

**Survey of Faculty Regarding Impact of COVID-19 on  
CUA Instruction, Re-Opening of Campus, and Financial Austerity Measures  
(May, 2020)**

**Survey Questions:**

**University Response to COVID-19**

Q1: I was adequately prepared to move online for Spring 2020.

Q2: The technology and training I was provided positioned me for successful online teaching.

Q3: I was appropriately compensated for my personal resources for online teaching in Spring 2020.

**RESUMING IN-PERSON INSTRUCTION for Fall 2020**

Q4: I agree with the university's decision to re-open on-campus activities for Fall 2020.

Q5: Faculty have been sufficiently consulted and given the opportunity to provide input.

Q6: I have concerns for my personal health and safety.

Q7: I have concerns for my students' health and safety.

**FINANCIAL AUSTERITY MEASURES for AY 20/21:**

Q8: I think postponing salary raises for faculty this year is appropriate.

Q9: I think implementing salary reductions for faculty this year is appropriate.

Q10: I think postponing contributions to my 403b is appropriate.

Q11: I think a 20%/10% salary reduction for the executive team is appropriate.

**Survey Results: (N=122)**

**Summary Table of Faculty Survey Responses re: COVID.**

Question	Avg ± Stdev (StErr)
Q1: Prepared to move online for Spring 2020.	2.63±1.22* (0.11)
Q2: Tech/training positioned me for online success.	2.68±1.14* (0.10)
Q3: Appropriately compensated for personal resources.	3.61±1.31* (0.12)
Q4: Agree with university's decision to re-open.	2.98±1.38 (0.13)
Q5: Faculty have been sufficiently consulted about re-opening.	<b>3.94±1.27*</b> (0.12)
Q6: Concerns for my health/safety.	<b>2.05±1.28*</b> (0.12)
Q7: Concerns for my students' health/safety.	<b>1.93±1.22*</b> (0.11)
Q8: Postponing salary raises is appropriate.	2.85±1.45 (0.13)
Q9: Salary reductions for faculty is appropriate.	<b>3.95±1.31*</b> (0.12)

Q10: Postponing 403b contributions is appropriate.	<u><b>4.11+1.17*</b></u> (0.11)
Q11: 20/10% Reduction in executive salary is appropriate.	<u><b>2.14+1.47*</b></u> (0.13)

**Scale:** 1=Completely Agree; 2=Somewhat Agree; 3=Neutral; 4=Somewhat Disagree; 5=Completely Disagree. \* *denotes statistical significance (p<0.05)*

### **Key Highlights/Conclusions:**

- Spring 2020 Redux:
  - CUA did a good job in Spring 2020 with the urgent/immediate move to online. Technology and training was effective (Q1\*, Q2\*; p<0.05) .
  - Several faculty had been teaching online so were prepared for the switch.
  - One faculty commented that students were “disheartened, distracted, and low-energy.”
  - CUA faculty were not compensated for personal resources used or equipment that needed to be purchased to support teaching (Q3\*; p<0.05) . Costs associated with instruction (i.e. supplies, Internet, office, computing, etc) normally borne by the university was shifted to faculty without re-imbursement.
- Reopening Campus:
  - Agreement with re-opening for Fall 2020 is neutral amongst the faculty (Q3). Several felt the announcement to re-open was for public consumption (recruitment, student return). Many feel the decision is premature and carries risk.
  - Faculty would like more involvement with the decision making and felt kept out of the loop (Q5\*; p<0.05).
  - Faculty had strong concerns that the university does not have a fully developed plan for re-opening the campus. At the very least, if it exists, this plan is not well articulated compared to those available at peer institutions (i.e. Notre Dame, Marquette, Indiana).
  - Faculty have concerns for personal (Q6\*; p<0.05) safety and health as well as the safety of our students (Q7\*; p<0.05) . Unless sufficient resources for testing, treatment, PPE, cleaning, etc. are available and in place by Fall, there is significant risk to the CUA community and its long-term reputation.
- Financial Austerity Measures:
  - Faculty felt not enough financial information and details has been shared with the faculty in order to critically evaluate the need for austerity measures proposed in Phase C.
  - Austerity measures should include utilization of resources from the university designated funds that were pulled for what was previously “the endowment”.
  - Faculty are neutral regarding postponing raises (Q8) as an appropriate action. While understanding the COVID situation and impact on higher education, most faculty felt that, through the accumulation of low compensation annually and lack of cost-of-living adjustments over the years, faculty have already contributed to needed austerity measures. Further, the Provost’s and VP of Finance’s assurance of raises at April’s Town Hall meeting with faculty and again at the Academic Senate fosters feelings of distrust, lack of transparency and bait-and-switch amongst the faculty.
  - Faculty strongly disagree with reductions in salary (Q9\*; p<0.05) and postponing 403b contributions (Q10\*; p<0.05). It was pointed out that the proposed furlough of faculty during semester breaks contradicts the standard definition of furloughs which coincides with a reduction in work responsibilities. Essentially, furloughs as proposed is a euphemism or poorly veiled marketing scheme that amounts to a reduction in salary.

