

**REPORT ON TENURE EXTENSION SURVEY
by the UCTP**

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Introduction
Context of Faculty Survey
Recommendations by the UCTP
Findings by Question
Results by Question
Appendix

Introduction

On May 27, 2020, Provost Clark announced a one-year tenure clock extension due to the disruption in teaching, research and scholarship activities stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic. In his message, Provost Clark noted that specifics of the extension implementation might vary by school due to differences in allowable extensions, and indicated that the University Committee on Tenure and Privileges (UCTP) would work with deans and faculties to resolve emerging issues.

To gain an understanding of the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty productivity and their needs related to a tenure clock extension, UCTP conducted a web-based survey of faculty that was open from May 26 to June 5. The survey consisted of seven open-ended questions as well as seven questions related to appointment type, title and primary school affiliation.

Context of Faculty Survey Influencing Interpretation of the Results/Key Themes

- Survey instruction specifically referenced the decision to extend the tenure clock and indicated that responses would help shape implementation of that decision. Since concerns of non-tenure eligible faculty were not mentioned in the survey invitation, it did not encourage participation of those members of our faculty. Across all schools, few instructional faculty participated.
- Similarly, other minority opinions provided important insights to faculty experience. We excerpt many of these in the full report, below.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Serious consideration should be given to concerns about both an immediate rise in expectations for tenure (for currently untenured faculty) as well as longer-term upward “creep.” As one key step to avoid this, we recommend that, when applicable, promotion regulations describing the text of solicitations for external letters be temporarily altered to add explicit guidelines to external reviewers to consider the effects of COVID-19 disruptions to faculty work.
2. Serious consideration should be given to concerns that the approved extension could actually increase disparities between faculty, including those of underrepresented minority groups and those bearing family responsibilities. It is well-documented, for example, that women often suffer from parental leave policies that enhance the productivity of those who do not bear the primary responsibility for child-rearing. Respondents raised concerns that this extension could generate similar unevenly distributed advantages. This may require case-by-case scrutiny. However, some checks could be implemented: e.g., that the Provost require that all appropriate faculty members check that COVID-related discrepancies are not playing out at the departmental/school level, and/or that

specific COVID-related protocols be added to procedures for all reviews and promotions.

3. Disruptions to many areas of faculty research (e.g., live performance, laboratory research, access to archives) may outlive or simply not correlate to the period during which the pandemic's effects are felt broadly within society. Many respondents, even in spring 2020, saw that we do not yet know how long these disruptions will last, nor how evenly they will be felt. While a majority called for an automatic application of the extension, some signaled that this too could produce regressive results (see #1 and #2, above). While a minority called for more individualized attention to specific cases or for the extension to be "optional," our recommendation is to pursue an "opt-out," automatic extension. This would also address another regressive outcome noted by some respondents: that a tenure extension delays the salary raise often associated with a positive tenure decision.
4. A surprising number of respondents, particularly in Medicine & Dentistry, claimed to be unaware of existing parental leave policies, or claimed that such policies "are not really implemented anyway." Better promotion of and transparency regarding leave policies must be implemented at all schools.

FINDINGS:

Clear majority opinions were expressed in response to two questions:

1. Question 3: "Should the extension be automatically given to all eligible faculty, or should a faculty member have to request an extension to receive it? Why?" A high majority—an average of 80% across all schools—responded yes, all eligible faculty should be automatically granted an extension. See below for important exceptions and concerns, including whether this extension is adequate/enough and whether it should be automatic.
2. Question 5: "How should the extension apply to faculty eligible for other extensions, such as extensions for new parents?" This question produced responses that were easily categorized as "yes/additive" or "no/concurrent." Divided in this way, the "yes/additive" responses produced a high majority, with only 37 faculty across all schools arguing for "no/concurrent" extensions. Reasons for both types of answers are given below.

Tables showing the breakdowns of these findings are in the Appendix.

However, a number of questions were too broadly framed or ambiguously worded to enable clear counts. These are:

1. Question 2: "Do you believe a one-year extension will be sufficient? If not, how should the extension be handled?" The largest number of responses at all schools could be categorized as "yes," though many caveats were offered (some

in the direction of “should be longer” and others citing uncertain trajectory of COVID pandemic. See Question 2, Appendix B).

