Introduction
Our subcommittee (Lisa Folda, chair; Anne-Elizabeth Brodsky, Jeff Gray, and Melissa Helicke) formed in September of 2013 as the Child Care Committee. Over the next few months, as we learned of the solidifying plans for a Homewood child care center and as we studied a range of documents from Johns Hopkins and our peer institutions, we saw that we could not easily consider child care as an isolated issue. Rather, child care is one piece of a much more complex puzzle—a puzzle that has tremendous ramifications for diversity and excellence at Johns Hopkins Institutions.

Accordingly, we broadened our charge to include all family support issues. We focused our committee work on looking at family-friendly policies specifically in terms of:

- Johns Hopkins’ mission
- Resources at Hopkins that are already available
- Best practices at peer institutions

We see family support to faculty and staff as crucial to Johns Hopkins’ mission—not only in terms of diversity, equity, and inclusion, but also in terms of excellence. Specifically, our recommendations support the Ten by 2020 goal to “attract the very best faculty and staff in the world through a welcoming and inclusive environment that values performance and celebrates professional achievement.” The university’s goal here is explicit: to support recruited faculty and staff “such that they want not merely to start their careers at Hopkins but finish them here.” Further, the university commits to “provide our employees those services and support necessary to ensure that a Hopkins position is conducive in every respect to growth and performance at the highest levels.”

Summary of Recommendations

1. Promote, improve, and expand child care resources at Hopkins
2. Promote and enhance WorkLife resources at Hopkins
3. Establish and publicize transparent family-friendly policies for faculty

---

1 Ten by 2020, page 20.
Recommendation #1:

Promote, improve, and expand child care resources at Hopkins.

a) Celebrate and promote the new child care center at Homewood.

b) Include DLC Representation on Child Care Advisory Board.

c) Act decisively to improve child care services at the YMCA.

d) Collect, through a transparent process, accurate data on the demand for child care; and expand child care options at a range of price points.
1a) Celebrate and promote the new childcare center at Homewood.

We applaud the progress made this year on childcare, including building a temporary and soon permanent facility on the Homewood campus! We recognize the hard work, over many years and by many people, that this new childcare center represents, and we are grateful for all those efforts.

As this new child care center is rolled out as an option for Hopkins faculty and staff, we urge the responsible party (currently a working group, as we understand it, in partnership with WorkLife) to advertise this new child care option broadly, across Homewood and Charles Village, to all Hopkins employees.

We recommend this for two reasons. First, opening an on-campus child center is a tremendous success story for Hopkins, one that should be proudly publicized.

Second, this broad publicity will emphasize that the child care center is open for, at least potentially, everyone. We urge the working group and the administration of the new child care center not to make assumptions about which employees are interested in and able to afford this new child care center. To broadcast the child care center only to certain demographic groups within Hopkins, or to solicit information about demand for child care only from certain groups, is to risk the perception that the child care center is only for certain people.
1b) Include DLC Representation on Child Care Advisory Board.

We recommend that Hopkins establish a Child Care Advisory Board, comprised of administrators, faculty, staff, and students, to tend to not only the new child care center but also broader child care issues at Hopkins.

We ask that one seat on this Child Care Advisory Board be reserved for a Diversity Leadership Council member, to be appointed on a rotating basis. This would ensure broad and diverse input to guide decisions related to child care; ultimately Hopkins’ child care efforts will be strengthened by having someone at the table who is focused on the implications for diversity and inclusion—and, by extension, on the ways that Johns Hopkins is perceived by its employees and it community.
1c) Act decisively to improve child care services at the YMCA.

Right across from our Eastern campus and only a mile from the Homewood campus, we have a beautiful child care center, for ages 2-5, connected with a gym, pool, and terrific playground. And yet Hopkins families do not fill the slots available to them. Why? The teacher/aide turnover is extremely high and, worse, the quality of care is unreliable.

