

**Report on Faculty and Staff
COVID-19 Work-Life Balance Survey
at Northern Illinois University**

**Submitted by
The Presidential Commission on the Status of Women
to
Lisa Freeman, President
July 2021**

**Contributors from the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women
Subcommittee on Research:
Dana Bardolph
Gudrun Nyunt
Jenna Osterlund Oltmanns
Andrea Radasanu
Jessica Reyman
Shannon Stoker
Patricia Wallace**

REPORT ON FACULTY AND STAFF COVID-19 WORK-LIFE BALANCE SURVEY AT NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

The Presidential Commission on the Status of Women (PCSW) sought to understand how COVID-19 is affecting the working conditions, social-emotional well-being, and work-life balance of the Northern Illinois University (NIU) community with the understanding that sharing and reflecting on these experiences can foster trust, solidarity, community, and resilience. An online survey was administered across campus with the hope of capturing a wide range of experiences.

THE SURVEY

Our survey, hosted on Qualtrics, was distributed through NIU email lists and an announcement in NIU Today. The survey was made available to participants from January 19, 2021 to February 24, 2021. The goal of this survey was to gather information from NIU employees regarding their experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic with a primary focus on how changes in the work environment affected work-life balance. Thus, the content of the survey emphasized work productivity and advancement as well as personal and social responsibilities and experiences.

We also captured respondents' perceived stress levels using an established measure, the Perceived Stress Scale (Sheldon, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983). It was anticipated that certain characteristics were likely to correlate with perceived stress in a predictable way; therefore, analyses tied to this measure occur within the other sections.

Finally, we collected information regarding respondents' perceptions of NIU's response to the pandemic as well as respondents' awareness and use of various university policies and practices as they navigated the new employment environment.

It should be noted that our inquiry does not allow us to identify definitive causes for any differences that were observed. Likewise, we have chosen to avoid speculating on the reasons for differences that were found.

Most of the sections begin with a brief introduction (with all relevant tables noted) followed by a summary of the findings. Below the summaries is more detailed content often including quotes.

THE PARTICIPANTS

When the survey was closed, 769 (**not all provided responses to every item**) respondents had completed the entire survey (see Table 1). Most of the respondents belonged to the Civil Service category (58%; vs. 48% across NIU) with Faculty (24%; vs. 36% across NIU), Instructors (6%), and Supportive Professional Staff (SPS – 12%; vs. 16% across NIU) making up the remainder.

Exactly half of the respondents (50%) had been working at NIU for 1-10 years. Only 4% were in their first year of employment, and the rest (46%) had been working at NIU for more than 10 years.

A majority (70%; vs. 54% across NIU) of the respondents identified as women, whereas 26% identified as men. Only 4% identified as non-binary, genderqueer, transgender; indicated that they preferred not to answer; or left the response blank.

Most of the respondents were white (84.3%; vs. 71% across NIU). The remaining racial ethnic identifications included Hispanic/Latino (3.8%), Asian American (3.2%), African American (2.6%), Bi-racial/Multi-racial (1%), and Native American (0.3%). A small percentage (4.6%) preferred to self-describe or not to answer.

WORK-LIFE BALANCE

Our principal focus with the survey was to address “work-life balance,” or how employees experienced a sense of balance or harmony among the demands of their careers, personal and familial commitments, and self-care. The survey solicited responses about how the conditions of the pandemic affected shifts in work-life balance, caregiving responsibilities, and perceptions of well-being and stress (see Tables 2-14).

Survey responses reflect the varied experiences individuals have had based on aspects such as dependent care and personal responsibilities, their own health and safety, their financial situation, and other contextual factors. However, it is not surprising that a majority (58%) of respondents saw a negative effect on their work-life balance during the pandemic. Those most impacted in terms of work-life balance include caregivers with dependents 2-8 years old, women, and faculty and instructors.

Summary

- 58% of respondents reported less work-life balance since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic; 16% reported no change to work-life balance; and 27% reported an increase in work-life balance.
- Caregivers with dependents 5-8 years old reported a significantly larger negative impact on work-life balance than those without dependents.
- Women with dependents reported contributing a significantly higher percentage to childcare within their household than men.
- Men with dependents reported a significantly larger negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on their career progression than men without dependents.

- All respondents with dependents reported a higher level of stress than those without dependents.
- Women with dependents reported having more stress than women without dependents, while men with dependents did not report having more stress than men without dependents.

Change in Work-Life Balance

In response to a question assessing changes in work-life balance, 58% of survey respondents reported that they were experiencing a lot less or a little less balance than normal, 16% reported no change in work-life balance, and 27% reported more work-life balance than normal.

Looking more closely at this issue of work-life balance, we analyzed the data according to employment categories and demographic categories. We noted that faculty reported a significantly larger negative impact on work-life balance than instructors, civil service, and SPS employees; however, instructors reported a significantly larger negative impact on their work-life balance than civil service employees.

In terms of gender and work-life balance during the pandemic, our survey results showed that women with dependents contributed a significantly higher percentage to childcare within their household than men. We sought information on how these changes in dependent care responsibilities affected career progression. We found that there was no statistically significant difference in participants' perception of how the COVID-19 pandemic affected the progression of their career between participants with dependents and participants without dependents; however, a difference existed when we looked at men versus women. Although no difference was found for women respondents, men with dependents reported a significantly larger negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on their career progression than men without dependents.

Caregiving Responsibilities

Our survey results showed that caregivers with dependents between the ages of 5 and 8 years old experienced more of a decrease in work-life balance compared to our whole sample of respondents. While overall the majority of respondents experienced lower work-life balance, caregivers with younger children reported more impact.

Many of our survey respondents provide caregiving for dependents. Out of all respondents, 57.9% of women and 62.3% of men reported that they actively care for dependents. When comparing men and women respondents who provide caregiving for children, we found that women contributed significantly more to childcare than men.

