REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COVID-19 FACULTY WORKGROUP

Contents

1. Report of the Workgroup
   p. 2-4: Introduction
   pp. 5-10: Recommendations
   pp. 11-13: General Findings
   pp. 14-16: Discipline-Specific Findings
   p. 17-18: Appendix A, Workgroup Personnel
   pp. 19-20: Notes
Introduction

The COVID-19 Faculty workgroup was formed in Winter 2021 by then Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Susan Capalbo. The group continued its work under current Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Rick Settersten, who had been a committee member but withdrew from the committee upon entering the Vice Provost position. The purpose of Settersten’s withdrawal was to avoid the conflict of interest that would be created if he served as both an author and the recipient of the report. The complete roster is included as Appendix A.

The workgroup was charged to assess the long-term overall and differential impacts of the pandemic on academic faculty productivity and to make recommendations for mitigating those impacts to the OSU Provost and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

“Long-term” must be stressed: the workgroup focused on durational impacts (1-5 years out) on academic faculty research, teaching, extension/outreach, and other areas of work that could outlast the campus closure, travel restrictions, and other necessary pandemic-related measures taken by OSU. As examples, areas that were studied for potential long-term impact included: faculty research trajectories; opportunities to present and publish; involvement in professional development; additional time required for course preparation, teaching, and mentoring; and cumulative records of accomplishment in teaching and outreach.

The workgroup focused on assessing these impacts based on (a) a survey of national-level research; and (b) a survey of OSU academic faculty conducted by the Survey Research Center (SRC), analyzed by the SRC and the workgroup, and prepared with representative input from academic leaders and faculty across disciplinary areas. The workgroup studied impacts on the population as a whole as well as potential differential impacts on a number of subpopulations:

(i) faculty as filtered by broadly construed disciplinary areas (bench science, field science, computational/data science, social science, arts, humanities, extension, and clinical);¹

(ii) faculty as filtered by self-expressed gender identity;

(iii) faculty as filtered by self-expressed racial identity.²

Survey

In the spring of 2021 (May-June), 2,613 OSU faculty employed and categorized as Academic Faculty and Tenured Administrators were surveyed for this research. The survey was conducted using the Tailored Design Method (TDM), previously “The Total Design Method” (Dillman 1978).³ An initial “pre-email” was sent to the study population on May 24, 2021 introducing the study, explaining the study purpose, how data would be used, and included a link to the survey. Following the “pre-email” three additional waves of survey invitations were sent from the OSU Survey Research Center (SRC) via the Qualtrics mailer over the course of several weeks (on May
26, June 2, and June 10, 2021) to those faculty who had not responded to the survey. In total, 707 faculty completed or partially completed the survey, resulting in a 27.1% response rate.

The survey had a total of 265 variables/questions, including closed and open-ended questions, distributed across 10 blocks or sections that a respondent could be asked to answer. The number of questions a respondent was asked to answer depended on skip and branching mechanisms programmed into the survey. The survey section/block branching was based on answers to a key question (Q1.2) positioned as the first question in the survey. This question asked what types of duties the individual is responsible for as indicated in their job description. Survey sections displayed to the respondent for their input were based on fundamental position job duties including instruction, research, extension, creativity, and clinical. All respondents were asked demographic questions regarding gender, faculty classification/tenure status, and organizational title/college (see Tables 1-3).

Table 1. Response rate by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender, Nonbinary, Genderfluid</td>
<td>Data N/A⁴</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Classification</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Term</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure/Tenure Track</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the Tenure/Tenure Track Population

| Untenured tenure-track          | 228        | 101      | 44.3       |
| Tenured                        | 640        | 210      | 32.8       |
| Total                          | 868        | 311      | 35.8       |

Table 3. Response by Academic College/Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Description</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Earth, Ocean and Atmos</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural Sci</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Forestry</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Pharmacy</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Programs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health &amp; Human Sci</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Central Support Functions</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Honors College</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

The actions already taken to mitigate impacts include (i) automatic tenure clock extensions for requests made prior to June 1, 2023; (ii) optional reporting of eSET/SLE scores in annual reviews and dossiers for courses taught Spring 2020 through Winter 2022; (iii) option to include a COVID impact statement in annual reviews, mid-term review, post-tenure review, and promotion and tenure dossiers when the period under review includes one or more terms from Spring 2020 to Spring 2021; (iv) the inclusion of a statement related to COVID impacts and accommodations in instructions sent to external reviewers of P&T dossiers. The workgroup finds that these steps conform with those taken at similar institutions.