We urge Hopkins to take the necessary steps to dramatically upgrade the quality of teachers and teaching aides at the YMCA. This means raising salaries to attract stronger applicants; improving teacher and aide training; and providing professional development to teachers, aides, and leadership. While this certainly represents an investment on Hopkins’ part, support of personnel at an existing facility could significantly increase capacity for quality child care in the Homewood area, and in a manner that is ultimately cost-effective to the university.
1d) **Collect, through a transparent process, accurate data on the demand for child care; and expand child care options at a range of price points.**

**Collect accurate data**

We are concerned that the estimates for the demand for child care for Hopkins employees in central Baltimore are low, due to the small sampling of Hopkins employees included in the surveys (tenure/tenure-track faculty at Homewood only—excluding non-tenure-track faculty, staff, administration, and JH employees who may live in central Baltimore).

We urge the child care center administration and working group to recognize that family situations are complex. For example, someone at a relatively low salary at JH may have a spouse or extended family member who would make this child care situation financially feasible. Similarly, even those of non-childbearing age may be raising a young child, for any number of reasons (adopted child, grandchild, niece or nephew, etc.).

To exclude these families not only tarnishes the opening of the child care center but also skews the data on overall demand for child care. Finally, it goes against the principles of diversity and inclusion.

We recommend doing comprehensive research now to have an accurate estimate of the full demand for child care facilities, before the construction of the permanent center.

**Expand child care options**

While the recommendations above are simply in keeping with best practices common at peer institutions, this last recommendation concerning child care is the one that is the most pressing and most explicitly asks Johns Hopkins to lead rather than follow.

Child care for Hopkins employees in central Baltimore is a critical need and equally critical opportunity for Johns Hopkins leadership among universities. It’s a need already recognized at every level of the university; the *Ten by 2020* report promises, rightly:

> a range of programs and services that reflect the importance of achieving a healthy mix between work, personal, and academic pursuits, including steps to increase the availability of high-quality child care options.²

We urge the President to charge an appropriate team of administrators to take the lead on this opportunity and this need for child care options—plural—at Homewood.

---

² *Ten by 2020* p21.
Specifically, this team would set into motion now the plans for multiple convenient child care centers, at various price points, for Hopkins employees in central Baltimore.

Setting and meeting this actionable goal will address a significant need; will benefit academic excellence at Hopkins; and will provide Hopkins with the opportunity for leadership among urban universities. We’ll address each of these points one by one.

**Significant need**

Planning for and facilitating expanded child care options in central Baltimore will address the specific needs of three important constituencies:

1. **Baltimore City residents**
   
   At the Diversity Leadership Council Awards Ceremony in early May of this year, President Daniels reiterated Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake’s goal of 10,000 more families in Baltimore City by 2020. Working families, at all salary levels, need child care.

2. **Hopkins employees**
   
   With thousands of employees, Hopkins assuredly has many families who would be very glad to have child care near their home or their work. For example, support staff of all kinds who work and/or live near the Homewood campus would benefit from quality child care nearby. This constituency is at the core of a successful institution.

3. **Young scholars**
   
   Graduate students, post-docs, and junior faculty are all in various moments of launching their careers. This is a tender and powerful time for them, intellectually and professionally. It is the time in their careers that, arguably, they most need to marshal resources and support: what happens at this time has ramifications down the road for the job market, publications, salary, and career trajectory.

   It also tends to coincide with a time of life that, should they choose to raise children, is “prime time.” This affects anyone who raises or considers raising children; it disproportionately affects women. According to the AAUP:

   The average age for receipt of a Ph.D. is 33 placing the tenure year at age 40. Women are more likely to receive the Ph.D. at a slightly older median age (34.1 years as compared to 32.8 years for men) Thus the period of most intensive work to establish an academic career coincides with prime child-rearing years. Because they are more likely to carry the burden of
child-rearing duties, women are often forced to make a choice between an all-consuming professional career or having children—a choice men are not generally forced to make. This is a significant source of inequities in faculty status, promotion, tenure, and salary.3

Thus the “need” we refer to for child care at various price points is not simply a statement about the convenience of child care near one’s work (especially when one’s hours are long), although we find that compelling in and of itself. Local, quality, affordable child care for academics with lower salaries is a need not only for their family lives but also for their potential as professionals—a potential in which Hopkins, as the institution training these people early in their careers, has a vested interest.

