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INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has led to a great deal of uncertainty about campus housing for the next term (US – Fall). Specifically, this crisis has pushed campuses to reevaluate if and how they will proceed with their operations. In response, President, Von Stange, assembled the Future of Housing (FOH) Work Group, which was tasked with exploring and making recommendations for how campuses may safely and most effectively proceed with providing campus housing for the next academic term, given the predicted next wave of the COVID-19 virus in late 2020.

The work group’s charge included the following overarching questions:

- To what level can campuses offer housing in the COVID-19 environment;
- What kinds of rooms/buildings should housing programs prioritize and keep/bring online (and for what purpose), given the known risk factors associated with congregate living;
- What is appropriate engagement for the various levels and types of staff who work within and support campus housing and residence life operations;
- What are the most promising mitigation strategies for a safe return to campus;
- How can residential programs create a true residential experience in an environment that requires physical distancing;
- Under the current conditions, how can a housing department ensure that they have built fairness and equity into their housing assignments process

Over 250 professionals submitted applications for the open call for work group volunteers; 8 campus housing and residence life professionals from colleges/universities around the country were invited to be part of the core group and lead the process. A week later, the core group identified and split into 8 sub-group areas (capacity/assignments; staffing/HR; community building; operations & processes; equity & inclusion; student discipline; risk management; and mitigation strategies), and expanded to include 44 members, including 5 representatives from sister associations of particular interest, given their purview on college campuses (i.e., Association for University and College Counseling Centers; American College Health Association; and University Risk Management and Insurance Association). Other professionals, including individuals from outside the United States, were also consulted and invited to provide programming in the virtual space.

This document represents a summary of the work group’s final recommendations and considerations for practice on behalf of the ACUHO-I membership, and is organized by sub-group area. Throughout this document, considerations will be identified, as will challenges and opportunities around different options and decision points. A few overarching points worth noting, include the following:

- All of us are still learning about COVID-19, and as such, revisions and refinements will be necessary and should be expected within the scope of each campus’ policy and practice development.
- The geographical nature of the COVID-19 virus, variability of spread, and institutional appetite for risk (amongst other factors) will understandably make different considerations more or less compelling for any given campus.
- In many cases, federal, state and local public health requirements will impact institutions’ options for re-opening, and particularly with regard to mitigation effort requirements.
- “First mover” campuses may set the standard (real or perceived) for your particular region and/or residential student population.
- The types of resources (physical and human) that are needed for a safe return to campus will likely shine an even brighter light on the inequities between institutions. For this reason, it is very important for colleges/universities to appraise their capabilities before making any decisions.
• The COVID-19 crisis has created great opportunities for collaboration within and across institutions, and across state and international borders, affirming that working in concert with one another is almost always the best way to proceed during times of crisis.
• The COVID-19 crisis has presented an important opportunity for student affairs professionals to assert their influence and expertise at the larger institutional table.
• Our primary objective, above all else, should be to return to campus safely.

We would like to explicitly acknowledge the current climate in the United States, and other countries, for Black students, colleagues, and staff. During COVID-19 planning, it is imperative that colleges/universities recognize how their policies, practices, and procedures may carry implicit biases and create action plans for how to remediate them.

“We are responsible for creating policies, practices, and programs informed by compassion and not bias, by equity and not exclusion, and by courage and not indifference” (ACUHO-I Leadership, 2020).

**CAPACITY/ASSIGNMENTS**

**THE CAPACITY/ASSIGNMENTS SUB-GROUP FOCUSED ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**

• What capacity level options may any given campus pursue to accommodate students safely as well as achieve other institutional goals/priorities?
• What factors should be taken into considerations in determining the ideal and/or appropriate capacity level?
• What factors will determine how students will be assigned or reassigned for safety or reduced/limited capacity levels (i.e., who do you accommodate and how)?

**MAIN CHALLENGES THAT EXIST AROUND EVALUATING THIS ASPECT OF THE ISSUE:**

• There are a variety of housing types and designs, including private/shared bedrooms and bathrooms, and each of these presents its own risk.
• There remains a great deal of ambiguity around what constitutes “safe” or acceptable practices/guidelines, including a varied range of state and local guidelines/expectations.
• There remains great uncertainty around enrollment/housing demand based on institutional and pending student academic decisions.
• The availability of private, off-campus or alternative housing options differ based on college/university location and institutional resources.
• Expectations from institutional leaders, students, parents/family, and/or other constituents can be quite divergent.
• In some cases, campus housing professionals are not “at the table” when discussions/decisions are made, which is highly problematic for both planning and execution.

**MAIN AREAS OF CONCERN FOR THE FIELD FOR THIS ELEMENT:**

• We know that most campuses offer a wide array of campus living arrangements from traditional style rooms in residence halls; to suites/apartments; etc. Each institution also serves different residential populations. Therefore, one solution/option will not fit all as we progress through the COVID-19 era.
• In the CDC’s updated guidance for institutions of higher education, they indicated that the lowest risk was not to open campus residences at all; more risk was to open at lower capacity and to close shared spaces; and the highest risk was to open as normal. Additionally, the ACHA’s guidance suggested that single occupancy was the best option, when it is possible. While there are common themes emerging within in-field modeling conversations (see the “common/promising practices” section below), we also expect that there is great potential for variability between institutions in terms of occupancy levels and space usage.
• Most operating budgets are built around maintaining occupancy levels of 90%+ capacity to maintain fiscal viability. Any significant reduction in capacity will adversely affect operations, including staffing.
• Professionals will need to explore how they will maintain the fundamental value of community traditionally formed through social and physical interaction within facilities with reduced capacity and restrictions on social gathering.
• Professionals will need to anticipate and develop processes for requesting accommodations for single/isolated rooms for medical reasons that may or may not be covered under ADA (e.g., anxiety disorder due to COVID-19).
• Ensuring that reduced capacity plans and adjusted housing rates do not negatively impact vulnerable populations such as students with greater financial need; students with disabilities; students who experience food insecurity and others.