2. Question 4: “This extension will apply to faculty who have already started their appointments. Should this extension be offered to newly appointed faculty in 2020? In 2021? Why?” A full 66% majority (across all schools; within schools, majority proportions ranged from 57% at Hajim to 81% at Warner) chose “2020,” “2021” or “Yes” as their answer. Some read this as a yes/no question and others as an answer to which “2020” or “2021” was the appropriate response. We judged “Yes” to mean “yes, it should [be] applied to such new appointments” unless we deemed it to be “unclear or unsure,” which constituted a category separate from “no/they should request it.”

Tables showing the breakdowns of these findings are in Appendix B.

Some questions did not achieve/were not intended to achieve true majority responses:

1. Question 6: “Do you think other term appointments should receive similar extensions? Why or why not? (If you hold such an appointment and wish to provide information about your specific situation, please identify the type of appointment.)” Overall, a greater number of respondents across schools replied “yes” to this than any other answer except “don’t know/unsure/don’t understand the question/don’t know what a term appointment is,” but the threshold of those responding “yes” did not cross 50%, and in the Warner School countable answers were evenly divided between “yes” and “no.” (This question also received far more blank answers than any other except Question 7.)
2. Question 7: “Any other comments or concerns about how the promotion regulations will be modified to grant this extension?” Many responses here reiterated points made in response to questions above.

Finally, evident from the responses to the survey are both the need to address appointments and review procedures beyond tenure-eligible faculty and the effect of evolving circumstances on faculty opinions.

1. Among concerns for non-tenure eligible faculty were: acknowledgments that those faculty often carry “a heavier load of teaching/supervising clinical practice, which will mean greater overall increased workload, stress, and possible contact with more students” and that generally such a policy should not reward “privilege with more privilege.” However, for some non-tenure eligible appointments, some respondents noted that there is no “trigger” or “deadline” for promotion that could be extended.” These conflicting arguments reflect a situation that varies by school and appointment, and require more input from the faculty to address.

2. Similarly, questions about the impact of COVID-19 on incoming hires or hires next year, and whether one-year extensions were sufficient that were answered at the end of spring term may need to be asked again, as the impacts of COVID-19 are better understood.

Overview of the Survey:

A total of 418 survey responses were completed with representation from all schools/colleges. [See Appendix A for the total number of faculty per school.] Table 1 shows the number of respondents by school/colleges and professorial rank/position. Responses to the seven open-ended questions were content coded, tabulated and summarized by members of UCTP. Responses are summarized below by question and tabulated responses are provided in Appendix A.

Table 1. COVID-19 Effects on Faculty Productivity Survey Respondents by School and Rank

School	Total Responses	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor	Other
Eastman	30	8	11	12	0
Hajim Engineering	26	10	6	9	0
Arts & Sciences	122	37	32	51	Visit Prof: 1 Instructor: 3
Medicine & Dentistry	201	71	59	69	Research Assoc. Prof: 3 Research Assist: 3 Instructor: 1 Other: 1
Nursing	16	8	3	3	Clinical Prof: 1 Instructor: 1
Simon	11	7	2	2	0
Warner	11	3	5	3	0
Total	418	144	118	149	14

Results by Question

Q1: What are ways that you expect COVID-19 work restrictions will impact the ability of faculty to build their case for promotion and tenure?

Responses to Question 1 revealed a long list of challenges stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic that are affecting faculty productivity in the areas of research, scholarship, teaching, and practice. Several challenges identified were common across the schools (see Table 2), while others were shared within one school and still others reflected unique individual concerns.

Among the concerns shared across schools, *delays and disruptions to research activities* was the top ranked concern in 5 schools (Hajim, Arts & Sciences, Warner, Medicine & Dentistry, and Nursing) and identified as a concern by all schools. *Child/family care responsibilities* was ranked the second highest concerns in 3 schools including Arts & Sciences, Warner, and Nursing and third highest in Medicine and Dentistry and Simon Schools.

Travel restrictions and conference cancellations was among the most frequently identified concerns ranked among the top four concerns by all schools.

The time spent in transitioning to online teaching was highly ranked as a significant concern in all schools except Medicine & Dentistry and Warner.