Other steps taken by OSU that have alleviated some COVID-related impacts to employees and their families include: 160 total hours of COVID leave; increased availability of childcare through OSU’s Family Resource Center, KidSpirit, and the expansion of Our Little Village; access to COVID testing; remote work options for some employees; and assistance with accommodations through the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access.

After studying the landscape of long-term COVID impacts on both the national and OSU scales, the workgroup recommends the following five additional steps in fulfillment of its charge. Although the first two recommendations address tenure-line and/or research faculty, the remaining three are based on additional data involving observed impacts to fixed-term faculty and, in the workgroup’s estimation, would substantially benefit faculty in those groups.

(A) Actions Related to the Evaluation of Faculty

Part A1: Tenure Clock Extensions

Gender-neutral Tenure Clock Extensions (TCEs) have been shown to have the potentially paradoxical effect of extending the time before the review occurs but setting a higher bar, a phenomenon that disproportionately and negatively affects women faculty. In the scenarios studied, male faculty may take TCEs but benefit more often from spouses, partners, or others who perform childcare duties; TCEs may thus allow some men faculty and/or faculty without children (men, women, or non-binary) to perform additional research than would have been possible without the TCE.

The study performed at OSU by the COVID workgroup demonstrated the potential for this scenario to occur here. At OSU, women and nonbinary faculty disproportionately reported pandemic impacts that impacted research. This phenomenon may co-exist with the disproportionate impact of the pandemic on faculty of all gender identities who cared for school-aged children and/or other family members. At OSU, the study revealed that disruptions to collaborative research or professional relationships were especially dramatic and capture the degree to which the isolation defining the pandemic extended into research outcomes; such disruptions were reported with less frequency by men faculty.
TCE can also decrease long-term earning potential, especially if faculty have taken more than one extension.9 At least one institution has implemented a retroactive pay increase to the term when promotion would have occurred without the one-year delay.10

RECOMMENDATION A1

The workgroup recommends that the Faculty Handbook Instructions defining “Procedural Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure” be revised to include the following statement:

Nationally and at OSU, Tenure Clock Extensions represent a strong and widespread tool for mitigating the impacts of the pandemic. TCEs, however, run the risk of raising the tenure bar due to increased research productivity in certain groups less impacted by the pandemic (disproportionately men; and/or those not caring for children or family members). Evaluators should use their disciplinary knowledge and accrued experience in the field to evaluate reported accomplishments relative to pre-pandemic standards of achievement rather than to a standard that may evolve due to the widespread national availability of TCEs.

The workgroup recommends that this statement remain in the faculty handbook until AY2025-26.

RECOMMENDATION A1.1

Given that the number of faculty who requested COVID-based tenure clock extensions is sufficient to produce long-term salary inequities, the workgroup recommends that unit leaders conduct equity reviews of faculty salaries for any faculty member who received a TCE, within three years of their promotion and granting of indefinite tenure.

26% of untenured tenure-track faculty members who responded to the survey reported filing for a TCE. 8% reported having plans to file but had not yet done so. Given that the number of faculty who requested COVID-based tenure clock extensions is sufficient to produce long-term salary inequities, the workgroup recommends that unit leaders conduct equity reviews of faculty salaries for any faculty member who received a TCE, within three years of their promotion and granting of indefinite tenure.
Part A2: Publication and Preparation of Results

Nationally and at OSU, the workgroup observed delays in the preparation and publication of results. Details on the nature and distribution of those delays are included in general and discipline-specific findings later in this report.

RECOMMENDATION A2

The workgroup recommends that, in periodic reviews and other non-promotional processes for AY 22-23, supervisors of academic faculty consider academic works, grant applications, and other typical metrics of productivity that are submitted and/or under review as markers of academic achievement and ongoing productivity. Based on disciplinary norms, units and supervisors will need to decide how to weigh such works relative to published accomplishment but should be aware that the publication pipeline is delayed.

At the national level, some scholars advocate for productivity issues to be addressed in narrative or cover letter to the CV.11 Others call for a more holistic review of faculty by reducing the reliance on quantitative measures of productivity, recognizing local work on the same footing as international work, and expanding the range of materials that count as scholarly output12.