Respondents reported reasons for a decrease in work-life balance, with many reporting reduced access to childcare and other support services previously relied on for dependents. Notably, due to childcare center and school closings and related health concerns with arranging childcare during the public health crisis, childcare support was limited for many families:

- *“It is difficult to find safe child-care, let alone childcare that can facilitate online learning that is intensive.”*
- *“Daycare was closed for many months, still closes from time to time for quarantining.”*
- *“Because of the pandemic and our financial situation, we are not able to hire a caregiver for our children.”*
- *“I sit at my kitchen table and my children (5 and 11) are often eating lunch beside me during meetings. The 5-year-old in particular requires continual supervision during remote learning. With small groups and switching between “home room” and “specials” there is some request to deal with nearly every 15 minutes. My attention is divided to say the least.”*

In addition to limited childcare and school support, some families reported having other unique needs in caring for dependents with disabilities and for adults in their lives:

- *“Pre-COVID, personal support workers came to the home to assist with responsibilities [for child with disabilities] and school aids were provided. Now, we are without those supports while educating remotely.”*
- *“My 22-year-old moved back home after completing a BS [degree]; [it is] challenging to get a position.”*
- *“Caring for elderly relatives has increased during this time as they are no longer able to conduct daily activities such as shopping, banking, or medical appointment.”*

Stress and Well-Being

Relatedly, we asked participants about how their stress levels were affected during the pandemic. We found that there was a statistically significant difference between men and women in perceived stress, with women reporting a higher level of stress than men. Furthermore, faculty and instructors reported a statistically significant higher level of stress than other employment categories, such as civil service or SPS. Unsurprisingly, those with dependents reported a higher level of stress than those without dependents, and this effect was particularly strong for women. Our survey results showed that respondents who identified as women, faculty or instructors, or caregivers had stress levels that were most impacted as a result of the pandemic.

CAREER IMPACT

Another important goal of the survey was to document career impacts of the pandemic on NIU employees, including work productivity and advancement. The survey solicited responses about the primary mode of work during the pandemic (i.e., remote and/or on-campus work); how the pandemic has affected career progression (e.g., tenure, promotion) or career-related activities; and changes to work hours, including changes in time spent on teaching, research, artistry, and service for faculty (see Tables 15-24).

Survey responses reflect varied impacts on career progression; hours worked; and changes in time spent on teaching, research, artistry, and service due to the pandemic, with differences based on employee classification and having to care for dependents. Most respondents reported that they had a fully remote work situation (46%) or primarily remote work situation with occasional work on campus (39%) in the five months prior to the survey administration. Responses indicated that tenure track/tenured faculty and employees with young dependents (2-4 years old) were the most impacted in terms of career progression, detailed below.

Summary

- 33% of respondents indicated that the pandemic negatively impacted their career progression; 58% of respondents indicated no change to their career progression; and 8% of respondents indicated that the pandemic sped up or facilitated their career progression.
- Faculty reported the largest negative impact on career progression
- Untenured/tenure-track faculty reported a larger impact than instructors/clinical faculty, with no significant difference between untenured and tenured faculty.
- Respondents with young dependents (children 2-4 years old) reported a larger negative impact on their career progression than all others.

Changes in overall work time (SPS and Civil Service)

In order to assess impacts on time spent working during the pandemic, we asked Civil Service and SPS employees a general question about changes in overall work hours as a result of factors related to the COVID-19 pandemic (relative to a typical year). Out of all Civil Service and SPS employees, 6.2% reported working fewer hours; 63% reported working about the same (i.e., no change in hours worked); 28% reported working more hours; and 2.8% reported working overtime.

Looking more closely at these two employment categories, a higher percentage of SPS employees reported working more hours (44.4%) compared with Civil Service (24.6%), although this difference is not statistically significant. A percentage of respondents (both SPS and Civil Service) reported spending more time than usual doing all of the following since the start of the fall semester 2020: working before or after normal business hours (8 am – 4:30 pm) (66%); working on weekends (44%); responding to last minute requests from supervisors or institutional leadership (33%); altering existing protocols or processes in their unit (43%); and a general category of “other” items that they spent more time than usual doing (8%).

We received 51 written clarifiers for the “other” category; of those responses, 26% pertained to additional time spent on emails/online work; 16% to adjusting online work; and 14% to additional unit work:

- *“People assume you are available all the time”*
- *“Responding to many more e-mails from students and administrators.”*
- *“Helping students develop online learning skills; learning about multiple new technologies for remote delivery and collaboration”*
- *“Preparing new course materials for online teaching”*
- *“Lower-level functions of my position, since we have less budget to allow for student/temporary help.”*
- *“Doing work for others in my unit and taking on responsibility as other positions are cut.”*

In addition to an observed trend of increased time spent working for some employees (largely uncompensated), employees reported taking on work that fell outside of their traditional purview and/or had their normal work schedules altered since the start of fall semester 2020:

- *“It is challenging being one of the only ones in our [building] on campus and has left me a bit overwhelmed at times due to the fact that I have taken on much more in my role in addition to taking on things that aren't even in my role/job description.”*
- *“As a newer employee, the expectation not to be on campus has slowed down my opportunities to learn from my team and to build team affinity.”*
- *“The term “COVID Time” has gotten thrown around a lot, acknowledging the expectation to check emails 24/7.”*

Furthermore, employees overwhelmingly reported that they have not been receiving compensation for their extra work time (93%). Less than 7% indicated that they have received compensation for extra work time.

Changes in time spent on teaching, service, research, artistry (Faculty and Instructors)

To further assess the career impacts on faculty (both tenure-track and tenured) and instructors, we asked a set of questions about changes in time spent on teaching, research, artistry, and service. For all faculty and instructors, 72% reported an increase in time spent teaching (with 26% of respondents indicating an increase of eight hours or more per week during COVID). Unsurprisingly, 54% reported a decrease in time spent on research (with 27% of respondents reporting a decrease in research time of eight hours or more per week); and 61% reported a decrease in time spent on artistry, if applicable (with 35% of respondents indicating a decrease in artistry time of eight hours or more per week). A small percentage of respondents indicated an increase in weekly hours spent on research (18%) and artistry (12%) during the pandemic.

Relatedly, we asked faculty and instructors to indicate the degree of impact that the COVID-19 pandemic had on their ability to engage in research-related activities on a scale of -10 (negative impact) to +10 (positive impact). All respondents indicated a negative impact on traveling to

research sites, mentoring students, collaborating with other researchers, presenting research at conferences, finding grant opportunities, applying for grants, meeting publication deadlines, and receiving prompt review feedback from editors/publishers. Of these categories of research activities, the greatest negative impacts were on traveling to research sites as planned ($M=-8.0$, $SD=3.28$), followed by presenting research at conferences ($M=-6.3$, $SD=4.45$).

With respect to clinical work, a higher percentage of respondents for which that category was relevant reported an increase in hours spent each week on clinical work (48%), although the sample size was small, with only 28 responses total. Thirty percent of respondents indicated a decrease in time spent (with 15% of respondents indicating a decrease in clinical work time of eight hours or more per week). Of those 28 relevant respondents, the types of clinical activities include supervision (e.g., of practicum and internship students) (39%); teaching (e.g., face-to-face clinical teaching for graduate students) (18%); and clinical/counseling work (e.g., providing counseling/psychotherapy to students and consultation services to faculty and staff) (18%).