Table 2 Ranked Order of Most Commonly Cited COVID-19 Related Factors Impacting Faculty Progress toward Promotion/Tenure by School

	Eastman	Hajim	Arts & Science	Warner	Medicine & Dentistry	Simon	Nursing
Disruptions to research activities	7 th	1 st	1 st	1 st	1 st	3 rd	1 st
Child/family care responsibilities	5 th	5 th	2 nd	2 nd	3 rd	3 rd	2 nd
Travel stopped/conferences cancelled	4 th	2 nd	4 th	3 rd	2 nd	1 st	4 th
Transition to online teaching	2 nd	3 rd	3 rd	6 th	10 th	2 nd	3 rd

Additional concerns shared across schools focused on:

1. *Decreased access to research funding* due to changes in funding priorities, budget freezes affecting internal funding sources and delays in pilot work delaying applications for external funding.
2. *Delays in publication* (Eastman, Arts & Sciences, Medicine and Dentistry, Warner and Nursing).
3. *Library and archive closures and extended limitations in access* was identified as an important barrier in two schools including Eastman and Arts & Sciences.
4. *Stress, mental health issues stemming from the pandemic* were identified as a disruptive factor in four schools (Eastman, Arts & Sciences, Warner, and Medicine & Dentistry).
5. *Negative teaching evaluations due to the transition to online teaching* was identified as a factor impacting promotion readiness by five schools including Hajim, Arts & Sciences, Medicine and Dentistry, Simon and Nursing.

Analysis of the survey response revealed unique areas of concerns in two of the seven UR schools. For the Eastman School, *library and archive closures and extended limitations to access* was the most common concern with approximately 53% of the respondents identifying this as a barrier to progress to promotion. Concerns related to

cancelled performances and extended closures of performance venues limiting performance opportunities were also reported. *Travel restrictions* have disrupted opportunities to perform, participation in student performance competitions, and teaching and taking master classes.

Unique barriers identified in Arts & Sciences included *delays in laboratory renovations* and *disruptions/decreases in student and staff productivity* due to lab closures, furloughs, social distancing, and funding cuts.

Within Medicine & Dentistry, barriers related to clinical practice were identified. Barriers included: increased clinical demands stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic; increased responsibilities related to safety precautions; clinical work requiring more time to complete; covering for sick and furloughed colleagues; and increases in administrative responsibilities. Temporary service closures have impacted progress toward promotion due to increased difficulty meeting relative value units and paused practice.

A few respondents from Arts & Sciences and Medicine & Dentistry noted that the pandemic would affect only a portion of faculty (“only impact those two or more years away from tenure”; “will only affect borderline cases”). (N=8)

Q2: Do you believe a one-year extension will be sufficient? If not, how should additional extensions be handled?

Across all schools, support for an extension in time to tenure was nearly unanimous and the majority indicated that the one-year extension should be automatic. However, a majority of faculty across schools *also* questioned whether a one-year extension was sufficient. Ideas about the duration of the extension and how additional time should be determined varied across faculty, with few patterns emerging.

Although the numbers varied by school, faculty from every school indicated that additional time beyond the one-year extension should be available but require application with justification based on individual circumstances. Many respondents noted that at the time of the survey, the trajectory of the pandemic was unknown and, ultimately, the length of an extension should be driven by the circumstances that unfold over the next academic year. One faculty member noted that “the COVID ‘hangover’ could last for years.” Responses indicating a specific duration ranged from “one year more than enough,” to “2 or more years”, from “one year from when productivity stopped” to “3 additional years.” Eastman faculty linked the duration of the extension to the reopening of archives and opportunities and funding for performances. Similarly, Arts & Science faculty linked the duration of the tenure extension to when laboratories opened and some indicated that the duration should depend on the discipline/research area.

Some responses to both questions 1 and 2 expressed concerns that faculty, especially female faculty, with young children, may be uniquely and exceptionally disadvantaged

by childcare and home-schooling responsibilities due to school/facility closures that extended throughout the Spring, 2020 semester: “For example, parents with young kids lose way more time than folks with older kids [or no kids), and deserve more leeway”; “people juggling home-schooling and childcare with work may need more.”