**Benefits to academic excellence**

Nowhere is the necessity of supporting young scholars more specifically accounted for than in the sciences, as noted in President Daniels’ and Dean Rothman’s op-ed “How to Reverse the Graying of Scientific Research” in The Wall Street Journal (3/4/2014). Daniels and Rothman write that “history has shown that it is often the youngest scientists who defy orthodoxy and shatter paradigms” and propose “solutions on three fronts: re-investment, re-examination and re-imagination.” We find that the child care situation at Hopkins is particularly germane to the third of these solutions, which Daniels and Rothman define as rethinking the NIH grant structures to “increase the availability of grants designated for young investigators” or “create a funding stream for smaller demonstration projects that allow new scientists to obtain preliminary data for an ensuing application.”

We wholeheartedly agree, and would add that quality, affordable, and nearby child care is a key factor in enabling young scientists to do their best work. Here we are thinking not only of scientists who have young children but also of, for example, those entering graduate school who are considering their career and family trajectories. Those potential researchers need to see that the academy—not just industry—offers options to support starting a family. That is, we quite likely lose some promising researchers before we even had them, because the prospect of maintaining a family and an academic career seems so daunting.

**Opportunity for Hopkins Leadership**

We see this as an opportunity to develop a more inclusive, unified Hopkins at which more and more staff members feel connected to the campus and its surrounding neighborhoods. The University already recognizes the advantages of this relationship

---

3 [http://www.aaup.org/issues/balancing-family-academic-work](http://www.aaup.org/issues/balancing-family-academic-work)
through its remarkable support of the “Live Near Your Work” initiative. Toward that end, good child care near the parent’s home or work is also a tool for recruitment, job performance, and retention.

It is an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to an institution that is “of Baltimore.” It’s a chance to soften the edges of our “island of privilege” in Baltimore while supporting economic redevelopment—to give just one example, the redevelopment going on around Homewood in Remington, Hampden, and Charles Village. Expanded child care options give us license to imagine and establish creative, productive partnerships across public and private interests. The demand for quality child care in this part of Baltimore brings together Hopkins’ interests, small-business interests of potential vendors, and the civic, public interest of keeping families in Baltimore City.

It is also an opportunity for Johns Hopkins to contribute to the national conversation, and nationwide best practices, around family support, early childhood education, urban renewal, and economic growth in the United States. It is part and parcel of the work of the Bloomberg School of Public Health, the Institute for the American City, and other sources of groundbreaking scholarship at our university.

That is, expanded child care makes Hopkins a better place to work and study, but it is far more. It is one fundamental premise for supporting public health and reducing inequalities.  

Simply put, we see this as an opportunity to be a leader among urban universities.

---

4 Judith Warner writes in her NY Times article “To Reduce Inequality, Start with Families” (4/20/2014): “If we want to strike at the roots of inequality in America, we’ve got to start at its source, in the family, at the very beginning of children’s lives. We have to make it possible for mothers — two-thirds of whom are now breadwinners or co-breadwinners for their families — to stay in the work force without the sort of family-related job interruptions that can greatly limit their lifetime earnings and even push some families into bankruptcy. We need to make it possible for all parents to give their kids the kind of head start that is increasingly becoming an exclusive birthright of the well-off.”

Recommendation #2:

Promote and enhance WorkLife resources at Hopkins.

a) Shine a brighter light on WorkLife resources.

b) Create an advisory board for WorkLife functions.

c) Enhance WorkLife resources by assessing the current mothers’ rooms and adding/enhancing where needed.
2a) **Shine a brighter light on WorkLife resources.**

Our WorkLife program received the 2014 Seal of Distinction from the Alliance for Work-Life Progress. Ian Reynolds, Director of WorkLife and Community Programs, is the President-elect of the College and University Work-Life-Family Association. There is much to be proud of in this area at Hopkins, and yet many employees do not know about the resources available.

According to AAUP, “The research shows that work/family policies are underutilized, as faculty perceive it may not be professionally prudent to use such policies.”

We advocate initiating a culture shift with regard to WorkLife at Hopkins. Specifically, we recommend that every new employee should meet with a WorkLife representative as part of his or her Hopkins orientation. To that end, we support the current idea, shared with us by Vice President for Human Resources Charlene Moore Hayes, to establish an **Onboarding site** at Eastern, where all new employees would go for their first day of employment.

Further, we recommend that this be done in a way that helps strengthen the relationship—both actually and in the eyes of faculty/staff—between WorkLife administrators and faculty administrators, such as department chairs as deans. If HR sets up an Onboarding site, we recommend that chairs or deans follow up to encourage faculty to make use of WorkLife offerings.