Part A3: Mentoring and One-on-One Interactions

Nationally and at OSU, the workgroup observed increases in the relative amount of effort directed to one-on-one mentoring as well as one-on-one client, student, and other stakeholder interactions. Women and nonbinary faculty reported disproportionately high levels of exertion in these activities – particularly student care and wellbeing – during the pandemic. Faculty of color teaching Ecampus courses also reported disproportionately high levels of exertion in these activities.

RECOMMENDATION A3

The workgroup recommends that academic units include opportunities for faculty to report efforts in one-on-one mentoring and one-on-one client, student, or other stakeholder interactions.

Part A4: Additional Impacts and Distribution of the Report

On the basis of the study conducted in collaboration with the Survey Research Center in Spring 2020, the workgroup identified additional impacts of the pandemic that applied to all OSU faculty as well as differential impacts correlated with disciplinary area, gender, age, and race. These are noted below.
Supervisors should be aware that, in the survey of OSU faculty conducted by the workgroup, women in particular, were more pessimistic about the ability of supervisors or units to fairly assess the teaching they did during the pandemic; 37% (n=98) of women felt they would be fairly assessed, compared to 46% of men (n=116). In addition, women and nonbinary faculty were more concerned about decreased research impacting both P&T (52% [n=140] of women concerned, 39% [n=107] of men) and long-term career development (65% [n=175] of women concerned, 56% [n=153] of men). Similarly, supervisors should be aware that 65% of BIPOC faculty cited concerns about the negative impact of the pandemic on productivity, compared to 54% of white faculty. 42% of BIPOC faculty were very or moderately concerned about the fairness of reviews of teaching, compared to 30% of white faculty; a similar differential existed for reviews of research, with 54% of BIPOC faculty reporting that they were very or moderately concerned about such reviews, compared to 43.5% of white faculty.

These data, taken together, suggest that actions taken by supervisors to make transparent their awareness of COVID impacts13 – including differential impacts – will constitute an important unit-level response.

RECOMMENDATION A4

The workgroup recommends that this report be made available to supervisors and academic faculty prior to the upcoming P&T cycles. The purpose of this recommendation is to preserve institutional memory about pandemic impacts through AY25-26, to provide a population-wide view, and to aid in the interpretation of accomplishments as well as the interpretation of COVID impact statements.
(B) Actions Related to the Professional Development of Faculty after the Pandemic

Part B1

Beyond evaluation, the workgroup identified a range of impacts that could be addressed post-pandemic without identifying a one-size-fits-all model for potential actions.

RECOMMENDATION B1

The workgroup recommends that units and/or Colleges explore ways to fund, support, and otherwise mitigate lost opportunities related to travel, presentation, professional development, instructional efforts, laboratory staffing, and/or other challenges identified by individual faculty at the unit level and presented, in aggregate terms, in this report.

This recommendation may be particularly important when it comes to professional development activities related to teaching, as disproportionate impacts are notable in that area. More women felt an impact of COVID on professional development opportunities in pedagogy: 45% (n=127) of women reported that development opportunities they had been planning to attend were cancelled or postponed, compared to 36% (n=94) of men.14

BIPOC faculty expressed stronger preferences for all forms of institutionally provided solutions to pandemic disruptions than white faculty. Tenure Clock Extensions were self-reported as more likely to be used by BIPOC than white faculty members at OSU, a datapoint that suggests the disproportionate impacts also noted in national studies of the pandemic. 48% of BIPOC faculty reported either filing or having plans to file, compared to 31% of white faculty.15 In terms of unit-level responses, adjustments to teaching or service duties in upcoming years were defined as moderately or very helpful by more BIPOC faculty (57% for teaching, 63% for service) than white faculty (46% for teaching, 52% for service). Additional grant-writing support was identified as very or moderately helpful by 58% of BIPOC faculty, compared to 46% of white faculty.

Taken together, these data suggest the unsurprising but significant conclusion that unit- or College-level actions taken in response to Recommendation B1 would be disproportionately beneficial to those groups, including women, nonbinary, and faculty of color, who experienced disproportionate impacts from the pandemic.