- Many felt 20/10% cuts in executive pay (Q11\*;  $p < 0.05$ ) was appropriate first step. Several commented that this was only a “token” cut and cuts should be much more severe considering what other leaders in higher education and industry have committed to. Other perks (i.e. housing benefits, travel and entertainment, etc.) should be further scrutinized.

## Survey: Comments & Suggestions

### Written Comments: Spring 2020 Response

- Rapid university response:
  - Well done!
  - I appreciated the decision to go virtual came sooner than later.
  - We all did as well as could be expected under the circumstances. The University was right to close its Programs Abroad when it did and shut the University when it did.
  - Everyone did as well as could be expected under the circumstances.
  - I think that, given the extraordinary circumstances, the move to online teaching went as smoothly as it could.
  - It would have been helpful to extend spring break a few days more for students so faculty would have had more time to prepare for the switch to online teaching. We really only had two days and it was stressful.
  - Although I think the past semester is over and we need to spend our energies on the future semester, I am disappointed that we were given two days for basic training and zero time to create materials and update syllabi to work in an online environment. It is not the same in my field to take what we can do in a classroom and then 1:1 pop that up in Zoom. Online courses take over a year to write and pilot and take a TEAM of people from content writers, layout designers, tech support, etc. There were also lots of challenges from the student perspectives that made synchronous learning hard so that required lots of videos and online worksheets/activities for asynchronous learning.
  - With student stress, I had to be flexible about accepting these late. That meant I had a tidal wave of material creation for multiple different courses and a real mess of making sure students had all assignments in. As a female professor in the Humanities, students often came to me for advice beyond the subject I taught - they told me professors were not adapting syllabi and even adding assignments to "make up" for classes. They were so overwhelmed by incomplete syllabi and weekly changes in other classes, they barely kept it together. I had students tell me I was the only professor to address mental health and wellbeing. We have to ensure all faculty adapt to the situation or others are taking on more work. I do want to thank everyone who works in Tech Services and CTE for the amazing job they did given their huge limitations. The university really reduced Tech Services over the last years and that was horrible at this time. I also wish we had totally gone to P/F because like students who needed emotional help, it is hard to certify an A is really an A in this climate. Not all students had the needed technology to make it work.
  - I was on sabbatical so I only experienced first-hand the administrative/non-teaching part of the response. No one was prepared for this, but this is not necessarily the administration's fault. I was impressed by the solidarity among colleagues and the willingness to help.
  - I'm proud of what we were able to accomplish and the compassionate way in which students were cared for during this unforeseen event.
  - I think everyone at the university - administration and faculty and staff - did about as well as could be expected under the circumstances.
  - Given the speed at which everything happened, I think the University pulled together to get resources out very quickly. Kudos to the Center for Teaching Excellence.
  - It seems like the university's response was slower than their peers in DC. (Georgetown and GW both announced earlier what their covid-19 plans were. They also had more online

- information addressing the concerns of students/faculty/staff.) Oftentimes I was looked to the decisions made at the local universities to anticipate what CUA would do.
- Generally positive. This situation caught everyone and every university off guard. Some decisions seemed a little slow, but others (cancelling spring break trips) proved to be correct and timely.
  - Relative to the few examples I've heard at other universities, CUA seems to have transitioned reasonably well in light of circumstances
  - My own individual experience was not bad, and I do not believe my department's was, either. The biggest problem we experienced was student engagement. The students soldiered on and did their work, but they were disheartened, distracted, and low-energy.
  - The university response was pretty ok, it was actually my home department that made things absolutely awful. But then again, I suppose that's a failure in university leadership to provide departments with an adequate framework.
  - I believe that the CUA Faculty has demonstrated commendable resilience, tremendous courage, and an inspiring level of optimism and professionalism in the face of this catastrophe. I couldn't be (and I haven't been) prouder to be a member of this most caring and supportive family than what I am now.
  - I would say I managed and managed better than I had expected. I conducted all my lectures in real time by writing on my laptop and presenting to the class. I met students for many office hours etc. and definitely felt that I had put in twice or thrice of the in-person work just to make sure that my students don't suffer and succeed during this crisis.
  - Some rose to the challenge, some fell short. The pandemic is a wake-up call to all who fell short.
  - The university was not prepared at all and was taken by surprise. I had experience with online teaching and could deliver my courses with success, in spite of the university. I'm grateful to my immediate faculty colleagues for their support.
  - The university leaned at least 80% on the initiative, capacity, and resources of the faculty to continue classes during the rest of the semester. The university's response is embodied in the low-quality and additional assistance provided to the pre-recorded messages of its leadership. If the faculty would have shown that level of response in their teaching, the culmination of the semester at CUA would have been a disaster.
  - I was very upset about the two-day turn around time when dealing with personal issues of my own. But I really appreciated the help from the CTE.
  - Measures should be taken to alleviate teaching loads (fewer preps, shorter class periods) to maintain high-quality instruction. Students are the first to notice when instruction is being impacted and it would be unwise to make this another factor to discourage them from taking classes in subsequent semesters as the pandemic crisis continues. Faculty are running the risk of professional burnout if exposure to unmanageable levels of stress is not adequately addressed.
- Prior experience with online teaching.
    - I had already been teaching online for 8 years.
    - I have been teaching online for several years and had much of the materials already developed for an online offering.
    - I have had online teaching experience since 2009, but transitioning to online teaching within a few days in March was still challenging, especially the use of Google Meet. Fortunately, TechService staff worked with me to figure out how to manage this system. After that initial hurdle, online teaching became easier. I used Google Meet to produce video recordings and conduct synchronous discussions with students. It seems to be the easiest platform for