However, it is important to note that a few faculty across schools noted that one unintended consequence of a tenure-clock extension is that faculty who are given this extension would be advantaged, thereby potentially widening the performance gap whether it is between genders, between those with and without children, or indiscriminately: e.g. “...it is equivalent to a parental leave policy applied to [and taken advantage of] by both non-childbearing men and childbearing women – it certainly has the potential to just raise the level of publications/research needed to get tenure.” Questions were raised as to whether extending the tenure clock was the appropriate mechanism for dealing with the academic consequences of the pandemic, and many dissenters as well as some who agreed with the tenure clock extension noted that it should not be automatic, but optional.

Q3: Should the extension be automatically given to all eligible faculty, or should a faculty member have to request an extension to receive it? Why?

This question built on the same divisions as Question 2: a high majority (an average of 80% across all schools) supported an automatic extension, and many cited equity concerns as well as some interest in efficiency/work burden. **Hajim**: “Unless there are transparent and widely agreed metrics to decide the approval/disapproval of an extension, it’s hard to have a well-informed and fair review process for the extension request.” **Eastman**: “The opt-in process will be unnecessary work for both faculty and administrators. Faculty should not be punished if, of example, stress causes them to miss a deadline. The University should want faculty to succeed.” **A&S**: “To eliminate human bias in decision making and the promotion of equity across all faculty, I’d like to ask for the automatic extension of tenure clock for all eligible faculty.”

Those who dissented from an automatic extension broke mostly into three camps: (1) those who preferred an “opt-in” extension (**Eastman**: “I’m concerned that if the extension is applied automatically, junior faculty will feel pressure to accept it even when their cases are strong enough to proceed on schedule. This would result in them spending longer than necessary at a lower salary and in a vulnerable position”); (2) those who fell into a middle camp (**SMD**: “People should request, but permission granted to everyone. That way faculty and department chairs will be aware that an extension has been granted but the rules have not otherwise been changed”); and, (3) those who advocated for more work-based discrimination inside the extension process (**A&S**: “For some, less lab-based researchers, they could potentially be more productive in this time - it seems like this should be more individual or discipline based”). A few responses compared this to parental leave—i.e. it should be requested but automatically granted.

Q4: This extension will apply to faculty who have already started their appointments. Should this extension be offered to newly appointed faculty in 2020? In 2021? Why?

The results for this question were more ambiguous than the previous results: only a 66% majority (across all schools; within schools, majority proportions ranged from 57% at Hajim to 81% at Warner) chose “2020,” “2021” or “Yes” as their answer. (It should be noted that the wording of the question itself was confusing, so that some read it as a yes/no question and others as an answer to which “2020” or “2021” was the appropriate response. We judged “Yes” to mean “yes, it should [be] applied to such new appointments” unless we deemed it to be “unclear or unsure,” which constituted a category separate from “no/they should request it.”) A number of respondents noted that they thought the UR was in a hiring freeze, and so refuted the basis for the question itself.

Among the relevant rationales that were given for the “Yes” response: **A&S**: “The extension should apply to any faculty who meet both of the following criteria: (1) accepted their appointments prior to March 2020 and (2) begin their appointments prior to the identification and widespread distribution of an effective vaccine enabling resumption of “normal” research activities”; **Warner**: “Seems like they could be encountering similar problems regardless of whether they are already here or not.”

Those who made a strong distinction between 2020 and 2021 starts included the following rationales: **Simon**: “It should apply for faculty on boarding in 2020. By 2021, we need to convert to a new normal and work within it.” Occasionally mentioned concerns about visas and related stressors for new international hires, as well as conditions for research and access (e.g., for Warner faculty, research in schools that may not have reopened). However a strong concern for equity (**SMD**: “Everyone or you create an uneven playing field”) was most prevalently voiced.

Q5: How should the extension apply to faculty eligible for other extensions, such as extensions for new parents?