Some institutions such as the University of North Texas have published memorandum containing guidance on how departments may develop revised evaluation guidelines that include changes in performance criteria for performance evaluations in the spring 2020 semester and the 2020-2021 academic year. Institutions in other countries have implemented altogether different frameworks for evaluation, such as achievement relative to opportunity.16
Part B2

National data defines faculty burnout related to pandemic-related stressors and increases in work expectations\(^\text{17}\). Burnout is an organizational phenomenon developed from chronic workplace stress that has not been managed.\(^\text{18}\) It is notable that faculty burnout and related mental health concerns have been reported in national data as disproportionately impacting women and faculty of color.\(^\text{19}\)

**RECOMMENDATION B2**

The workgroup recommends that appropriate supports be offered to aid faculty in managing increases in emotional and workload demands related to the pandemic. Academic units can make efforts to reduce faculty burnout by supporting opportunities for respite and self-care as needed (e.g., model and support work-life balance, offer course releases or other reductions in workload, suspend, or reduce non-essential tasks/responsibilities to offset workload increases).

(C) Actions Related to Ongoing Career Disruptions

**RECOMMENDATION C1**

The workgroup recommends that the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs reconvene a workgroup in one year’s time to review faculty adoption of policy and programming to address career disruptions as a result of the ongoing pandemic.

When these workgroups were convened, there was likely an unstated assumption, or optimism, that the pandemic would be “over” by the time that this report was issued. Therefore, the report’s recommendations could address recovery. We now recognize that the pandemic is not yet over, and that there will be a “long COVID.” As such, the workgroup believes that the university will need to continue to monitor research on the effects of the ongoing pandemic on academic careers as well as the uptake, effects, and negative unintended consequences of policies put in place stemming from the recommendations made in this report.
General Findings

Based on study of the national landscape of COVID disruptions as well as a survey of OSU faculty conducted in Spring 2021, the COVID workgroup highlights the following most-noteworthy impacts.

1. Cancellation of Opportunities

   Across all disciplines, travel to research sites, conferences, engagement with collaborators, and networking opportunities were significantly disrupted. Differential impacts by discipline were observed, but the general incidence of such disruptions as reported by OSU faculty hovered around 50% (range: 44% in arts and humanities to 57% in sciences). Such disruptions did not only involve physical travel or formally cancelled opportunities, but access to collaborators even when the collaboration could occur remotely. Instructional faculty experienced a loss of professional development opportunities.

   BIPOC faculty reported reductions in funding (40%) at a rate considerably higher than white faculty (20%). The workgroup speculates that this striking finding may have to do with the distribution of BIPOC faculty in relation to disciplinary areas of study and/or may indicate that BIPOC faculty disproportionately experience funding vulnerabilities related to the nature of the research, the kinds funding institutions implicated, or other factors related to larger systemic issues with the overall distribution of research funding dollars nationwide.

2. Preparation of Results/Creativity

   Loss of time to create and/or write impacted a significant number of faculty during the pandemic. At OSU, 78% (n = 425) of faculty reported having less time to maintain their normal research levels. Notably, respondents indicated that increased time to perform other activities impacted time for creating and/or writing. Specifically, 76% (n = 414) faculty lost time due to increased teaching or service responsibilities while 70% (n = 382) found that more time and resources were needed to perform research or engage in creative endeavors. This loss of research and creative time resulted in a majority of faculty concerned about review/merit raises (54%, n = 294), and the long-term development of their work or career path (61%, n = 333). These same concerns are more prominent amongst BIPOC faculty, with 67% concerned about review/merit raises (compared to 52% of white faculty) and 75% concerned about the long-term development of their work or career path (compared to 59% of white faculty).

   While the loss of time is notable for all faculty, 68% of women and nonbinary respondents were more likely to indicate that they have had a reduction in their research and/or creative time due to increased teaching and/or service responsibilities, compared to 47% of men. 57% of BIPOC faculty noted a reduction in research and/or creative time, compared to 34% of white faculty.

   As noted above, 52% of women and nonbinary respondents were also very or moderately concerned about how that decrease in research or creative productivity would impact promotion and/or tenure, compared to 39% of men. 68% of BIPOC faculty were very or moderately
concerned about how that decrease in research or creative productivity would impact promotion and/or tenure, compared to 52% of white faculty.

These findings are consistent with national research. During the pandemic, studies have found that female academics reported fewer hours worked due to child, parent, and other care duties, and, with fewer hours worked, more time devoted to teaching and other tasks, which decreased time available to perform research.

3. Time Invested in Instruction

Time needed for instruction increased dramatically for faculty during the pandemic. 77% (n=543) of faculty indicated that they engage in instruction. Of these, 65% (n=356) were responsible for converting at least one course (unique preparations not multiple preparations of same course) to remote delivery in three academic terms. Among those instructing, 78% (n=421) reported spending more time on preparing lecture content, 57% (n=311) spent more time preparing exams and other assignments, 66% (n=361) spent more time helping students with technical issues and access, and 70% (n=381) spent more time on building rapport with students, supporting student mental health and helping students who were struggling to meet course expectations.