- students. I would recommend it. I could not use Zoom because the version needed for a class longer than 40 minutes was not available when we switched over. It took quite a while for the University to make access to the professional version available.
- I was already teaching on-line, so there wasn't a change for me, but the adequacy of training and technology has always but sub-optimal.
  - I do not agree with the term "online teaching" as one that accurately describes what faculty have been doing since mid March (I am not saying, either, that this is the term being used in this survey or by the Faculty Assembly). Rather, I think of this as multiple forms of emergency instruction done online. Also, I find it disappointing that, at the end of the semester, there has been no specific acknowledgement/recognition from the University administration of the multiple and costly efforts faculty and staff had to make in the transition to emergency instruction. In particular, faculty members with dependents at home had to undergo a sustained problem with balancing family- and work-related obligations. This will continue to be a problem in the fall (and most likely the entire academic year) until dependent-care services reopen safely. Inasmuch as those circumstances continue, to expect from faculty a much higher degree of preparedness in the fall would be short-sighted and inconsiderate of the variety of vulnerable positions in which faculty find themselves.
  - Technology & Training:
    - Thanks to Blackboard, it worked well. Zoom license came rather late, but my wife had one.
    - Kudos to the university tech staff for doing crash courses on on-line teaching, but I ultimately had to figure out much of it by myself.
    - Making Zoom available from the beginning would have been helpful
    - CUA should have made Zoom available from the get go, and also have paid for it
    - I was already prepared and had experience teaching online, so was a smooth transition for me. I think all faculty should be offered a course to better prepare them for remote teaching.
    - There are just three hundred or so faculty so a check in by tech services would have been possible.
    - Training sessions were very general, so that faculty were stuck with trial and error and learning on the fly. We started with an asynchronous approach, quickly discovered that wasn't working for students, so we switched to synchronous. We started out with Zoom, had major technical problems, and converted to Google Hangouts. We spent lots of extra effort trying to make this work. But in the end, it was not as high quality as we wanted to deliver. Most of us don't have the technical skill or equipment to do this well from home.
    - More time and more training would have the transition less brutal for all concerned -- many area universities and schools gave their faculty one (in some instances even two) full weeks of training in the technology and pedagogy of distance learning and teaching.
    - The university's Blackboard system is sufficient, but there was strong emphasis on using its built-in test features. These features were found to be difficult, not intuitive, and impractical, particularly for Engineering and Programming based exams. That said, I was able to work around the system, at the "cost" of losing the many touted benefits of BB's testing capabilities (timed exams, anti-cheating tools, etc.)
    - Administration unresponsive to many faculty suggestions and comments. Proposed plans are uncreative. This is an opportunity to revolutionize higher education using technology. We can't go back to same old, same old safely.
  - Personal Resources:

- Each faculty member should be given a stipend for apps, technology, and supplies (print toner, paper, etc). I bought several apps, a new headset, and ate the cost of printing on my home's laser jet. I also used my personal tablet and computer. We ended up buying a monitor to support my teaching.
- I went through numerous reams of my own paper/toner in light of my requirement for increased written submissions by students.
- Where do we submit for reimbursement of home office expenses and around-the-clock course preparations?
- The next time my laptop dies I would like to be provided a university laptop in addition to my desktop computer, given how necessary it is to complete my work.
- I feel that part time adjuncts were not fairly compensated for the extra training and extra work required to move online
- Working from home did, however, result in unexpected personal expenses.
- The event was unexpected, but the CUA administration simply assumed we would, and should unilaterally expend our own resources to acquire the devices and materials we would need to continue our course on-line. When I pointed out in a meeting that the US government was allotting resources to CUA partially with a view to covering costs of this sort, I received no reply.
- I also have no budget for office supplies at home - many working professionals have a budget from work to buy needed tech and supplies. For me, these needed items are also coming out of my paycheck. With the library closed, I have spent hundreds of dollars buying needed books for my teaching (not even for research!) I also need support in getting videos and media online. There is a lot I have to teach that is not on a streaming platform for a lot of reasons.
- Other Comments:
  - These questions lack context, seem rigged, and results will give the impression that faculty feel entitled or are out of touch. Who WAS prepared and adequately compensated in this world? Would delay in order to train, prepare and guarantee compensation have been preferable to risk-driven haste? What would we have done differently?

### **Written Comments: Decision to Re-Open Campus for Fall 2020 Response**

- Decision to Re-Open Campus:
  - It's good to give students and faculty hope that we will be able to resume in person, but everyone knows things could change.
  - Extremely risky decision.
  - To my mind, this is simply impossible. A campus is already a Petri dish under the best of circumstances. There is nothing CUA or anyone else can do that is going to be able to keep us safe. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Case-Against-Reopening/248785>
  - My only area of concern is Metro, for commuting faculty, staff and students. But on campus life is something I feel confident we will be able to phase in safely.
  - Even though university has announced resuming in-person instruction this fall, I would wait and see what decision is made in July when we have a better picture of what the status of the vaccine is. I am sure if there is any danger to our health then university will stay online. Honestly that doesn't worry me at this time. Things may improve. So we should wait and assess that later.
  - This is the right call. Time now to figure out how to make it work.
  - That was an intention, not a guarantee. Made to calm applicants and returning students to not lose revenues. Understandable. Nobody can say what we know then.