Respondents were asked to describe how NIU's responses and messaging about how to carry out clinical work had impacted work experiences. Although there were few responses to this question, some reported good, clear messaging from the university, whereas a few seemed less confident in NIU's responses and messages:

- *"Use of Teams Platform under HIPAA compliance has been hugely helpful. I do struggle with obtaining written information from students in a compliant way and I am working with IT on this. If Qualtrics had a BAA and was then HIPAA compliant, this would be very beneficial to my work."*
- *"Timely communication. Suggestions for training were offered. All have helped navigate supervising remotely."*

In terms of service, 30% of faculty and instructors reported an increase in time spent on service, although the majority of respondents (44%) indicated that their service loads remained about the same during the pandemic.

In terms of gender, our survey data indicate that women's time spent on teaching increased significantly more than men's, regardless of faculty rank (untenured or tenured) or position (tenure track/tenured or instructor). There was no significant difference regarding change in time spent on research, artistry, service, or clinical work between men and women. With respect to dependent care, respondents with dependents reported a larger decrease in time spent on research and clinical work than those without dependents, regardless of gender.

It is clear from the survey data that faculty and instructors have been devoting substantially more time to teaching during the pandemic, largely as a result of the transition to online teaching as well as the stripping away of support systems for men and women with dependents (54% of dependents were at home full time during the pandemic):

- *"Working in [excess] of 10-12 hour days to stay on top of messages and meetings with students. I don't feel I am being asked to do this, it is just what I do for my students."*

- *"I've spent considerable time training to teach virtually and improvising new protocols for advising students virtually and doing other mentoring. Research is basically non-existent right now."*
- *"I have had to work what I call is the "3rd shift" in order to have the quiet time I need to focus on higher level tasks like research planning, writing, course development, etc."*

REMOTE WORK

Over the course of the pandemic, NIU became largely a remote campus. While much about the experience of balancing work and home during the pandemic was stressful, the survey respondents evinced preference for retaining some of the flexibility of remote work post-pandemic (see Tables 25-49).

Summary

- 60% of respondents preferred a mix of remote and in-person (hybrid) work post-pandemic, while 26% preferred remote, and 13% preferred in-person.
- A marked preference for a hybrid work experience was prevalent across genders, ethnicities, and categories of employment – although civil service employees were more enthusiastic than others about remote work.
- Preference for remote work was lower among employees who think their jobs require “presence on campus or some other in-person location.”
- Costs associated with remote work did not affect the preference for remote work.
- Those who preferred to continue working remotely had a significantly higher level of concern for their health and safety than those who preferred a hybrid model or those who preferred in-person work.

Remote work preferences were affected by whether the employee thought their job could be done as well remotely or not. Half the people who said that their job “requires presence on campus or some other in-person location” didn’t want to see remote work continue after the pandemic -but even among this group 37% preferred a mix. And among those who thought their job could be done equally well remotely or in person, 47% still preferred a mix of in person and remote working conditions. So, even those who could work entirely remotely preferred some in-person components, and those whose work required an on-campus presence still wanted the flexibility of hybrid work.

Those who preferred to continue working remotely had a significantly higher level of concern for their health and safety than those who preferred a mix of remote and in-person or those who preferred in-person work only. Likewise, those who preferred a mix of remote and in-person work had a significantly higher level of concern for their health and safety than those who preferred in-person work.

Many people opted to share their opinions to the open-ended question regarding whether they “prefer to continue to work remotely even after the pandemic is resolved.” Of the 1021 total statements, 617 were positive and 404 were negative.

The positive statements, making up about 60% of responses, converged around three main themes:

- More productive/ fewer interruptions (29%)
- Time and money savings (20%)
- More Flexibility (17%)

Many of the qualitative responses reflected the positive themes:

- “I am able to get a lot more work done remotely than I am at the office.”
- “I appreciate the reduction of distractions when working remotely, and I believe I am more productive.”
- “I enjoy the flexibility and that I do not have to spend gas/time commuting to NIU.”

The most common negative comments about remote work, which comprised about 40% of the remote work comments, also revolved around three themes:

- Less feasible for some positions (30%)
- Fewer social interactions (23%)
- Bad for learning/teaching (17%)

Other responses reflected the negative themes:

- “My role involves advising students. While I do conduct...Team meetings, they aren’t as effective as the ‘stealth’ advising I do via casual conversations, organic brainstorming and relationship-building.”
- “The ‘social’ aspect is still missing during the remote work since TEAMS does not fulfill that void. My employees are more engaged in conversations when in person and we are able to troubleshoot issues more effectively in a room with a whiteboard and no remote interferences (e.g., dropped internet, microphone issues, etc.).
- “It’s an inferior mode of teaching and learning – necessary for emergency but to be ended as soon as possible.”

The survey also queried respondents on challenges they have experienced in their transition to working remotely and posed questions aimed at understanding what made remote work successful or unsuccessful. When asked to describe “any difficulties you’ve experienced related to expectations about being on campus or not being on campus,” 262 respondents offered comments resulting in five common themes:

- No choice/ had to be on campus (13%)
- Tech issues (13%)
- Access to resources like offices, mail, and equipment (12%)
- Safety (12%)

- Poor/slow communication (10%)

The rationale behind the negative responses reflected reasons from technology to safety:

- “Little things that build up. There are only about 2 of us from our division regularly in the office, so we become responsible for all of the mail, restarting everyone’s computers, etc.”
- “My only difficulty is my computer on campus does not have a microphone or camera, so I cannot do Teams meetings.”
- “My work laptop crashed three times in the fall semester. Internet in the community has been dicey.”
- “Worried that others on campus are not as careful, putting me and my family at risk.”

With safety as one of the themes identified as a concern with being on campus, it is important to consider the likelihood that employees will support protective measures. Respondents were asked how likely they were to agree to receive the vaccine if it was offered to them ranging from 0 to 100% likely. The average score was an 88.8% (SD=24.1) suggesting that NIU employees are comfortable with receiving a vaccine.

Finally, when asked to rate several items with respect to their importance in the remote work arena, 43% of the 104 responses focused on tech-related resources, while 31% spoke to the importance of communication and guidance, and 13% of them specified schedule flexibility. Examples of the kinds of resources respondents mentioned in the open-ended follow up question are access to printers, scanners, software, tech assistance and support, and guidance and communication regarding process changes. When asked about difficulty in accessing resources, 40 respondents provided feedback, 41% of which focused on hardware (printers, laptops, phones) and 25% of which mentioned software like Microsoft and Zoom.

NIU’S RESPONSE

There was some interest in expanding the survey to identify how well NIU responded to the abrupt shift to remote work and beyond. Respondents were presented with several sets of questions that assessed their perceptions of the university response and the usefulness of university policies and provisions during the pandemic (see Tables 50-54). The data provide an idea of respondents’ perceptions of the NIU response, which may be important in identifying areas where stronger communications were conveyed and where improvements could benefit the university.