Concerns about teaching success impacting review processes were disproportionately expressed by BIPOC faculty. 42% expressed high or moderate levels of concern about impacts on promotion and/or tenure, versus 19% of white faculty who expressed concerns at the same level. For non-promotional processes (review and/or merit), 46% expressed high or moderate level of concern about the challenges of teaching during the pandemic affecting those processes, versus 29% of white faculty.

4. Time Invested Per Pedagogical Interaction

Increases in time invested in the total conversion of extant courses to remote delivery may obscure the impact of the pandemic on Ecampus instructors and on faculty who converted fewer discrete courses over the course of the four terms during which OSU engaged in primarily remote delivery.

In the survey results related to instruction (presented graphically in the report prepared by the Survey Research Center, Part II of this report, pp 20-22), direct support to individual students represented areas in which increases to teaching effort (outside of class time) were large. On questions related to such exertions (e.g., assisting students with technical issues, identifying students struggling to meet expectations, supporting student mental health), between 63% and 71% of faculty reported increases in the amount of time needed for such interactions. For comparison, 78% of respondents indicated that the amount of time needed to prepare lectures and course content increased. These data suggest that increases in time needed for one-on-one interaction were almost as impactful as the conversion of course materials. Such reinvestments of time into one-on-one interactions would be made even when a course prepared for remote delivery was offered a second or third time. Additionally, these data capture the impact of the pandemic on Ecampus instructors. Although Ecampus courses are by definition prepared for remote delivery under any circumstances, 66% of Ecampus instructors reported exerting more
effort to identify and support students struggling to meet course expectations, while 68% reported exerting more effort to support student mental health and disability access.

56% of respondents reported an increase in the amount of time required to perform advising unrelated to coursework (e.g., mentoring undergraduate and graduate students) under pandemic conditions.

While similar percentages of men and women reported spending more time in preparing courses for remote delivery, differences appeared in the time needed to support and mentor students. Women and nonbinary faculty reported spending more time supporting student mental health (78% vs 64% for men) and identifying and supporting students struggling with the course (77% vs 63% for men).
Discipline-Specific Findings

1. **Humanities** (n=48)

   Apart from the general findings noted above, humanities areas were most affected generally by loss of access to writing space (31% of faculty reported having no access to space, on home or at campus, conducive to their research work, while 96% had regained either no or only limited access to on-campus office space as of the survey date) and by publication delays (66% of faculty reported increased review and/or publication schedule times). Reductions in external grant funding had very little impact in the humanities, affecting only 2% of faculty, although 12.5% experienced the modification of a residential fellowship. However, 58% of faculty reported having lost access to necessary off-site texts (e.g., those held in archives) due to travel restrictions and curtailment (e.g., archives).

   Observed differentials by gender involved the cancellation of research plans (44% of women cancelled pre-approved plans for research, compared to 19% of men) and disruption of collaborative relationships (59% of women experienced a lack of typical engagement from co-authors or collaborators, compared to 47% of men). The gendered differences noted were disproportionately experienced by women aged 18-44.

2. **Arts** (n=27)

   Arts faculty depend on campus spaces as sites for creative work: 63% of arts respondents describe using studios, rehearsal spaces, and/or other OSU spaces to perform or create creative content, with 75% of that population reporting the presence of specialized equipment or other resources that could not be reproduced in an off-campus space. As of the survey date, 81% of respondents had regained either no or limited access to such spaces.

   Few arts faculty (7%) reported dependence on external grant funding, although 26% reported planning to hold a residential fellowship during the pandemic. All of those were either cancelled or modified.

   Effects of the pandemic on the time available for the preparation of work mirrored that for the general population as described above, but it is noteworthy that 63% reported that their art requires, as its core modality, live audiences to gather and 67% reported being affected by closures or curtailments of galleries or other venues in which they typically present or display work. Publication delays affected 55% of respondents.