- Without tests, tracing and a vaccine, it is not wise to create personal contact on campus.
- There are so many practical concerns. When will decisions be made? If we do go to in-person instruction, the administration needs to take full responsibility for the safety of faculty as well as the students, provide guidance for all modes of learning (lecture, performance, lab, office hours, etc), and protect their employees. What is the liability of a faculty member if a student gets sick and contact tracing leads to a specific class? Class size: First year courses are typically >50 people. How are we going to socially distance and teach 70-100 students at a time in person? Large online courses are challenging to manage and near impossible to have a discussion. Breaking up into sections is not practical because who will teach extra sections? If we are lecturing in person, do we even have a lecture hall big enough to socially distance with 70 students? How will cleaning will be done between classes? Faculty will be sharing lecture hall computers. What provisions are made to protect the faculty from transmission via surface contact? How do we hold office hours in a tiny basement offices with poor ventilation and no windows? Lab-based courses will also present a unique problem because of the nature of instruction. How do we get through a lab with 48 people in a space where we can't socially distance? If we need more sections, who is going to teach them? Online labs are not a good alternative - they do not provide the physical feedback and adequate training (especially in safety and chemical handling), they do not meet accreditation guidelines, and medical schools are not necessarily going to accept them for pre-meds. Additionally, many of online labs which are commercially available have been compromised on sites like Chegg and CourseHero. For small departments, what happens if one or more faculty gets ill? The idea that the remaining people can just continue the instruction is not practical - they have their own courses to manage. I have so many more questions.
- I think the situation will be better by August with more testing available. CUA needs to prepare immediately for changes or else the Fall will be a sh\*tshow.
- It all depends on what safety measures are taken. I assume we will not reopen unless it is safe to do so. But I support the effort to TRY to open in the fall.
- We should do it if the situation allows it!
- Let's wait with decision as long as possible.
- Wait until there is more data.
- The university had to announce the resumption of on-campus instruction to calm the fears of prospective students. But I give it a 50-50 chance of actually happening.
- If we try to have students on campus, it will be chaos at best.
- Haven't heard what measures will be undertaken to protect faculty and staff.
- Science and data must be followed, and presently we are not in a state where a decision about opening can be made. I highly doubt we'll be there by August. If all the science and data tell us okay to open in Aug, great, but that is the metric the University should follow.
- I think the university should err on the side of caution by taking a wait-and-see approach to deciding when/how to open the university. We don't want to commit to something early and then have to suddenly adjust if these a second wave of covid-19 cases.
- I believe the university decisions are being made primarily for financial reason without considerations for the faculty well being. Most of the faculty in my department are in the higher risk group due to age. I doubt that it will be advisable from Them/us to return to crowded conditions at the end of August. Also, it is MUCH easier to prepare for a known situation rather than having to prep for multiple contingencies!
- There needs to be a daily wellness check for every person on campus, including as a minimum at the beginning of a daily temperature reading. Those with an elevated



- temperature should be sent home or, for those faculty and students living on campus, isolated until a follow-up determination can be made with respect to Covid-19. I have send this to the CHRO e-mail provided to us for in-put and to my Dean. I have no reason to think that my concern has been taken seriously. I would not feel coming to campus without such a protocol in place.
- I think it is unsafe to reopen the University in the fall. I plan to offer to teach online; if I am forced to teach in person, I may not return. I am already looking at alternate employment opportunities that allow remote teaching.
  - We don't have enough information yet to make a well-informed judgment, and safety much depends on the nature and circumstances of on-campus teaching.
  - The announcement that we will resume in-person instruction is premature. There is too much uncertainty about the virus.
  - Should follow District of Columbia guidelines.
  - We should be proactive and not hold classes this fall.
  - Students can attend classes in turns when the room is not large enough to guarantee safe distancing. Students should wear N95 masks during the lecture time and have the tools/material to clean their station.
  - I would like to hear the university leadership answer to the question: "Who will be responsible for any illness or death of any faculty or student that is consequence of CUA's leadership decision of resuming instruction in 2020? "
  - No thought has been given to members of the teacher, student, or staff population who fall into "high-risk" categories. I have heard offhanded comments about us being "young and healthy" and hence OK to resume in person activities. Taking the health of our community for granted like this is highly irresponsible, demoralizing, and, frankly, not very Catholic.
  - Opt-out option or on-line for faculty with health concerns.
  - The fact that many students, faculty, and staff commute by metro and public transportation should be considered. In particular, the metro is usually crowded, making it difficult to respect safety measurements. If the campus is re-opened in the Fall semester, either partially or completely, I suggest we make available alternative transportation tools (e.g., Georgetown provides a bus to bring students/faculty/staff from Virginia to DC).
  - I would like to hear the university leadership answer to the question: "Who will be responsible for any illness or death of any faculty or student that is consequence of CUA's leadership decision of resuming instruction in 2020? "
  - Teaching in person is, in my opinion, clearly preferable. But it is just hard to know what is possible. I don't feel the university has yet articulated a clear plan and certainly as far as I can see, faculty have not given input
  - I understand the University's pressing need for tuition dollars; however, I do not see how they are going to guarantee safety. One among many issues: we do not have a cleaning staff large enough or capable enough to disinfect classrooms between every class.
  - I agree with the desire to return but need to hear much more about the PLAN to keep everyone safe before I can say I agree. Faculty need to be consulted and their concerns incorporated into the plan. Alternatives must be allowed for faculty who do not feel safe returning to the classroom.
  - I think we need to open with as normal a semester as possible in the fall. Student life needs to be as normal as can be, with exceptions made for students with peculiar risks. I think it's important we get back as quickly as possible and as normally as possible, carving out exceptions for those faculty, staff, and students who cannot be exposed to the virus.