Summary

- Of the items provided to the respondents, Supervisor Flexibility was rated the highest (M=6.2) in terms of actions taken by the university

- The greatest number of respondents indicated awareness of the Work-from-home Policy (63.4%) and Sick Leave Benefits (52.6%)
- The Flex Time Availability provision was used the most (19.0%) and is the option most anticipated to be used in the future (22.4%)
- Greatest satisfaction was reported with Supervisor Flexibility (M=7.2) and NIU's Protecting the Pack website (M=5.5)
- Least satisfaction was reported with the NIU COVID-19 Concerns Form (M=2.1), NIU Human Resources (M=2.5), and Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity, and Education (M=2.6)

Several questions asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement (1=Strongly Disagree; 4=neutral; 7=Strongly Agree) with a series of statements related to NIU's response to the pandemic. The first set represented more general questions about perceptions of the NIU response. The item about health endangerment in this set required reverse scoring. Overall, people responded positively to the items with the greatest endorsements for the supervisor's flexibility regarding work arrangements.

A separate set of questions was provided that assessed respondents' awareness and use of NIU policies and provisions. Specific focus was given to those policies and provisions that would be especially useful to employees during the pandemic (e.g., sick leave policy). Respondents were given a list of policies and provisions and asked to select all that applied. Although there was a range of levels of awareness of the policies and provisions in existence at the university (Total endorsements=2122; this number surpasses the number of respondents because each respondent could have indicated familiarity with more than one policy/provision), very few respondents endorsed having used them during the pandemic (N=338) or expecting to use them in the future (N=423). The Sick Leave and Flex Time policies received the most endorsements. It should be noted that a few items were only relevant to certain groups of respondents. The Extension of the Tenure Clock Policy would apply most to untenured tenure-track faculty. Not surprisingly, most (88%) indicated awareness of the policy, although it should be noted that fewer reported having used the policy (12%) or were considering using it in the future (34%).

Likewise, the provision allowing for the waiver of the use of student evaluations in performance reviews was only available to tenured and tenure-track faculty (see Table 57 for a breakdown). Although the provision does not apply to instructors, there are alternative provisions for instructors covered under the University Professionals of Illinois (UPI) contract. It's possible that those individuals had the UPI contract in mind when answering this question.

In an attempt to drill deeper into policy impacts, respondents were asked an open-ended question in which they reported any existing NIU policies that made it harder for them to accommodate work-life balance during the pandemic. Only 119 respondents provided feedback on this, and very little of the content was focused on existing policies. The most common responses provided (31%) identified scheduling issues as interfering with work-like balance, with technology issues and a lack of flexibility being second most common (13% each).

Respondents shared many unique issues experienced while working from home during the pandemic:

- *No specific policies, just the implicit pressure when coworkers send emails at unconventional hours.*
- *The lack of a uniform electronic signature policy and the software for such has been particularly frustrating. Not everyone has the capability to create validated electronic signatures, and there needs to be training on how to use software for signatures.*
- *Understanding how to be as fair as possible in managing staffing challenges due to staff who need to work outside of normal business hours. Also, how to balance workload with significantly reduced staffing.*

Respondents were also asked about their satisfaction (-10=very dissatisfied; +10=very satisfied) with various policy-related resources at NIU. The resource list was comprised of those items that were thought to matter most to employees during the pandemic (e.g., Training for working remotely). All items had means in the positive range (but with high variability). Respondents indicated the greatest satisfaction with supervisor flexibility (M=7.2) with the Protecting the Pack website (M=5.5), Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning (CITL)'s Remote Teaching website (M=4.9), and CITL's workshops for online teaching (M=4.9) close behind. The urgency in abruptly transitioning to online teaching very likely made these resources popular.

In an open-ended question, respondents were asked to report any lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic that could inform the future use of policies and practices for remote work or for work-life balance. This was an opportunity for everyone to sum up policies and practices that were the most or least effective within a remote work experience. Many respondents (N=423) provided input. The majority (41%) indicated that they learned that flexibility is critical to both when and where work occurs. Investment in technology (with an emphasis on paperless processes) and the benefits of a general re-evaluation of work processes received the next highest endorsements (19% and 16%, respectively).

There were common themes identified as lessons learned:

- *I have become more productive working remotely and I believe increases the options to work remote going forward will not have as many negative consequences as typically stereotyped by administrators and managers.*
- *Going truly paperless with forms, etc. will be very beneficial - paperless practices provide speedy processes for students and staff alike.*
- *The need for an individualized work plan for each employee that ensures equity for all.*

In a final open-ended item, respondents were given the opportunity to provide suggestions for NIU to improve support to faculty and staff during the COVID-19 pandemic. Many provided feedback on this item (N=440). The majority of the responses (18%) were related to human resource issues (e.g., worktime flexibility, use of benefits), but other common topics were related to technology issues (e.g., the need for electronic signatures) and the importance of clear communication practices (17% and 14%, respectively).

The feedback on this item varied:

- *Require flex hours for staff who are working weekly after normal hours OR pay staff overtime or additional pay for salary employees.*
- *More paid time off (regardless of COVID-19 symptoms, illness, caretaking). More paid time off for new parents. I feel stressed and overworked. Several extra help positions were laid off and we were not allowed to refill/rehire them. I have had to take on more work.*
- *Continue to give regular reminders about support services, even when we are transitioning to being back in-person. Different supports are needed by different people at different times so the receptivity to it varies.*

CONCLUSION

The Covid-19 pandemic affected faculty and staff in multiple ways.

- Work-life-balance was negatively impacted for many, but particularly women with dependents and caregivers with children aged 2-8.
- Employees from all categories with young dependents aged 2-4 saw a negative impact on their career progression.
- Faculty and instructors experienced decreases in time spent on research, artistry, and clinical work, with concomitant increases in time spent on teaching and service (with women spending significantly more time on service compared to men).

Not all results of the survey were negative, however.

- Remote work became a requirement, and employees across all classifications reported a preference for some continuation of this via a hybrid working model.
- There was also a clear approval of NIU's response to the pandemic, particularly regarding supervisor flexibility and the Protecting the Pack website.

As the campus adapts to the post pandemic world, the PCSW hopes that reflecting on these experiences will foster trust, solidarity, community, and resilience.