3. **Social Sciences** (n=127)

   Social science faculty experienced a range of Covid impacts, with 50% of faculty experiencing a lack of access to workspace, 62% lacking the necessary time to write or prepare results, 65% experiencing less than typical engagement with co-authors and/or study team members, and 68% noting delayed review and publication times with journals or other publication venues. Turning to gender, impacts of the pandemic were more acutely experienced by women. Specifically, 55% of women had fellowships cancelled compared to 27% of men, 31% had less
access to workspace compared to 17% of men, and 68% of women had less time to write or prepare results compared to 54% of men. Finally, looking at both gender and age, we find that younger women (18-44) experienced the most impacts from the pandemic with over 70% of women respondents indicating less time to write and prepare results, 83% experiencing extended review and publication times, and 58% having more conferences or meetings cancelled.

4. Sciences (n=416)

Approximately half of respondents reported a decline in research funding availability, with 12% reporting a significant decline. Many researchers reported that they lacked the time needed to write or prepare results and engagement (58%) and a loss of engagement with co-researchers or study team members (62%); women experienced these impacts more often than men. Over half of respondents reported delays in review processes and publication time and 67% reported impacts on scheduled or planned presentations of their work at conferences. Half of researchers reported a loss of laboratory or project personnel during the pandemic (49.5% of 329 respondents).

In computational sciences, while the majority of faculty (90%) were able to work remotely, activities were impeded for 60% of respondents due to increased responsibilities and/or lack of appropriate equipment.

In bench sciences, 36% experienced a decline in research funding, 37% reported a decline in collaborative team engagements, 80% had reduced access to laboratory facilities and 62% reported lack of sufficient laboratory personnel. National research indicates that time spent on research decreased most for those requiring specialized infrastructure. Furthermore, productivity was impacted, with 35% reporting that they had less time to prepare manuscript for publication, 56% experienced a delayed review process, 76% reported canceled, delayed or altered conferences.

In field sciences, COVID conditions affected travel, safety, and access to field or clinical sites for a majority of researchers engaged in field research (N = 216). Access to field sites was restricted completely for 26% of respondents and reduced for 52% of respondents, with OSU travel restrictions listed as the most common reason for loss of access (67% of 168 respondents).

5. Extension (n=87)

90% of Extension faculty who responded to the workgroup survey indicated that some portion of their position involves community or stakeholder relationships, while 50% indicated that some portion of their position involves field work. Only 16% indicated that some portion of their position involves laboratory work. These data suggest the interactive nature of work in the Extension population.

Impact on interaction was profound, with 73% reporting decreases in the level of interactions with stakeholders and communities. Impact was also cumulative, with 91% reporting loss of assistance from others with whom respondents typically work closely. Almost all Extension faculty indicated that their work was curtailed by loss of access to space or travel restrictions in some way, with 74% to 77% describing that impact as moderate or greater. 41% of faculty experienced
at least some funding decline. 57% of Extension faculty reported redirecting some portion of their efforts towards pandemic-related duties such as public health efforts.

62% of women respondents reported a decrease in engagement from necessary collaborators at the upper end of the impact scale (a “great deal” or “a lot”), compared to 37% of men respondents. Faculty, projects, and disciplinary areas that tend to be more networked may be particularly susceptible to cumulative, system-wide disruptions; this datapoint suggests that women faculty disproportionately experienced that additive effect.

6. Clinical (n=25)

Most clinical faculty who responded to the survey work directly with living human or animal subjects. Clinical faculty presented a different picture than some other academic populations, as the level of interaction with subjects stayed the same or increased for 52% of respondents. 48% reported directing efforts towards pandemic-related responses such as public health efforts, while the same number reported an increase in the relevance or impact of their clinical expertise during the pandemic. Of those who directed energy towards pandemic responses, 66% reported concurrently maintaining their customary clinical duties at the same level as typical.

On top of these shifts, 64% of clinical faculty reported that the time required per-case or per-interaction increased. Notably, clinical faculty experienced funding losses at a greater level than observed for most other populations, with 56% of faculty experiencing at least some funding impact.

The majority of respondents (80%) to the survey in the clinical area identified as women. The small number of men respondents (n=5) makes it difficult to analyze differential impacts in relation to particular job duties during the pandemic while preserving confidence about the statistical significance of the conclusions. However, the large number of women respondents is itself noteworthy, given the degree to which clinical areas were involved with direct response to the pandemic and the maintenance (or increase) in interactive relationships with the community during the campus shutdown.
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The workgroup asked faculty to self-identify by disciplinary practice—rather than reporting College-by-College—because faculty in a given College may be engaged in a range of methodologies. The College of Science, for instance, includes faculty with very different approaches and areas of expertise, and the workgroup felt that self-identification by academic practice would offer a more nuanced measure of pandemic impacts.