- I like some of the creative ideas proposed by schools like Beloit - and even Notre Dame and South Carolina. We should make some changes to the calendar.
- The University needs a clearer and more specific plan, and this plan needs to be announced IMMEDIATELY. Specifically, we should take a stand on either starting early and ending by Thanksgiving (so as to prevent the mass potential spread of the virus in travel between students' various hometowns and campus over Thanksgiving break and the normal return), OR we should plan to end in-person instruction at Thanksgiving and to finish the semester online. We should also consider slightly shortening the term (which also further minimizes the time for spread and allows more flexibility with the previous schedule suggestions). THE MOST IMPORTANT THING IS WE NEED A MORE DEFINITE PLAN (albeit while still being flexible to the situation and announcing that we will have to monitor things) IN ORDER TO PROVIDE MORE SECURITY TO PARENTS, STUDENTS, AND FACULTY. MANY COMPETITOR UNIVERSITIES (LIKE NOTRE DAME AND MARQUETTE) ALREADY HAVE SIMILAR PLANS IN PLACE. WE WILL PERSUADE MORE STUDENTS TO ENROLL AT CUA IF THEY HAVE SOME BETTER IDEA OF WHAT THEY ARE CHOOSING.
- Much depends on exactly how the administration sets up real-world conditions for instruction. But there can be no doubt that both our short and long term needs can only be served by real world instruction.
- I can understand the administration's concern to provide a hopeful message, particularly for potential students. The situation regarding the virus, however, remains fluid and potentially very dangerous for opening up university campuses.
- If students are being invited back to campus under circumstances in which they come and go where ever they like, whenever they like -- the faculty MUST also be given the choice to distance teach to protect themselves and their family members (some of whom may be especially vulnerable to COVID-19) from possible exposure to the virus.
- I am very concerned about this plan and do not how see how it can be made safe. I don't think the university's plan for dorms will keep students safe, and the classrooms in my building have no external ventilation which is unsafe. Unless there is widespread testing and contact tracing for students, faculty, and staff.
- We must be better prepared for fall and not have a repeat of spring. There will for sure be another wave and I think we are not prepared for individual and class quarantines that will also occur even if we are on campus. I just cannot understand why it is unsafe for GW to be in the classroom and alright for us in the same city. Why has the university not polled the faculty about our needs and experience last semester? They ask us to take potential cuts in pay and retirement, but never once have asked us what we need to be successful. My idea is to create a syllabi flexible enough to be online or in person - I would like to teach one synchronous and one asynchronous class per week. That can also separate people and open up classroom space to social distancing. I have a real fear teaching a 4:4 load because that's hard to teach four different classes with no textbook under normal circumstances - if I have to teach students in the classroom and come up with an online program for those distance learning or in quarantine, I don't think I can handle that workload. I cannot imagine doing this.
- This is a very challenging time for our leaders and members of our community. I understand the desire to re-open and would support reopening if we can find ways to ensure the health and well-being of our community. There are many variables. I think we will have to wait for more data. At this point, a more helpful approach would be to find ways to strengthen online education. If we can do a great job teaching students online by the fall, we will be able to compete better and assure our students they are getting quality education.