APPENDICES

Table 1: Participant Demographics

	N	%
Full-Time vs. Part-Time		
Full-Time	725	94.3
Part-Time	33	4.3
Other	11	1.4
Employment Category		
Civil Service	444	57.8
Faculty	189	24.6
Instructor	44	5.7
SPS	91	11.8
Time at NIU		
Less than a year	34	4.4
1-5	198	25.6
6-10	182	23.6
22-15	124	16.1
16-20	87	11.3
More than 20 years	147	19
Faculty Status (Total: 233)		
Instructor	36	15.5
Lecturer/Adjunct Professor	3	1.3
Clinical Faculty	11	4.7
Untenured tenure-track	41	17.6
Associate Professor	69	29.6
Full Professor	62	26.6
Other	11	4.7
Gender		
Man	175	25.3
Woman	485	70.2
Genderqueer/Gender Non-Conforming	1	0.1
Non-Binary	5	0.7
Transgender Man	1	0.1
Transgender Woman	0	0
Prefer to self-describe	2	0.3
Prefer not to answer	22	3.2
Race/Ethnicity*		
White	596	73.2
Black	18	2.2
Hispanic/Latino	26	3.2
Asian	23	2.8
Native American	3	0.4
Bi-racial/Multi-racial	8	1.0

*This question was “select all that apply” – thus, individuals may have selected more than one category.

Table 2: Indicate the degree of shift in your work-life balance (ability to balance career, personal or family commitments, and self-care) since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic.

	N	%
A lot less balance than normal	193	27.8
A little less balance than normal	209	30.1
No Change	108	15.6
A little more balance than normal	111	16.0
A lot more balance than normal	73	10.5

Table 2 a: Shift in work-life balance by caregiving responsibilities: There was a statistically significant difference between group means for caregivers with children 5-8 compared to all others as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,692)}=15.589$, $p<.001$).

	M	SD
Children 0-1	2.91	1.323
Children 2-4	2.30	1.421
Children 5-8	2.00	1.288
Children 9-12	2.37	1.410
Children 13-17	2.63	1.405

Table 2 b: Shift in work-life balance by employment category: There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,687)}=27.691$, $p<.001$). Post-Hoc analysis using Tukey indicated that faculty reported significantly less work-life balance than civil service and SPS. Instructors reported significantly less work-life balance than civil service.

	M	SD
Faculty	1.85	1.064
Instructor	2.03	1.028
Civil Service	2.85	1.320
SPS	2.51	1.399
Total	2.51	1.326

Table 3: Indicate what percent you normally contribute to each of the following within your household (0-100%):

	M	SD
Financial support	69.6	25.81
Household chores	72.4	22.89
Childcare	52.5	32.19
Other	62.2	37.95

Table 3a: Differences in contributions to childcare by gender (men, women): There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,313)}=25.830$, $p<.001$).

	M	SD
Men	38.99	24.071
Women	58.43	33.090
Total	52.81	31.962

Table 4: Dependents respondents actively care for:

	N	%
Children 0-1 years	47	5.8
Children 2-4 years	63	7.7
Children 5-8 years	89	10.9
Children 9-12 years	98	12.0
Children 13-17 years	109	13.4
Children 18 or older	103	12.7
Elderly relatives	109	13.4
Other	46	5.7
No dependent caregiver responsibilities	225	27.6

Table 5: Dependents with special needs:

	N	%
Yes	80	19.4
No	333	80.6

Table 6: Select all that apply regarding the children that you care for:

	N	%
At home full time	161	54.2
In school and/or daycare part-time	92	31.0
In school and/or daycare 100%	73	24.6

Table 7: How has COVID-19 changed your caregiving responsibilities?

	N	%
COVID-19 has increased my caregiving responsibilities.	272	68.3
COVID-19 has decreased my caregiving responsibilities.	4	1.0
There has been no change in my caregiving responsibilities.	122	30.7

Table 8: Perceived Stress by Gender (Man/Woman): There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,629)}=15.883$, $p<.001$).

	M	SD
Man	27.43	5.316
Woman	29.49	5.863
Total	28.95	5.792

Table 9: Perceived Stress by Employment Category: There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(3,657)}=6.317$, $p<.001$). Post-Hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD indicated that faculty experienced significantly more stress than Civil Service employees.

	M	SD
Faculty	30.44	5.421
Instructor	30.60	6.432
Civil Service	28.28	5.825

SPS	28.92	5.895
Total	29.02	5.838

Table 10a: Perceived Stress by Dependents (Yes/No): There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,661)}=6.984$, $p=.008$).

	M	SD
Dependents	28.31	5.861
No dependents	29.52	5.761
Total	29.01	5.829

Table 10b: Perceived Stress of Women by Dependents (Yes/No): There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,463)}=10.989$, $p=.001$).

	M	SD
Women with Dependents	30.25	5.637
Women with no Dependents	28.44	6.020
Total	29.49	5.863

Table 11: Indicate the degree of impact that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on various aspects of your well-being (-10 to +10):

	M	SD
Physical well-being (maintaining healthy habits)	-2.3	4.93
Social well-being (maintaining connections)	-4.4	3.67
Emotional well-being (healthy coping strategies)	-3.2	4.21
Intellectual well-being (maintaining mental stimulation)	-1.2	4.39
Vocational well-being (engaging in personally satisfying work)	-1.3	4.70
Spiritual well-being (maintain self-purpose and harmony)	-1.2	4.72

Financial well-being (satisfactory financial management)	-0.4	4.61
Environmental well-being (expressing a respect for nature)	2.5	4.15

Table 12: Experiences during COVID-19:

	N	%
You contracted the virus.	38	4.7
A family member living with you contracted the virus.	50	6.1
A family member not living with you contracted the virus.	313	38.5
You had to quarantine due to exposure.	161	19.8
Someone close to you has died as a result of contracting the virus.	79	9.7
None of these.	271	33.3

Table 13: Rate your level of agreement with the following statements (-2 to +2):

	M	SD	% who agree or strongly agree
I am concerned about my own health and safety during the pandemic.	1.3	0.86	87.8
I am in an at-risk category for COVID-19	0.5	1.28	52.3
I am concerned about my family member's health and safety	1.6	0.74	94.3
I am concerned about my job security as a result of the pandemic.	0.8	1.08	66.8
I think a vaccine for COVID-19 is important to ending the pandemic.	1.6	0.81	87.5
The COVID-19 virus poses a serious public health risk.	1.7	0.64	95.1
I think the use of masks and social distancing are important to preventing the spread of the virus.	1.8	0.60	96.0
I am concerned about my domestic safety during the pandemic.	-0.4	1.39	25.5
I am concerned about the effects of social isolation on my well-being during the pandemic.	0.6	1.08	63.3

I am concerned about the effects of social isolation on the well-being of family and friends during the pandemic.	1.2	0.89	84.4
---	-----	------	------

Table 14: Indicate how often you recall experiencing the following over the course of the pandemic (Scale: 1-Never, 2- Almost never, 3- sometimes, 4- fairly often, 5- very often):

	M	SD
Felt upset because of something that happened unexpectedly	3.07	0.951
Felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life	3.08	1.072
Felt nervous and “stressed”	3.53	1.037
Felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems	3.72	0.879
Felt things were going your way	3.16	0.810
Felt that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do	2.81	1.108
Felt unable to control irritations in your life	2.80	1.059
Felt that you were on top of things	3.26	0.964
Felt angered because of things that were outside of your control	2.89	1.086
Felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them	2.54	1.133

Table 15: What has your work situation been in the past 5 months?