That is, an institution that clearly values work, life, and family balance is one that attracts top faculty and staff. That, of course, is a significant force driving the new child care center. Our point here is that once faculty and staff arrive here, we should prioritize letting them know, at the outset, that Hopkins *encourages* them to use the resources from WorkLife. Doing so can only enhance job satisfaction and retention. WorkLife resources should feel integral to employment at JHI, not ancillary.

---

2b) Create an advisory board for WorkLife functions.

Create an advisory board for WorkLife functions including a diverse group of Hopkins employees to help in disseminating information and guiding strategic decisions for future programs. The current structure is opaque at best and often does not address employee needs—sometimes simply because so few employees are aware of the WorkLife benefits available.

An advisory board could offer more ideas to WorkLife on how to inform people about WorkLife benefits and how to know what people need. Equally important, the board would function as a network of friends of WorkLife, at varying ranks throughout JHI.
2c) **Enhance WorkLife resources by assessing the current mothers’ rooms and adding/enhancing where needed.**

We recommend that WorkLife add more mothers’ rooms with hospital-grade pumps where needed. For example, right now on the Homewood campus there is one mothers’ room in Shaffer (for one mother at a time) and one in Bloomberg. Nursing mothers who do not have private offices will be better served with multiple and convenient places to pump; those with private offices will also be better served with easy access to hospital-grade pumps, which are far more efficient and effective than typical pumps.

Finding additional spaces on the Homewood campus (as well as others, as needed) and securing pumps from WorkLife will help mothers of very young babies be able to breastfeed their babies longer. We need look no further than our own Bloomberg School of Public Health and Work, Life and Engagement Office to realize the associated health outcomes for a child’s first year of life.\(^6\)

\(^6\) For example, “The Benefits of Breastfeeding”
Recommendation #3

Establish and publicize transparent family-friendly policies for faculty.

a) Establish innovative guidelines for dual-career hires.

b) Implement best practices in stop-the-clock tenure policies.

c) Support women faculty.
3a) Establish innovative guidelines for dual-career hires.

We recommend that JHU follow best practices in dual hiring, as described below. In so doing, JHU will be not only acting on its commitment to diversity and excellence in our faculty and staff but also leveraging our prestige and sheer size to support diversity and excellence at area institutions.

According to a 2008 Clayman Institute for Gender Research study of 9000 faculty at 13 top tier research institutions:

72% of faculty have partners who work full time (36% of whom are academic partners, making them dual-career academic couples). Women academics are disproportionately impacted in dual career hiring because more academic women than men have academic spouses (particularly in science and engineering) and women are more likely than men to refuse a job offer because they have not found a suitable position for their partner.7

Acting wisely in dual-career hires can help JHU diversify our faculty, deepen our talent pool, and build our academic excellence and innovation. As the leading institution of higher education in an area with many, many other colleges and universities—not to mention resources in the MD/DC area who seek highly educated personnel—we are uniquely positioned to take a strong leadership role in our hiring practices.

We recommend that JHU match the faculty hiring efforts of UC-Berkeley, University of Michigan, Duke, and others by establishing and publicizing a clear, proactive protocol for dual-career hires. Specifically, we suggest that JHU follow the recommendations of “Effective Policies and Programs for Retention and Advancement of Women in Academia,” published by Work Life Law at the UC Hastings College of the Law (paraphrased below). This report states that “universities that get the dual career puzzle right find this an effective tool for ‘stealing the talent’ and highlight their previous successes as a recruitment strategy” (Duke has featured videos on its website, for example).8

Key steps toward an effective hiring protocol at Johns Hopkins for academic couples include:

- Establish a central, publicly available procedure for handling dual-career hires
- Name a dual-career broker—someone with the necessary knowledge of the university departments and with the influence to facilitate in the Provost’s office
- Provide funds centrally (for instance, through the Provost’s office)9

7 “Effective Policies and Programs for Retention and Advancement of Women in Academia” page 7.
8 “Effective Policies and Programs for Retention and Advancement of Women in Academia” page 7.
9 “Effective Policies and Programs for Retention and Advancement of Women in Academia” pages 7-8.
• Take full advantage of MA-HERC as a resource, and add a funding mechanism to incentivize the use of MA-HERC for employers to hire spouses. That is, MA-HERC would pay a portion of the spouse’s first-year salary.

