: In general, do you trust the management team?
There was also a significant change in workers’ perception of the management following participation in the FCFS program. For example, migrant parents whose children came to the centers believed that factory management understood their challenges as migrant parents significantly more than during the baseline survey. This is also true when compared to non-participants of the program (Chart 13). Furthermore, the participants of the program were much more likely to believe that the factory management cared about their wellbeing (Chart 14).

A department manager from one of the participating factories told CCR CSR staff during an on-site observation that he found parent workers to be more motivated and efficient during the summer when their children were around. He said workers would greet him when they saw him, which they didn’t do in the past. He also said that due to the positive impact of the project on a few dozen of these workers, 70-80% of the workers in his department became more efficient and helped him improve the production output.

It is also interesting to mention that workers’ perception of management was significantly correlated with their satisfaction with the job/factory – the more they tended to agree that the factory management understood their challenges as migrant parents and/or cared about their wellbeing, the more they were satisfied with the factory. Therefore, a similar connection between participants of the FCFS program and worker satisfaction are to be expected, and will be introduced in the following section.

"When workers are happy, we are happy too. When they were grumpy, they either make troubles for you or pick fights from time to time. What we are afraid of most is receiving phone calls in the middle of the night saying that a fight has broken out among workers and that they’ve gotten into trouble. Now we can sleep better at night.”

- A Deputy General Manager of Admin & Recruitment.
4.3 Impact on worker satisfaction

The FCFS significantly increased the worker satisfaction among beneficiaries.

The beneficiaries of the FCFS program were significantly more satisfied with the factory compared to the baseline parents and non-participants of the program. For example, 69% of the program participants said they would “absolutely” recommend the factory to their friends and relatives, which is 18% more than the baseline and final non-participants (Chart 15). The general worker satisfaction rate was also significantly higher among the beneficiaries of FCFS:

97% were satisfied with the factory, compared to 79% of the baseline parents and 88% non-participants (Chart 16). It is also noteworthy that among the beneficiaries of the program, worker satisfaction was not significantly correlated with their age, gender, age of their children, length of their service in the factory, their migration status and whether or not they had left-behind children.

"This is a very good project. We needed such projects for the satisfaction of our workers. We did this summer program this year and also hired professional teachers to help. The parents were very happy, especially when they saw the progress their children made during the summer. I believe that the impact is a long term one and a win-win to all parties involved."

- General manager of a participating factory
4.4. Impact on Retention

How long workers plan to stay in the factory is usually a good indicator for capturing possible changes in worker retention. The survey shows that retention was positively correlated with workers’ satisfaction with the factory. Therefore, we observed that the FCFS program had similar positive impact on worker retention as workers’ satisfaction with the factory. Chart 17 indicates that 88% of the participants planned to stay in the factory for at least two years, a 22% increase from the baseline and 17% more than the final non-participants.

Chart 17: How long are you planning to stay in this factory?

“This project is very inspirational, particularly in how to retain workers in ways other than salary.”
- A general manager
V. Success, Challenges and Sustainability

5.1 Success Factors

Participating factories’ commitment and support naturally had a great influence on the level of success of the project. In factories with sufficient support from management and with enough resources to allocate personnel, the project was extremely well communicated, implemented and supervised at all stages. From promoting the FCFS program to all workers, setting-up the facility and enrolling children, to monitoring the daily operation of the FCFS, those involved in the implementation and running of the center did so while fully embracing the best interest of workers and their children. Through onsite observations and interviews with various stakeholders, we found the following additional factors to add to the success of the program:

- Communication with workers: when roles and functions of the FCFS were well communicated to the workers, they had fewer concerns about the safety of their children at the centers. Therefore, it is important for the factory to have designated personnel familiar with all the procedures and who are ready to answer workers’ questions.
- Factories with family dormitories where children are allowed to stay helped eased the economic burden of workers as they did not have to rent an apartment outside the factory when their children came to stay. This could explain why economic burden was not a major issue for the pilot factories, as the two larger sized factories with the largest number of beneficiaries provided family dorms. Therefore, when factories expand the program or new factories adopt the program they need to take into account the associated costs for workers so that no-one is excluded from the project on the grounds of money.
- The more daily activities the factories offered, the more positive the impact on children, especially when outdoor activities were organized. Parents were also more satisfied and less worried that their children would be bored when the factory organized a good selection of activities.
• The more teachers worked at the FCFS, the less worried parents were about their children’s safety and the more satisfied they were with the FCFS.