	N	%
Remote work only	352	45.6
Primarily remote work; occasionally on campus	301	39
Primarily on campus; occasionally work remotely	74	9.6
On campus work only	45	5.8

Table 16: How do you think the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the progression of your career (e.g., tenure, promotion) or career-related activities?

	N	%
Impaired progression/ obstructed activities	248	33.4

No change	433	58.4
Sped up progression/ facilitated activities	61	8.2
Total	742	100

Table 16a: Change in career progression by employment category: There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(5,219)}=4.149$, $p=.001$). Post-hoc analysis using Tukey HSD indicated that faculty experienced a significantly greater impact on their career progression than all other employment categories.

	M	SD
Faculty	1.43	0.548
Instructor	1.79	0.704
Civil Service	1.86	0.538
SPS	1.84	0.672
Total	1.75	0.596

Table 16b: Change in career progression by faculty status: There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(3,733)}=25.857$, $p<.001$). Post-hoc analysis using Tukey HSD indicated that untenured tenure-track faculty experienced a greater negative impact on their career progression than instructors and clinical faculty.

	M	SD
Instructor	1.73	0.674
Untenured tenure-track	1.27	0.452
Clinical faculty	1.91	0.701
Associate Professor	1.38	0.490
Full Professor	1.53	0.593
Other	1.64	0.809
Total	1.49	0.591

Table 16c: Change in career progression by gender/dependent care: There was a statistically significant difference between group means for men with dependents compared to men without dependents as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,172)}=5.249$, $p=.023$).

	M	SD
Men with Dependents	1.71	0.549
Men with no Dependents	1.91	0.579
Total	1.78	0.567

--	--	--

Table 16d: Change in career progression by gender/dependent care: There was a statistically significant difference between group means for those with dependents 2-4 compared to all others as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,740)}=7.695, p=.006$).

	M	SD
Children 0-1	1.66	0.668
Children 2-4	1.55	0.645
Children 5-8	1.65	0.641
Children 9-12	1.67	0.622
Children 13-17	1.74	0.594

Table 17: Change in Work-Hours (Civil Service and SPS)

	Civil Service		SPS	
	N	%	N	%
Working fewer hours	27	6.1	6	6.7
About the same	297	67.0	39	43.3
Working more hours	109	24.6	40	44.4
Working over time	10	2.3	5	5.6
TOTAL	443	100%	90	100%

Table 18: Select those items on which you have been spending more time than usual doing since the start of fall semester 2020 (select all that apply).

	N	%
Working before or after normal business hours (8-4:30)	507	66.3%
Working on weekends	339	44.3%
Responding to last minute requests from my supervisor or institutional leadership	252	32.9%
Altering existing protocols or processes in my unit	327	42.7%
Other	62	8.1%

Table 19: Change in average time spent on **TEACHING** per week during COVID

	N	%
Decreased by 8 or more hrs	8	3.2
Decreased by 4-7 hrs	2	0.8
Decreased by 1-3 hrs	5	2.0

About the same	56	22.3
Increased by 1-3 hrs	52	20.7
Increased by 4-7 hrs	62	24.7
Increased by 8 or more hrs	66	26.3
TOTAL	251	100

Table 19a: Change in average time spent on TEACHING per week by gender: There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,222)}=14.405$, $p<.001$).

	M	SD
Men	4.92	1.544
Women	5.64	1.241
Total	5.39	1.394

Table 20: Change in average time spent on RESEARCH per week during COVID

	N	%
Decreased by 8 or more hrs	56	26.9
Decreased by 4-7 hrs	34	16.3
Decreased by 1-3 hrs	25	12.0
About the same	56	26.9
Increased by 1-3 hrs	19	9.1
Increased by 4-7 hrs	10	4.8
Increased by 8 or more hrs	8	3.8
TOTAL	208	100

Table 20a: Change in average time spent on RESEARCH per week by caregiving responsibilities: There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,206)}=4.452$, $p=.036$).

	M	SD
Dependents	2.85	1.726
No Dependents	3.36	1.655
Total	3.05	1.713

Table 21: Indicate the degree of impact that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on your ability to engage in each activity (scale -10 to +10).

	M	SD
Traveling to research sites as planned	-8.0	3.28
Mentoring students	-3.3	3.69
Collaborating with other researchers	-3.0	4.44
Presenting research at conferences	-6.3	4.45
Finding grant opportunities	-3.2	4.08
Applying for grant funding	-2.8	4.25
Meeting publication deadlines	-4.0	4.71
Receiving prompt review from editors/publishers	-4.2	4.52

Table 22: Change in average time spent on **ARTISTRY** per week during COVID

	N	%
Decreased by 8 or more hrs	15	35.7
Decreased by 4-7 hrs	3	7.1
Decreased by 1-3 hrs	8	19.0
About the same	11	26.2
Increased by 1-3 hrs	3	7.1
Increased by 4-7 hrs	1	2.4
Increased by 8 or more hrs	1	2.4
TOTAL	42	100

Table 23: Change in average time spent on **CLINICAL WORK** per week during COVID

	N	%
Decreased by 8 or more hrs	4	14.8
Decreased by 4-7 hrs	1	3.7
Decreased by 1-3 hrs	3	11.1
About the same	6	22.2
Increased by 1-3 hrs	5	18.5
Increased by 4-7 hrs	6	22.2
Increased by 8 or more hrs	2	7.4
TOTAL	27	100

Table 23a: Change in average time spent on CLINICAL WORK per week by caregiving responsibilities: There was a statistically significant difference between group means as determined by a one-way ANOVA ($F_{(1,25)}=4.490$, $p=.044$).