The response rate for the survey conducted by the COVID workgroup was 27.1% as reported by the SRC using the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) standardized outcome rate calculator. This response rate falls within the typical range for such surveys, and the workgroup determined to take the data as representative in most areas. Areas wherein the data is more limited and must be approached with caution include those with small total numbers of respondents. This includes most of the demographic categories (American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian or Asian American; Black or African American; Middle Eastern or North African; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; Other) other than White or Caucasian. In order to have a sufficient sample size to report on differential impacts by race, the workgroup determined to aggregate these categories as BIPOC. The workgroup is sensitive to the limitations of this method. To take any other approach, however, would have resulted in analysis being conducted on groups of respondents so small (Black faculty associated with bench science, for instance) that individual respondents might have been identifiable by study group members. Therefore, the SRC and the workgroup mutually agreed that the SRC would provide the workgroup with aggregate data on BIPOC respondents, creating a bucket large enough that the workgroup could offer analysis relative to race without compromising the privacy of individual respondents.


The survey included a question (Q10.2) with the potential response “nonbinary, transgender, genderfluid.” A gender category that corresponds to that exact wording is not available for the population as a whole, i.e. nonrespondents to the survey, the size of the whole population (and hence the response rate for this group in itself) is not included in the chart. In order to ensure that the relatively small number of respondents who selected this option were represented in the survey results while protecting the anonymity of those individuals (which made identifying responses by the subset itself impossible), the workgroup reports differential impacts for “women and nonbinary respondents.” The alternative was to not represent the nonbinary respondents in differential impacts at all, thus reproducing and reifying a gender binary (M/F) within the survey. In portions of the survey results that are not measuring differential impacts by gender, which represents most of the survey, all respondents are aggregated together regardless of expressed gender identity.

This statement is linked under the general COVID accommodations page at the Faculty Affairs website, linked above. It reads: “The COVID-19 pandemic has taken a serious toll on faculty productivity especially research, scholarship and creative work, as well as their teaching, mentoring and service. Research on a national level suggests that faculty of color and women faculty may be disproportionately affected. We ask that you consider this candidate’s professional accomplishments in the context of the disruptive and prolonged COVID-19 pandemic and the circumstances under which faculty have been operating since March of 2020.

Oregon State University has provided COVID-19 accommodation for academic faculty including (a) COVID-19 tenure clock extension to all tenure-track faculty upon request; (b) the inclusion of a COVID-19 impact statement in the dossier at the faculty member’s discretion; and (c) optional inclusion of Student Evaluation of Teaching scores in promotion and tenure dossiers for courses taught in Spring 2020 through Spring 2021. Evaluators and reviewers should assess the candidate’s accomplishments and productivity and provide an evaluation of the merits of the dossier without prejudice related to COVID-19 tenure clock extensions and without prejudice related to the candidate’s decision about reporting or not reporting student feedback for the Spring 2020 to Spring 2021 terms. Reviewers should also be mindful of impacts that may have been noted in the COVID-19 impact statements.”

For an example of another institution’s report on the adverse effects of COVID-19 pandemic on faculty leading to a recommendation for tenure clock extensions, see the Report of the Task Force on Equity in Faculty Evaluation submitted to the Provost and Faculty Senate at the University of Delaware: http://fascen.udel.edu/Sites/agenda/Equity-in-Faculty-Evaluations-Task-Force-Report11-11-2020.pdf. Institutions such as Cornell have gone beyond tenure clock extensions to offer programs to support faculty who have been adversely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic to resume research productivity: see

The observed phenomenon in the OSU study has also been described at the national level. See https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/investigating-the-potential-impact-of-covid-19-on-the-careers-of-women-in-academic-science-engineering-and-medicine.


Data on nonbinary faculty related to this question was insufficient to make a non-binary assessment.

At the same time, Tenure Clock Extensions were viewed more favorably by BIPOC than white faculty. 34% of BIPOC faculty reported an additional year of TCE, beyond the one year automatically for those who request it, as a very or moderately helpful solution to the effects of the pandemic, compared to 16% of white faculty.

https://www.monash.edu/academicpromotion/achievement-relative-to-opportunity


Faculty reporting non-binary gender identities are included in the overall data as defined in n4 above. But given that the number of respondents in particular disciplines may be as low as 1, are not included in the discipline-specific data for privacy reasons.