• Lead the academic community of central Maryland with creative, bridge-building approaches to dual hires (such as the collaboration among Duke, NC State, and UNC-Chapel Hill)

Building on tools and procedures in place at peer institutions and on MA-HERC, JHU can easily carry the banner for creative, thoughtful, and mutually beneficial hiring practices among area colleges and universities. We believe this fits with our aspirations to be a leading urban university and to contribute— in scholarship and in action—to the revitalization of our and other American cities.
3b) Implement best practices in Stop-the-Clock tenure policies.

Many Johns Hopkins schools have stop-the-clock policies for the arrival of a child, but they are uneven. Following the Hastings report, we recommend changing all policies to automatically extend the tenure clock by one year for each child born or adopted into a faculty member’s family—as well as for similar major life events. Importantly, we urge that this policy be an “Opt-Out” policy rather than “Opt-In,” as is currently the case. The climate of academia in the US is such that some faculty members, for reasons ranging from junior status to perception of the chair’s personal feelings about work and family, may not ask for leave or a stopped clock for fear that they will be seen as less serious about their work. An “Opt-Out” policy solves this problem easily and definitively.

This same stigma, or fear of stigma, associated with stopping the clock needs to be addressed after the fact as well. Specifically, outside reviewers for tenure decisions may measure a scholar’s productivity against the number of years he or she has been in the department; if productivity seems low to an outside reviewer, that faculty member might well lose his or her chance at tenure. Likewise, JHU loses its chance to keep a faculty member it has nurtured and trained through his or her early career.

To solve this aspect of the dilemma, we recommend that Hopkins adopt language like that of MIT’s. The UC Hastings Report explains:

> When requesting an evaluation for an applicant for promotion, MIT uses standard language to explain to reviewers that “the time period for this promotion can vary, including one or more extensions of the tenure clock” and remind them “that the criteria for promotion and tenure at MIT are the same for all faculty regardless of the length of his/her service at MIT.”

Again, we see this as an easy and effective fix for a persistent problem at our university.

10 According to the AAUP, “Work and family conflicts for faculty is a serious problem. The Mapping Project Survey conducted by Professor Robert Drago and colleagues at Penn State University found that work/family problems among faculty arise partly from “bias avoidance” (a term that defines behavior on the part of faculty members that leads them to avoid family commitments they would otherwise make, fail to fulfill family commitments, or spend time on strategies to hide parenthood and care-giving from others at work).” Further, “The research shows that work/family policies are underutilized, as faculty perceive it may not be professionally prudent to use such policies. (See D.E. Friedman., C. Rimsky., and A. Johnson. 1996. College and University Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs. New York, NY: Families and Work Institute.)” http://www.aaup.org/issues/balancing-family-academic-work

11 UC Hastings 6-7. Cited from an email from a MIT Sloan School of Management faculty member to Joan C. Williams, June 21, 2009.
3c) Support women faculty.

As we have shown, childcare and related work/life balance issues affect all members of the Hopkins community—those who are caregivers as well as those who may be considering the how a child might or might not fit into their academic futures. But the research shows that issues around family responsibilities disproportionately affect women academics.

We see ever-improving gender parity in graduating PhDs in the US. Yet women are underrepresented in our university leadership. With the departure of Katherine Newman, we have only one female dean; only 11 of 44 trustees are women; women faculty dominate non-tenure-track positions but lag in tenure-track lines.

We urge the university leadership to incorporate best practices for improving the culture of gender equity at Johns Hopkins and coaching women into leadership roles. We applaud the establishment of the “Emerging Women’s Leadership Program” at the School of Medicine12, and believe there is significant value added to expanding this model to additional JHU campuses and faculties. We also concur with the DLC Faculty Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee’s recommendation to establish a faculty mentoring program.

12 Emerging Women’s Leadership Program 2014.
Further Reading

"Are We Crazy About Our Kids?” Video: http://www.raisingofamerica.org/crazy-about-our-kids

“Balancing Family and Academic Work.” AAUW. http://www.aauw.org/issues/balancing-family-academic-work


Johns Hopkins Institute for the American City. https://rising.jhu.edu/americancity
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