This question produced responses that were most easily categorized as “yes/additive” or “no/concurrent.” Divided in this way, the “yes/additive” responses produced a high majority, with only 37 faculty across all schools arguing for “no/concurrent” extensions. (There were also significant numbers who said they didn’t know, or were unclear or unsure.) Among those arguing for additive extensions, some wrote: “Especially for new parents this situation is twice as problematic, and I believe extension terms should not be overlapping.” Also common were “we should be generous” or “we should be equitable” as well as “add them—the idea is to support junior faculty.” More extensive responses (both from **Hajim**) were: (1) “The one-year extension due to COVID-19 should apply independently from the other extensions, especially for new parents. The disruption to research and teaching of having a child is in addition to any disruption caused by COVID-19, so it’s unfair to remove the one-year extension for new parents.

To think about the issue from another angle, if a faculty member has a new child in 2022, then the impact of the parenting is in addition to the COVID-19 disruption in 2020. Even if a faculty member has a new child co-occur or shortly after the COVID-19 period, it's unfair to consider the total impact to be less than the sum of those 2 disruptions." (2) "In general, the COVID-19 extension should be used generously to assist tenure-track faculty achieve success in spite of this difficult time, especially with the drying up of funding sources through this year and likely for years to come."

One solution required some negotiation of the time-frames for both COVID extensions and parental leaves: **SMD**: "I think it totally depends on the timing of the extensions. If the time of unproductivity due to having a new child and the government shutdown is the same, then I think it is ok for them to be concurrent not consecutive. However if you have the government shutdown end in Spring 2020 and the new child in the Spring of 2021 these are two separate time periods that warrant their own extensions."

Some noted that concurrent leaves would lead to more women leaving the workplace, and several noted that these leaves produce double effects that are both injurious and positive (**SMD**: "They get double! And of course, they can also opt out. Remember, these extensions still hurt working families, because extensions delay promotion, reducing pay. Stop acting like these extensions are cost free for young scientists").

Again, the possibility that such extensions could disadvantage others, particularly over the long term (i.e., driving up productivity expectations) were raised. **SMD**: "I think that everybody needs to be offered these extensions. There needs to be a mechanism to keep faculty informed. However, I do not think that they should be automatically given because data suggest when we do this, people take an extra year even when they don't need it. There needs to be an active process of offering this and then people accepting the extensions and acknowledging that it is their responsibility to ask to come up earlier if it turns out that they don't need the extension (which will likely be the majority of faculty)."

It is absolutely urgent to note that a significant number of faculty, particularly in SMD, claimed that they were not aware of existing parental leave policies at the University, and that this survey either provided the first inkling of such a policy or allowed doubt about the policy to surface. (**Simon**: "My impression is that extensions for new parents are not really implemented anyway, so I'm not sure if any policies regarding the mix of the two extensions would create any significant impact.")

Q6: Do you think other term appointments should receive similar extensions? Why or why not? (If you hold such an appointment and wish to provide information about your specific situation, please identify the type of appointment.)

Overall, a greater number of respondents across schools replied "yes" to this than any other answer except "don't know/unsure/don't understand the question/don't know what

a term appointment is,” but the threshold of those responding “yes” did not cross 50%, and in the Warner School countable answers were evenly divided between “yes” and “no.” (This question also received far more blank answers than any other except the last.) Gradations of yes and no appeared along some lines such as “are there promotions within a term appointment?” and “it depends on whether research is counted towards promotion in these appointments” and a number of responses clarified the reasoning behind the response (equity/job precarity/the essential nature of non-tenure eligible faculty) rather than policy. For example: **Simon**: “If the appointment requires research then yes. If it requires only teaching, then I think Deans should deal with each contract individually and decide on contract extension/renewal on a case by case basis. This flexibility is especially important due to uncertainty about teaching needs due to pandemic. The goal should be preserve tenure track faculty who do research.”

Some sample “yes” responses: **Hajim**: “Yes, for fairness reasons the impacts of COVID-19 should be taken into account for all promotion decisions.” **A&S**: “Emphatically YES. For the university to be moving to give added security to a certain class of faculty, while removing security from others is highly objectionable, especially given that contract faculty now account for some 25% of the non-URMC schools and that many of them are also pursuing active scholarly careers while teaching the lion's share of our student enrollments. Contract faculty are essential to the mission of the college and should not be made to feel second class citizens. They are as deserving of professional security as the TT faculty! We must not allow the pandemic to leave privileged people more privileged and vulnerable people more vulnerable.”