- Doesn't every single person have concerns about safety of self and others? What is being accomplished here?
- Many of us have personal and family health concerns, and there seems to be no consideration of those concerns. There is no way to eliminate the extended exposure and risk from sitting in a lecture room breathing the same air as several students for 75 minutes at a time. Illnesses spread like wildfire in the fall even in the best of times. Having students living in the dorms will make campus a veritable petri dish.
- I think the University needs to have a comprehensive plan and it needs to include PPE, testing, contact tracing, and training for faculty and staff. I understand there are financial issues here but there is a measure of irresponsibility that is very concerning.
- Depends on how this would work. Social distancing. Wearing a mask when I lecture? Requiring students to wear masks during class? Penalties for not doing so?
- Shared Decision-Making:
  - I do not know what should be done, but I want faculty to be part of the decision-making process.
  - Faculty is rarely consulted, the administration always makes decisions, and informs faculty thereafter, this is nothing new.
  - No consultation with us.
  - To my knowledge, no teaching faculty have been consulted so far. We will be on the front lines if/when students come to campus. We will be in front of them for 50 minutes to 3 hours at a time, a dangerous amount of exposure by any account. Our students will be living in communal facilities. Even if they are told that there will be one student living in each dorm room, they will visit each other's dorm rooms, hold (illicit) parties, and there will be a serious outbreak of the virus. Professors are at a more vulnerable age, and should one of us contract the virus, serious hospitalization or death could result. None of this has been acknowledged, and it proves that faculty's well-being isn't even a concern to the university administration. I have a health condition which my doctor deems too dangerous to risk exposure to covid-19. Many of us are medically unable to return this fall, given the inherent risks, and the university needs to work with HR to make our options as clear as possible. We deserve to have these options outlined for us now, not 2 months from now, so that we can prepare for face-to-face or online instruction, depending on our medical conditions and other factors. The university cannot feasibly or morally insist that every instructor return for face-to-face instruction, and lack of clarity in this regard is causing significant distress and concern for many faculty members.
  - Include faculty in working groups. Give faculty the opportunity to nominate and vote within each school, not hand-picked selections so that the process feels inclusive and transparent.
  - What is the composition of Garvey's reopening committee? Any faculty representatives?
  - Improve communication with faculty and include them in working groups
  - These decisions have been made with a presidential leadership style, but there has been no consultation whatsoever. As a matter of fact, consultation is confused with communicating decisions already made. Faculty need to be more involved.
  - A careful reopening plan would need to be implemented. A committee that includes faculty, staff and students should be ideally created. There are already a few universities making a decision about it including those planning to start on campus instruction in the Fall semester but finishing the semester before Thanksgiving.
  - While I agree with the university's decision [to re-open] I think faculty need to be consulted far more.

## Written Comments: Financial Austerity Measures Response

- General Comments:
  - Appropriate contingencies. Many places have already done them, but we seem to be in a better position
  - NO HIRING FREEZE!
  - Is the Administration reaching out for any financial support to the Church or Vatican? And if not, why not?
  - Obviously, these financial issues will ultimately depend upon our fall enrollment situation.
  - Glad we are not talking about selective pink slips or furloughs.
  - Dept. operational budgets could probably survive with more than 3% cut. Freeze all "entertainment budget" for catering, receptions, and restrict travel budgets. Also, no bonuses for upper admin.
  - It's hard to judge among various austerity measures without a \$ value attached to them. The president's 5/19 email says that measures already adopted will yield \$12M in savings. The Covid-19 Financial Risk Summary dated 5/11 and shared with us by Dean Walsh identifies a budget hit of \$15-30M in FY 2021. So at least another \$3M in cuts and perhaps another \$18M are needed, by the university's own calculations. Thus, it seems certain the "B" level austerity measures in that 5/11 Risk Summary will be needed, and probably at least some of the "C" level measures.
  - Furloughs should not happen over regularly scheduled breaks, but should be combined with additional cancellations to classes while faculty are not being paid.
  - If a furlough for all faculty and staff is necessary, it should be an actual furlough (and not simply a euphemistic pay-cut). This could easily be accomplished by shortening each teaching semester by one week. That will match the two-week furlough and achieve the 4% salary reduction savings, but it will give faculty some break from work in return (as in the definition of a furlough). I agree with the University's efforts to furlough before making cuts to 403b contributions. I strongly request the administration to be as transparent and as timely as possible when making these announcements. Other schools have announced harsher measures much sooner. It's difficult to not be skeptical when we generally know CUA is not as wealthy as these other schools. If more drastic measures are going to be called for, this needs to be communicated clearly and as quickly as possible.
  - We are kept so in the dark in the deliberative phase of the process, it is hard to know what measures are justified/warranted.
  - I agree with those measures only if determined as absolutely necessary.
  - Any decisions need to acknowledge the significant inequity between current staff and faculty compensation and that of the upper administration, as a simple matter of justice.
  - This seems to hit certain faculty and departments harder than others. Clinical and contract faculty already often live outside the beltway to afford housing. I would like to see a plan that protects those who earn less first. It's hard to say someone should still earn 200,000-400,000 a year when you cut someone making under 70,000 (which is the amount to own a home in DC) or even much less. When we feel secure in our jobs and know we can meet rent, then we are better able to take care of students and our courses.
  - It will be helpful to know how much money is needed and how much saving we get from each option. For example, if the executive team takes a 30% cut and that saving is much

larger than cutting faculty salary, then I would support a larger cut of executive salary because the faculty has been underpaid for years.