The spillover effect of the program is not entirely conclusive; however, we could observe that retention significantly increased for non-participants compared to the baseline. This might not only be due to the FCFS; however, in two of the participating factories with the larger program, managers and workers stated in interviews that the general atmosphere in the factory improved since setting up FCFS. On the other hand, we understood that in some factories non-participants were not well informed of the program, and thus were not aware of the positive changes in their factory and the potential benefits they could receive. Furthermore, we need to consider that the impact assessment was carried out less than 4 months after the program began – a rather short period to observe a lasting impact and a significant spillover effect.

5.2 Challenges

5.2.1 Duration of FCFS

When we asked parents what the biggest challenges they face are, the number one challenge for parents in both the baseline and the final evaluation turned out to be “looking after my children”. This confirms our assumption that parents, especially migrant parents, have a strong need for childcare support. Although FCFS enabled families to live together during the summer months whilst simultaneously reducing compliance risks associated with children entering production areas, parents still face the struggles of being separated from their children throughout the rest of the year or the challenge of providing childcare solutions when FCFS is closed. The two small sized factories decided to run the FCFS as a continuous, yearlong program, but in the two larger sized factories where most beneficiaries are, the pilot program only covered the summer months as planned.

“"I was always worried about my kid’s safety during the summer vacation, as every year I heard about accidents involving children such as children drowning in ponds or dying from electric shocks. I always remind my child not to eat unknown mushroom types from the hill and to not go swimming in the pond without adult supervision. FCFS has four teachers to look after my five-year-old son. I feel much more at ease now and can focus on my work.”

- A father

In the future, one challenge for us to address will be how to scale it up to cover more workers. Another challenge is how to extend the service beyond the summer. We’ve noticed that some parents seem to be helpless when they have to work and their children are not of school age yet, and this problem exists not only during the summer vacation. Now we have asked the production management to see how many workers would need such help."

- A general manager from a participating factory
5.2.2 Challenges Related to Demand

Lack of information and knowledge about the FCFS is another challenge. While there is a strong need for parents to get child-care support this doesn’t always translate into demand for FCFS. As a matter of fact, where knowledge and familiarity with FCFS is low, demand for such projects also seems lower, as can be seen in the baseline survey where only 34% of the parents said they would certainly bring their children to such a center. Meanwhile this number increased to 81% among the beneficiaries of the program (Chart 5). When extended families of working parents lack awareness of FCFS and its benefits, the demand for such a project is also lower. Among those who did not participate in the program, the number one reason for not participating was their extended families’ lack of approval (Chart 18). During interviews with the non-participants, it became clear that some feel living conditions in their hometowns were possibly better suited for children than the factory dormitories or rented apartments and that their extended families worried children would not be taken good care of in the FCFS. Some parents also mentioned post-work tiredness as a factor for not bringing children to the FCFS.

Chart 18: Top Reasons for Not Participating in FCFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My family (e.g. grandparents) will not agree</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He/she is too young to go to a day-care center</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even with a day-care center, I won’t have time to take care of him/her</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.3 Distant Parenting

Similar to results in previous studies many parents may feel guilty about being separated from their children and in this case getting particularly stressed when parting with their children after spending the summer together. As Charts 19 and 20 show, parents who participated in the program continued to feel guilty and worried about their children’s education after they return to their hometowns. This indicates the strong need to instill a greater sense of confidence in parents regarding the important role they play in their children’s lives and convincing them that this role does not have to diminish due to distance. The finding also underlines the need to equip them with the skills to strengthen and maintain the parent-child bond. CCR CSR parenting training program has shown in other programs to effectively address these issues. Thus, for future FCFS programs, CCR CSR will strongly recommend complementing the FCFS with such training programs so that parents are equipped with better parenting and remote parenting skills.

---

4 “They Are Also Parents: A Study on Migrant Workers with Left-Behind Children in China”, CCR CSR, 2013.
5.3 Sustainability

The sustainability of the program very much falls onto the commitment of factories. As we discussed in section 3.2, workers have a strong need to continue FCFS beyond the summer months. Thus the sustainability of the program is not likely to face challenges in terms of demand.