And on the other side: **A&S**: “No. The role of TT research faculty is unique”; “No--their research productivity is not at the heart of the tenure case.” **Warner**: “No, but I do think that clinical/non TT faculty should be recognized in many units, including Warner, as carrying a heavier load of teaching/supervising clinical practice, which will mean greater overall increased workload, stress, and possible contact with more students than TT faculty may have”

Other answers: **ESM**: “Time for the University to rebuild to something better.” **A&S**: “I'm not sure what the question refers to. Tenure is earned by building a case of teaching, service and research over a SET period of time. This extension adds to the period. Other types of appointments (instruction track, clinical track) do not have an "up and out" trigger, so there is no "deadline" for promotion that could be extended.”

Q7: Any other comments or concerns about how the promotion regulations will be modified to grant this extension?

The majority of the comments that can be categorized into groups (outside of reiterations of previous points, “thank you,” and N/A) fall into several categories: a general sense that “generosity” or support for faculty should be forthcoming at this time; concern that “upward creep” of productivity will make tenure requirements unrealistic/inequitable; concern for gender inequity; concern for internal reviews (e.g.,

3rd year) and later-career promotions (e.g. to Full Professor); concern about how the years during which the pandemic is affecting productivity are treated by external tenure reviewers and ad hoc committees; concern for the financial risks of delaying the tenure process; and concern about the communication of any policy changes. Several commenters asked that the UCTP take these issues into hand; that the results of the survey be made public to the UR community; and that schools decide independently of one another about these issues. A number of article links were also provided and those can be found at the end of this document.

Some sample responses: **SMD**: “Invest in your faculty and support them now, and they will thank you later. We are all under tremendous stress. Having to worry about tenure and appointments is an unnecessary distraction.” **Simon**: “One concern is that tenure promotion evaluation committee may eventually take into account this extra year and set a higher bar. It would be ideal that tenure promotion criteria of those who received this extension remains the same as the usual tenure promotion criteria, but if not, any modification of criteria should be clarified and communicated in advance.” **A&S**: “It is important that any request for outside letters make clear that the extra year(s) should not be held against promotion candidates.” **Hajim**: “I think needs are going to be highly variable and faculty should not need to rely only on the kindness of their department chairs to arrange for extensions. Not all academic units will be the same - experimental labs may be quite different from humanities scholarship, for example. Perhaps the UCTP could set up a standing committee to review requests.”

Media links, with respondents’ language introducing them:

“One could view the current crisis as an opportunity to make broader and bolder changes about a possible outdated system that might actually impact the quality of research (see for example <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/04/09/covid-19-demands-reconsideration-tenure-requirements-going-forward-opinion>).”

I”m not sure how to deal with this issue, but please do try to take into account the disproportionate adverse effects that the COVID crisis seems to be having on women scholars: <https://www.nature.com/articles/>”

“Here are some ideas that the university and this committee should explore. <https://medium.com/@mkaufman99/suggestions-for-supporting-vulnerable-academics-during-the-pandemic-moms-24f7d2481433>”

“Here is the best summary of the consequences of tenure extension AND, more importantly, other things that a tenure committee can do to minimize the gender disparities that COVID will have on tenure cases. https://science.sciencemag.org/content/368/6495/1075?fbclid=IwAR3TSkcrpWbmjSnnuH-NAWkSfxPa0akwgOeNBuTwWs2S_i1YvXBml1dpH_0”

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Total number of faculty per school

ESM:	105	
Hajim:	114	
SMD:	1615	+ 4*
SON:	57	
Simon:	40	
A&S:	345	+4*
Warner:	36	
Total:	2320	

*these counts reflect faculty in central administration whose primary appointments are in the relevant schools (SMD; A&S)

APPENDIX B

Content Coding by School

Question 2: Do you believe a one-year extension will be sufficient? If not, how should the extension be handled?