	M	SD
Dependents	3.72	1.965

No Dependents	5.22	1.093
Total	4.22	1.847

Table 24: Change in average time spent on **SERVICE** per week during COVID

	N	%
Decreased by 8 or more hrs	41	10.2
Decreased by 4-7 hrs	17	4.2
Decreased by 1-3 hrs	42	10.4
About the same	178	44.3
Increased by 1-3 hrs	50	12.4
Increased by 4-7 hrs	45	11.2
Increased by 8 or more hrs	29	7.2
TOTAL	402	100

Table 25: Preference for working remotely * Category of Employment

	Faculty		Instructor		Civil Service		SPS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	20	10.8%	8	21.1%	135	34.5%	19	22.4%
No	40	21.6%	8	21.1%	33	8.4%	10	11.8%
Other	4	2.2%	1	2.6%	7	1.8%	2	2.4%
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	121	65.4%	21	55.3%	216	55.2%	54	63.5%
TOTAL	185	100%	38	100%	391	100%	85	100%

Table 26: Preference for working remotely * Employment

	Full-time		Part-time		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	173	25.9%	8	27.6%	1	16.7%
No	85	12.7%	6	20.7%	0	0
Other	14	2.1%	0	0	0	0
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	395	59.2%	15	51.7%	5	83.3%
TOTAL	667	100%	29	100%	6	100%

Table 27: Preference for working remotely * Time at NIU

	Less than a year	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	More than 20 years

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	3	10.7	59	32.4	46	27.5	22	19.8	22	27.2	30	22.4
No	1	3.6	11	6.0	25	15.0	16	14.4	12	14.8	26	67.9
Other	1	3.6	4	2.2	1	0.6	1	0.9	3	3.7	4	3.0
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	23	82.1	108	59.3	95	56.9	72	64.9	44	54.3	74	55.2
TOTAL	28	100	182	100	167	100	111	100	81	100	134	100

Table 28: Preference for working remotely * Gender

	Man		Woman		Transgender Man/Woman, Gender Non-Conforming, Genderqueer, Non-binary	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	42	26.8%	118	25.2%	9	31.0%
No	24	15.3%	58	12.4%	3	10.3%
Other	3	1.9%	9	1.9%	0	0
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	88	56.1%	284	60.6%	17	58.6%
TOTAL	157	100%	469	100%	29	100%

Table 29: Preference for working remotely * Race/Ethnicity

	White		Black		Hispanic/Latino		Asian		Native American		Bi-/Multi-racial	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	139	24.6	6	33.3	12	46.2	5	23.8	2	66.7	2	28.6
No	75	13.3	2	11.1	0	0	5	23.8	0	0	3	42.9
Other	10	1.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	341	60.4	10	55.6	14	53.8	11	52.4	1	33.3	2	28.6
TOTAL	565	100	18	100	26	100	21	100	3	100	7	100

Table 30: Preference for working remotely * Change in Work Hours During COVID

	Fewer hours		About the same		More hours		Overtime	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	2	8.3	87	29.8	60	42.0	5	33.3
No	4	16.7	31	10.6	8	5.6	0	0
Other	0	0	4	1.4	3	2.1	1	6.7
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	18	75	170	58.2	72	50.3	9	60
TOTAL	24	100	292	100	143	100	15	100

Table 31: Preference for working remotely * Nature of Work

	Can be carried out equally well on campus or remotely		Can be done remotely but not as effectively as on campus		Can be done effectively remotely but some parts are negatively impacted		Requires presence on campus or some other in-person location	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	155	50.8	14	9.9	11	4.8	2	7.4
No	5	1.6	32	22.6	41	17.7	13	48.1
Other	1	0.3	3	2.1	8	3.5	2	7.4
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	144	47.2	92	65.2	171	74.0	10	37.0
TOTAL	305	100	141	100	231	100	27	100

Table 32: Preference for Remote Work * Financial Cost due to Caregiving Responsibilities during COVID

	\$0		\$1		\$80		\$160		\$320	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	27	30.7	5	16.1	0	0	0	0	1	25
No	12	13.6	6	19.4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	48	54.5	20	64.5	2	100	5	100	2	50
TOTAL	88	100	31	100	2	100	5	100	4	100

Table 33: Preference for Remote Work * Financial Cost due to Caregiving Responsibilities during COVID...CONTINUED

	\$400		\$480		\$560		\$640		\$720		\$800	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	1	25	0	0	1	25	1	100	1	100	4	40
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	20
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	3	75	2	100	3	75	0	0	0	0	3	30
TOTAL	4	100	2	100	4	100	1	100	1	100	10	100

Table 34: Preference for Remote Work * Financial Cost – Tutor for Child during COVID

	\$0		\$1		\$80		\$160		\$240	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	24	34.3	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	0	0
No	13	18.6	2	22.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	1	1.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	32	45.7	7	77.8	1	100	2	66.7	1	100
TOTAL	70	100	9	100	1	100	3	100	1	100

Table 35: Preference for Remote Work * Financial Cost – Tutor for Child during COVID...CONTINUED

	\$480		\$560		\$640		\$720		\$800	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prefer mix of remote and in-person	1	100	1	100	1	100	0	0	1	100
TOTAL	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	2	100

Table 36: Difference in concerns related to health and safety if asked to work on campus in the Spring by preference for remote work:

Preference for Remote Work	Concern about health and safety if asked to return to on-campus work in the Spring	
	M (Scale 1-100)	SD
Yes (n=177)	82.75	24.37
No (n=89)	51.76	34.96
Other (n=13)	63.62	42.13
I would prefer a mix of remote and in-person work (n=392)	68.27	29.58

Table 37: Cost of remote work

Category	M	SD
Technology resources needed for at home work	\$142.45	225.14
Work-at-home setup	\$119.19	197.01
Caregiving responsibilities	\$112.71	238.69
Unpaid time off	\$67.35	197.01
Tutor for child	\$62.23	178.33
Other	\$162.25	280.71

Table 38: Indicate the estimated amount of financial costs you incurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic for any of the following areas (amount indicates dollars). – **Technology resources needed for remote work**

M=\$142.45 (SD=225.14)

\$ Amount	N	%
.00	207	40.9
1.00	80	15.8
80.00	46	9.1
160.00	43	8.5
240.00	28	5.5
320.00	23	4.5
400.00	21	4.2
480.00	10	2.0
560.00	13	2.6
640.00	5	.0
720.00	4	0.8
800.00	26	5.1
Total	506	100

Table 39: Indicate the estimated amount of financial costs you incurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic for any of the following areas (amount indicates dollars). – **Unpaid time off**

M=\$67.35 (SD=197.01)

\$ Amount	N	%
.00	70	79.5
1.00	7	8.0
80.00	0	0
160.00	1	1.1
240.00	2	2.3
320.00	0	0
400.00	1	1.1
480.00	0	0

560.00	2	2.3
640.00	1	1.1
720.00	1	1.1
800.00	3	3.4
Total	88	100

Table 40: Indicate the estimated amount of financial costs you incurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic for any of the following areas (amount indicates dollars). – **Work-at-home set-up**

M=\$119.19 (SD=197.01)

\$ Amount	N	%
.00	200	43.0
1.00	63	13.5
80.00	54	11.6
160.00	44	9.5
240.00	42	9.0
320.00	15	3.2
400.00	10	2.2
480.00	4	0.9
560.00	8	1.7
640.00	8	1.7
720.00	0	0
800.00	17	3.7
Total	465	100

Table 41: Indicate the estimated amount of financial costs you incurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic for any of the following areas (amount indicates dollars). - **Caregiving responsibilities**

M=\$112.71 (SD=238.69)