The sustainability of the program is not likely to face significant challenges in terms of costs, as the most cost intensive stage is the pilot stage when factories first set up the centers. Therefore, factories committed to preventing the common compliance risk of children in the factory workshops during summer months and at the same time interested in improving worker satisfaction and retention, are likely to continue the program as a cost-effective approach to win the hearts of its workforce. By the end of the program, three of the participating factories in the pilot program confirmed their commitment to continue the FCFS program in 2017, and another two (one of them is the surveyed factory) saying they are most likely to continue if the production allows. A peak in production in the summer might deter some factories from organizing project activities, especially when workers are expected to work overtime. As such we hope that the participating buyers will work together with the factories to encourage them to continue the program and build on the successes of the pilot program.
VI. Summary and Conclusions

It is obvious from the baseline and final evaluation worker surveys and interviews that the FCFS program obtained overwhelming positive feedback from the beneficiaries and resulted in significant improvements in worker-management relationships, workers’ satisfaction with the factory and worker retention. The program positively impacted children who could spend their two-month summer holiday in a safe and inspiring environment, and became more active and outgoing after participating in the FCFS program. This result was confirmed during 69 interviews we conducted with parents, children and teachers during three on-site observations.

As for the challenges and gaps, even with a summer FCFS program, working parents still face challenges related to childcare, and there’s a strong need to improve workers’ and their families’ awareness about FCFS to ensure they know about this option. The data also shows the importance of supporting parents with parenting training in order to help them deal with their emotions when children need to leave for their hometowns after the summer holiday.

In summary, there is a strong need to replicate the FCFS model at more factories and to spread its positive impact among a larger workforce, especially in factories with large migrant worker populations. Meanwhile, there is a strong case to scale up the FCFS program at existing participating factories. The positive impact of FCFS can further be magnified if combined with parenting training programs.
Appendix 1. Introduction to FCFS

a) The Challenge for Families

- Children separated by their parents often end up as child laborers, and contribute to skilled workforce shortage
- Our research demonstrates that 38% of parents make frequent mistakes at work due to their worry about children, and that 46% eventually quit work in order to be closer to the family
- Companies are at greater legal and compliance risk due to the presence of children in production areas

b) The Challenge for Companies

- 61 million left-behind children, only reunited with family once a year
- Those who do join their parents often do not get adequate care and end up on the factory floor in unsafe conditions
- Distracted workers prone to mistakes miss their children and quit often

61 million left-behind children, only reunited with family once a year

Distracted workers prone to mistakes miss their children and quit often

b) The Challenge for Companies

- Children separated by their parents often end up as child laborers, and contribute to skilled workforce shortage
- Our research demonstrates that 38% of parents make frequent mistakes at work due to their worry about children, and that 46% eventually quit work in order to be closer to the family
- Companies are at greater legal and compliance risk due to the presence of children in production areas

CCR CSR offers Parent Support Packages that provide working parents with the support needed to regularly connect with their children, such as pre-paid phone cards, support groups and activities etc. As part of this package, we also develop an FCFS tool for brands and its suppliers. FCFS is a temporary, factory-based facility intended to give children and their working parents more time to spend together during the summer. Because of the lack of access to child-care services, a large number of migrant parents have to leave their child at home in their villages. This separation results in a significant strain on relationships, parents’ well-being and children’s development. By providing a safe and inclusive child-
friendly space, FCFS allows parents and children to be together and factory management to foster greater trust and improved relationships with their workforce.

FCFS space aims to:

- Provide a child-friendly environment that allows for children’s play and recreation, daily contact and joint activities with parents.
- Improved trust in not only family relationships, but also in employer-employee relations.
- Reduce recruitment and training costs due to increased worker loyalty and morale.
- Achieve higher worker retention and reduce risk associated with the usage of labor agents.
- Offer a competitive advantage in attracting and retaining staff.

d) How is the Program Designed?

1. Factory manager information session
2. Pre-assessment
3. Staff training
4. Set-up support
5. Support, monitor and track implementation
6. Organise parent-child activity days
7. Impact assessment and final report