Eastman (Responses N=29)

Yes, and automatic	7
Appropriate now but depending on pandemic, may be insufficient	5
One yr. sufficient with individual petitions for additional time	7
Not clear	3
Pandemic effects may influence work for 1.5 years	2
Depends on access to archives	1
May not be adequate for females with children	2
Will not be enough	1
Opening of performances/funds to support performing maybe extended	1
Should be equivalence between number disrupted semesters/extension	1
Revisit duration fall 2020	1
COVID "hangover" could last for years	1

Hajim (Responses N=26)

Yes	14
Maybe no – depends on if children and dependents home care persist	2
Extension may not be right mechanism; increases gap (with/without children	1
Extension should be decided on case by case basis	3
Two years may be more appropriate/depending on teaching demands	1
Depends on COVID trajectory	7
Beyond one year by individual application	1
Duration should depend on access to labs	2
Should allow early applications	1
Tenure requirements may need to be changed	1

Arts & Sciences (Responses N=117)

Yes	27
Yes, but...	32
Depends on COVID trajectory	24
Unclear depends of infrastructure recovery (funding libraries, publishers, teaching responsibilities)	13
Minimum that should be considered	6
Research already set back 2 years Two years with option for extension	1
Maybe not	2
Option for faculty to apply for additional time	11
Probably not sufficient	2
Extension should take into account tenure evaluations	1
Should be equivalence between number disrupted semesters/extension	3
Extension length should depend on discipline/research area	2
Extension should be individually based	2
Future extensions should be communicated asap	1
Too early to tell	2
Extension may be advantage to non-child-bearing faculty	1
Circumstances should be considered in the tenure decision	2
Adequate if research not laboratory based	1
Proposal offers nothing to associate professor promotion	1
Evaluate duration of extension Spring 2021	5
Faculty should be able to determine their own trajectory	1
Not sure extension is in order	1
More than enough, UR promotion criteria lower than peers	1
Some issues may not be resolved by extension	1
Extension should not be conceptualized as abnormal	1

SMD Responses (N=198/201)

Yes	77
Yes, but/Yes, probably...	20
One year plus	23
Depends (on trajectory of COVID, of its effects)	38
Depends: should be individual requests after one year automatic extension	9
No, not enough: should be two years or more	7
Three years	3
Should be one year plus additional years on request	5
At least one year	1
Should be done on individual request basis	2
Don't know	3
One year automatic; apply for a second year	1
No: one year is generous/too generous	2
Should be optional	1
Should be on request	1
Tenure should be abolished	1
Clock should be extended while UR doesn't pay what we are worth	1
Extension should be one year from when productivity ended	1
N/A	2

Question 3: Should the extension be automatically given to all eligible faculty, or should a faculty member have to request the extension to receive it? Why?

	YES	NO	OPT-IN	Uncl/No ans.	Outlier
ESM (N=28):	20	0	4	2	2
Hajim (N=26):	22	0	3	1	0
ASE (N=124):	100	1	11	12	1
SMD (N=201):	171	0	21	3	1
Simon (N=11):	9	0	1	1	0
Warner (N=11):	9	0	2	0	0

Question 4: This extension will apply to faculty who have already started their appointments. Should this extension be offered to newly appointed faculty in 2020? In 2021? Why?

	2020	2021	“Yes”/”Everyone”	Unclear/Unsure	No/request
ESM (N=29)	12	0	10	6	1
Hajim (N=26)	10	0	5	10	1
ASE (N=122*)	29	6	37	35	10
SMD (N=201)	54	10	73	44	22
SON (N=16)	10	0	0	6	0
Simon (N=11)	7	0	0	1	3
Warner (N=11)	8	1	0	1	1

*There were five respondents who left this answer blank. Also, a number of responses (many in “unclear/unsure”) responded by stating that they thought their school was in a hiring freeze, and hence would not have incoming faculty.

Question 5. How should the extension apply to faculty eligible for other extensions, such as extensions for new parents?

	No	Yes	Add	Roll/Concurrent	DK	Unc/NA	Outlier
ESM	0	1	13	0	8	3	5
Hajim	0	0	14	2	4	4	2*
ASE	5	5	70	6	9	21	4
SMD	0	16	108	15	16	37	9**
SON	0	0	7	1	1	4	3
Simon	0	0	3	2	2	0	4
Warner	0	0	8	1	2	0	0

*Both outliers wanted “case by case” assessment.

**Outlier answers included 5 statements that they should be additive unless the extensions are overlapping (e.g. the parental leave is in effect during COVID)