\$ Amount	N	%
.00	90	56.3
1.00	34	21.3
80.00	2	1.3
160.00	5	3.1
240.00	0	0
320.00	4	2.5
400.00	4	2.5
480.00	3	1.9
560.00	6	3.8
640.00	1	.6
720.00	1	.6
800.00	10	6.3
Total	160	100.0

Table 42: Indicate the estimated amount of financial costs you incurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic for any of the following areas (amount indicates dollars). – **Tutor for Child**

M=\$62.23 (SD=178.33)

\$ Amount	N	%
.00	70	74.5
1.00	10	10.6
80.00	1	1.1
160.00	3	3.2
240.00	3	3.2
320.00	0	0
400.00	0	0
480.00	1	1.1
560.00	2	2.1
640.00	1	1.1
720.00	1	1.1
800.00	2	2.1
Total	94	100

Table 43: Indicate the estimated amount of financial costs you incurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic for any of the following areas (amount indicates dollars). – **Other**

M=\$162.25 (SD=280.71)

\$ Amount	N	%
.00	40	52.6
1.00	11	14.5
80.00	4	5.3
160.00	0	0
240.00	3	3.9
320.00	3	3.9
400.00	2	2.6
480.00	0	0
560.00	2	2.6
640.00	2	2.6
720.00	1	1.3
800.00	8	10.5
Total	76	100

Table 44: Nature of Work * Category of Employment

	Faculty		Instructor		Civil Service		SPS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The work can be carried out equally well on campus or remotely.	35	18.5	16	36.4	228	51.5	39	42.9
The work can be done remotely, but it's not done as effectively as on campus.	62	32.8	13	29.5	52	11.7	16	17.6
Parts of the work can be done effectively remotely, but some parts are negatively impacted from remote work.	84	44.4	13	29.5	114	25.7	31	34.1
The work requires my present on campus or some other in-person location.	8	4.2	2	4.5	49	11.1	5	5.5
TOTAL	189	100%	44	100%	443	100%	91	100%

Table 45: If you were asked to work on campus this spring, indicate the degree of concern you would have about the following health and safety issues (1-100):

	M	SD
Concern about my own health and safety	69.9	30.80
Concern about the health and safety of loved ones that I see frequently	77.2	29.26
Concern about virus spread on campus	75.5	28.32
Concern about virus spread in the community	74.6	27.93

Table 46: Based on your observations when working on campus, indicate what portion of the campus community adheres to NIU's Coronavirus guidelines:

	N	%
None	2	0.5
A few	8	2.0
Some	50	12.3
Most	221	54.6
All	89	22.0
Haven't Noticed	35	8.6

Table 47: Resources

Satisfaction with resources (-10 to +10)	M	SD
NIU Employee Assistance Program	4.3	5.23
Flexibility provided by my supervisor	7.2	4.22
NIU's Protecting the Pack Website	5.5	4.36
Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning's Remote Teaching Resources Website	4.9	4.49
Center for Teaching and Learning's workshops for online teaching	4.9	4.79
Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity and Education	2.6	4.66
NIU Human Resources	2.5	5.91
NIU COVID-19 Concerns form	2.1	4.93
Training for working remotely (if any provided)	3.2	4.60
Training for returning to work (if any provided)	3.4	4.56

Table 48: In the move to remote work, rate how important each of the following items has been for you to perform your work (scale 1-10):

	Technology	Work Space	Training for Remote Work	Other
Mean	M=9.7 (SD=1.12)	M=7.6 (SD=2.57)	M=4.3 (SD=3.28)	M=5.8 (SD=4.16)

Table 49: In the move to remote work, rate how difficult each of the following items has been for you to access (scale 1-10):

	Technology	Work Space	Training for Remote Work	Other
Mean	M=3.7 (SD=2.90)	M=3.9 (SD=3.08)	M=2.8 (SD=2.70)	M=4.7 (SD=4.01)

Table 50: Indicate your level of agreement (from 1 - strongly disagree to 7 - strongly agree) with each statement below.

	M	SD
I feel confident in NIU's leadership to effectively manage the pandemic.	5.73	1.380
I feel confident in my department's leadership to effectively manage the pandemic.	5.70	1.605
My work responsibilities endanger my and my family's health during the pandemic.	2.63	1.762
I have been able to balance my personal and work commitments effectively during the pandemic.	4.72	2.006
I worry about job security due to the pandemic.	4.41	1.993
My supervisor has been flexible and understanding with my work arrangements during the pandemic.	6.20	1.285

Table 51: Policies and Provisions at NIU (total sample)

	Were aware of prior to completing this survey		Have used the policy/provision		Plan on using the policy/provision	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Extension of the tenure clock	237	29.1	7	0.9	16	2.0
Waiver of use of student evaluations in performance reviews	255	31.3	51	6.3	60	7.4
Sick leave benefits	428	52.6	97	11.9	105	12.9
Flex time availability	352	43.2	155	19.0	182	22.4
Work-from-home policy	516	63.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Family First Coronavirus Response Act Emergency Sick Leave	334	41.0	28	3.4	60	7.4
TOTAL	2,122		338		423	

Table 52: Untenured Tenure-track Assistant Professors (n=41):

	Were aware of prior to completing this survey		Have used the policy/provision		Plan on using the policy/provision	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Extension of the tenure clock	36	87.8	5	12.2	14	34.1
Waiver of use of student evaluations in performance reviews	35	85.4	4	9.8	8	19.5

Note: The other two who indicated that they used the policy/provision and the two who indicated that they plan to use the policy are Associate Professors.

Table 53: Waiver of Use of Student Evaluations in Performance Reviews – Summary Table

Faculty/Instructor Position		Were aware of prior to completing this survey		Have used the policy/provision		Plan on using the policy/provision	
Type of position	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
Untenured/tenure-track Assistant Professor	41	35	85.4	4	9.8	8	19.5
Clinical Faculty	11	9	81.8	2	18.2	2	18.2
Associate Professor	69	64	92.8	20	29.0	25	36.2
Full Professor	62	54	87.1	14	22.6	13	21.0
Instructor	44	18	40.9	7	15.9	7	15.9

Table 54: Indicate your level of satisfaction (from -10 to +10) with any of the following NIU resources:

	M	SD
NIU Employee Assistance Program	4.3	5.23
Flexibility provided by my supervisor	7.2	4.22
NIU's Protecting the Pack Website	5.5	4.36
Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning's Remote Teaching Resources Website	4.9	4.49
Center for Teaching and Learning's workshops for online teaching	4.9	4.79
Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity and Education	2.6	4.66
NIU Human Resources	2.5	5.91
NIU COVID-19 Concerns form	2.1	4.93
Training for working remotely (if any provided)	3.2	4.60
Training for returning to work (if any provided)	3.4	4.56