- Unless the University is forthcoming of where all the money is going (executive salaries, all the consultants, how much it is costing for hiring three new Deans, etc. etc.) We need much more transparency. When I look at President Garvey's salary--a 20% cut is about my whole salary. I would like to know that the University is cutting everywhere it can at the administrative level before asking faculty and staff to contribute.
- Postponing Raises:
  - I am already among the lowest paid faculty members and I have been full time for 8 years.
  - Raises are not realistic right now. Voluntary pay cuts by the executive team are appropriate but need to be better explained.
  - I am perfectly OK with no raises this year, but I'm a lot less OK with furloughs, pay cuts for faculty and staff (esp those paid under 80K or so) or cuts to retirement. We have been underpaid for so long, whereas our administration has not been underpaid comparative to peer institutions. If there are going to be cuts, they should be proportionate. (I am OK with \*shared\* sacrifice! But faculty need to be involved in these decisions.)
  - Our salaries are already 20% less than any university so it's outrageous for the administration to cut our salary. I think this is an excuse not to increase our well-deserved raise which should have happened few years ago. I think the administration can be more creative in recruiting efforts and advertising properly to attract students. If the administration will cut our already low salary a lot of faculty will leave the university.
  - As faculty is generally in a better financial position than staff, any austerity means should be careful to take care of our loyal and long serving staff at the same time that we are looking out for our own interests.
  - Faculty should get raises as promised and there should be no salary reduction for faculty.
  - We need to take the long view. Higher education will never be the same. I do not think lower paid support staff should experience the same plans as professional staff and faculty.
  - I think pay reductions should be on the table; however, it should not be a flat 10% across all faculty. Rather, it should be progressive. There are members of the community who make significantly less than the standard wage, and a reduction would set them even further back. For young faculty, especially clinical this may create hardship on top of stress.
  - The provost last promised all of the faculty that our merit-based raises were forthcoming, even months into the pandemic. I wish that he would keep his word but it appears that is not the case. After completely recreating my classes for an online platform mid-semester, I certainly feel that my colleagues and I am entitled to merit-based salary increases, notwithstanding that I am severely underpaid considering my experience and qualifications, and in comparison with all of our peer institutions. Now it appears that the university not only is reneging its promise for long-awaited raises (how many years have we been receiving emails about these alleged raises, which were supposed to be delivered in the fall semester if I remember correctly?), but now the university is making the brunt of this crisis fall upon us. It is a well-known fact that almost every faculty member is underpaid, so to further curtail our salaries and benefits is frankly a criminal act. We are already struggling to get by. The executive team could take higher salary reductions - 40 - 50% - and struggle significantly less than us. We're aware of how much the executive team makes, as the Faculty Assembly

gathered that data during the "Academic Renewal" process. Frankly, a larger executive salary cut would solve most of our problems. Further executive cuts of at least 30% if not significantly higher would help instill faith in the faculty that the university administration understands what rough economic times we are experiencing and appreciates all of the hard work we're doing to keep students engaged and satisfied in these difficult learning circumstances.

- While I don't like the thought of salary reductions or postponing contributions, in these unprecedented times, we all need to do our part and I'm willing to do so.
- In regards to faculty salary deductions: 5% or less is appropriate.
- Cuts should not affect faculty and staff that have been underpaid for the last 10 years!
- I feel that faculty members have been doing, and will do, their job very well, although the switch to online classes. The workload of faculties has not decreased during the pandemic. So, I don't feel that it is fair to reduce the faculties' salaries as an austerity measure.
- Per the University mandated study into faculty compensation, Faculty are already woefully underpaid. Faculty were promised [commensurate] action. Choosing to use this pandemic as a reason to go in the opposite direction will be a catastrophic hit to faculty moral, and I predict, a good excuse to seek employment at one of the Schools found to be compensating faculty more. This is also pretty ironic given the "Have I been compensated for the cost of going online" question above.
- Postponing salary increases and/or reducing salaries should be a last resort effort.
- The university has underpaid us consistently for the seven years I've been here. One paltry merit raise the entire time. No cost of living raise. All other costs go up. Cutting faculty and staff lines, etc. etc. has made teaching more laborious, more intensive. In my department we've lost 7 tenured or TT people since I arrived. 1 replacement of a tt person. Yet the amount of work \*remains\* the same to be done by fewer people. We basically have faculty serving on every single service committee because otherwise we couldn't get anything done. And even then, it's suffered: our curriculum committee is a joke, but we simply do not have the hours and the ability to meet and take this task on. In addition (and this to me is the key): we were expected to "dig deep," to go above and beyond, to really make this all work. But in a context where we'd been treated so poorly for so long, well in short: I felt nothing but ill will toward our institution. I think we should consider a strike in the fall.
- Postponing 403b Contributions:
  - My retirement already has lost massive value. Do \*not\* reduce contributions.
  - Changes to 403B unfairly affects older faculty.
  - I find postponing contributions to my 403b very alarming!
  - If we have to go to salary reductions or suspension of TIAA cref benefits we should be given the choice. Also, this survey does not mention the furloughs that may also be part of the plan circulated by the Deans. We should discuss those and try to understand what they mean. Semester breaks? What are those?
  - Faculty reductions should be a last resort. Don't touch the 403b contributions.
- Faculty Salary Reduction:
  - A one-time salary reduction should be considered as less drastic than delaying raises--which would deliver long-term savings to the university and long-term losses to faculty; and

postponing retirement contributions, which would deliver short-term savings to the university but carry long-term, compounded losses to faculty.

- "Inappropriate" seems irrelevant unless we propose alternatives. Any salary cuts should be a greater percentage for those high on scale, say over \$100,000.
- Pay Cuts for Executive Team:
  - Larger pay cuts for exec team are warranted.
  - CUA faculty needs [more] than a symbolic salary reduction from the leadership. Anything less than 30% is just a joke on all the faculty who have been carrying the weight of bad leadership and excessive number of executive positions. COVID-19 is a serious challenge to CUA. Thus far, the only response that has been adequate to the circumstances has come from CUA's faculty.
  - Our executive team should volunteer for AT LEAST a 30% reduction.
  - Exec reductions should be much higher (40%) considering they have been giving themselves raises while starving out faculty and staff. We have taken our reductions annually since Garvey arrived. Unfortunately, I fear we do not have the leadership to come through on stronger footing.
  - Balanced Executive salaries are way out of line compared to other schools. And entertainment budgets are especially excessive. The issue remains a lack of faculty consultation and no faculty governance. Decisions are made on high and imposed front the top down.
  - The cut in executive pay team is essential and fair (especially given how much they are paid). Cuts to faculty pay would be deeply demoralizing and punish those of us on the "front lines," as it were, in trying to keep instruction going. I'd support reducing employer matching contributions to TIAA-CREF, but cutting them entirely will have a huge long-term impact on the retirement benefits of faculty.
  - Salary reductions for executive team should be much greater and should be made permanent. The faculty raises and retirement contributions should be maintained. The \$100M in unrestricted pooled investments should be used as needed for faculty compensation.
  - Excess executive and administrative team payment and numbers are consuming the resources that should go to teaching. Faculty are poorly compensated and they now have to work more for lower pay.
  - With regards to the last question, I chose 4 because I believe those who make more should cut more than those who make less.
  - 20%/10% salary reduction for the executive team is too little reduction.
  - The salary reduction for the executive team should be higher.
  - We are already below market averages on faculty salary, so university should hold the line on reducing salary.
  - The proposed reduction by the "leadership team" of their own compensation is appropriate as a first step. I understand that there may need to be reductions in faculty compensation. The problem is that the President and his "team" have no credibility. In less than three weeks, they have gone from promising raises and a parental leave program to announcing austerity measures. I didn't believe the rosy picture. Why should I believe them now. The President and his "team" have been slow to respond to the severity of this crisis from the beginning, i.e., before spring break. On April 21, Johns Hopkins President Daniels published a

much more complete plan than President Garvey proposed just last week, three weeks later.

- Faculty salaries pale in comparison to leadership salaries. I think those higher paid leaders should take a bigger cut and spare the already low paid faculty. It is a hardship for even lower paid staff to have to lost two weeks of pay this summer.
- John Garvey needs to lead by example. He is provided housing by the University and should not have any large expenses. His salary should be reduced by 50-70%.
- Faculty have contributed enough. We cannot take more. The generous compensation for the higher administration needs to be looked at. There is actually more: while our president likes to compare us with John Hopkins and Georgetown, he forgets that the faculty and staff do not trust our current administration. The healing of the wounds caused by the horrible process that was called Academic Renewal has not even begun. Asking faculty for more is just unchristian. It would mean a lot more if the President and Vice Presidents took a higher cut. 20/10% are just meaningless. What about following the example of some CEO's who gave up 100% of their compensation? Faculty and staff still have to pay rent/mortgage in an expensive market, while President Garvey lives for free at Nugent Hall. Also, has anyone looked at our organisation? How can we become more efficient and cut the excess in administration? COVID-19 offers a unique opportunity to become more effective and more efficient.
- Initial measures by the Administration in regards to salary cuts of President and Vice-Presidents are a good example of leadership. Moving forward, the entire faculty and staff may have to share the sacrifices although it would be preferable to tap into reserves, endowment or other funds to cover salaries and operating budgets. The salary raises may be minimal this year but would send a positive signal that the significant pay gap with other universities is being addressed. If faculty salaries are to be cut in December, faculty could be allowed to use research time instead.
- The CUA leadership can "demonstrate" a clearer resolution of contributing to austerity by reducing their incomes beyond a "symbolic gesture." That implies, at least, reductions of 40% for the President and Provost, and 30% for the V-Presidents. The faculty has been underpaid for more than 5 years as demonstrated by the study on faculty compensation completed last year.
- Most executives and business owners have taken major reductions in salary. Most MDs have taken 75-80% reduction in order to keep their staff viable. 10-20% is minimal.
- I also think that Dean's or program should consider not receiving their stipends given that they are compensated with reduced teaching loads or other service requirements.
- President and others should take higher pay cuts
- More cuts for administrators; more effort to raise money for specific things like classroom technology and health safety
- Administration has been grossly overpaid in relation to faculty and staff d sad o this is a chance to equalize burdens better.
- The administration's cut in pay is too small and perhaps other administrative personnel should receive cuts.
- College and university presidents and top administrators taking pay cuts seems to be a positive initiative and I believe it is done in good faith. I also think that the university leaders



should consider further cuts on their salaries should this round prove to be insufficient and/or unfair depending on potential further cuts affecting university employees with much lower salaries living in one of the most costly cities in the country. Austerity measures should always be taken with the most vulnerable members of the university in mind (part-time staff and instructors, graduate and international students, etc.). We have an opportunity to show students and their families that this is an institution that truly cares, and especially for those in need. We should think creatively and be willing to go above and beyond.