COMMON/PROMISING PRACTICES IN THIS AREA:
• Capacity levels and decisions around building usage are very much tied to geography (local and state instructions) and institutional capacity (buildings and beds available). Still, there are specific models that appear to be most prevalent in the field, as capacity allows, these include:
  • Reduction of density in traditional over-assignment areas (e.g., temporary triples/lounges)
  • Reduction of triples, quads or anything other than designed double/single occupancy
  • Assignment of one student per bedroom regardless of design capacity
  • Assignment of one student per bedroom/bathroom
  • Reduction of community use bathrooms (e.g., establishing student to fixture ratios)
  • The use of apartments and suites with shared within-unit washrooms
  • Treating campus cohorts as if they are a unit/pod
  • Exploring private off-campus options for displaced students (due to reduced capacity) or overflow space for isolation/quarantine.
• Balancing variable room rates to create more equity or avoid unanticipated expenses (e.g., charging only double room rate for a single-assigned room).
• The interplay between various mitigation strategies should be considered in the aggregate and should inform housing configuration and capacity decisions, including:
  • Availability/feasibility of enhanced cleaning
  • Physical distancing strategies
  • Implementing education and health promotion efforts in residential communities
  • Designating isolation/quarantine areas/facilities
  • Establishing a plan for testing
  • Establishing a plan for case investigation and contact tracing
  • Implementing other measures, such as requiring masks; designating single direction hallway traffic flow/ entryways and exits; instituting guest restrictions; etc.
• Identifying suitable isolation/quarantine spaces in residence halls, or elsewhere.
• Occupancy restrictions will likely be concurrent with guest/visitation policy, both in-hall and in-room

OUTSTANDING/UNANSWERED QUESTIONS:
• One of the main components that remains unanswered is how institutions should plan for quarantine/isolation spaces, as no clear or consistent guidance has been provided on this. However, a recent article suggested that 2-7% is a common range for colleges/universities at this point.
• If capacity is reduced, who decides on the populations to be accommodated (or not)? While accommodating new/1st year students might be a logical choice due to an increased need for institutional connection/support, distance, need, off-campus options (or lack thereof), international status, etc., will require institutions to make their own decisions based on their unique situation, mission, etc.
• Once capacity and who will be offered available spaces have been determined, the assignment (or reassignment of returning students) will become the next major question/hurdle to overcome, and particularly if a campus decides on single occupancy, and current assignments include more than one person per room.

CONSIDERATIONS MOVING FORWARD:
• How will you pivot based on changed circumstances (e.g., resurgence in cases, mid-fall term conversion of teaching method, spring term, etc.).
• How will you manage the PR and communication challenges associated with reassignment, cancellation of assignment, or individual and/or group outbreaks.
SHORT-TERM/COVID-19 SOLUTIONS THAT MIGHT BECOME A STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE:

Reduced occupancy models and changes to residential live-on requirements will likely be very common occupancy management strategies as we continue to work through the COVID-19 reality. Perhaps the most concerning potential holdover from these COVID-19 solutions is the assumption that the value proposition of living on campus is no longer there. ACUHO-I’s recent sponsored research study with NSSE revealed that first-year students who live-off campus outside the family home and sophomore students who live off-campus persist at lower rates. We encourage practitioners to consult this study prior to making permanent modifications to their live-on requirements.

STAFFING/HR

THE STAFFING/HR SUB-GROUP FOCUSED ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

- What changes will need to be made to training for student staff, graduate assistants, and professional staff to accommodate local, state, federal COVID-19 guidelines?
- What resources and/or training are available for student staff, graduate assistants, and professional staff related to self-care, and their personal physical and mental health while dealing with COVID-19 changes and/or other equity and inclusion concerns on campus?
- How can we assist staff who are dealing with job-related or equity questions resulting from furloughs, staffing reductions, no residents on campus, etc., due to COVID-19 or institutional budget reductions?
- How do departments continue to offer graduate assistants opportunities for development if faced with reductions in staffing or if no students are living on campus?
- How can staff members conducting job searches better understand which positions are still being actively searched and available to be filled?

MAIN AREAS OF CONCERN FOR THE FIELD FOR THIS ELEMENT:

- Local, state, and federal guidelines are still changing or being developed, making it difficult to plan for group activities like training.
- Institutional expectations are still being developed, delaying decisions on changes to many processes (e.g., duty, medical responses, health & safety/facility checks, community development, etc.).
- Institutional guidelines are still being developed around physical distancing, proper PPE use, COVID-19 symptoms, etc., and will need to be included in training plans.
- Some training areas related to COVID-19 response/expectations are still being identified and/or developed and may have to be quickly pulled together to be included in training schedules for staff.
- Due to the variety of institutions and needs, there is no one-size-fits-all solution to training for staff. While there are similarities in topics, specific expectations vary by institution, and to some degree, might prevent large-scale sharing of online/virtual training presentations.
- Some institutions have not finalized start dates for the next term, which impacts when staff members need to report to campus for training.
- Institutional decisions on occupancy levels (i.e., singles, doubles, no students on campus, etc.) in many cases have not been made, which is delaying decisions on staffing needs.
- Institutions are also considering extending remote work options for staff. Staff who live-in/live-on may also need to participate in remote work and departments will need to determine what that work will look like and if their roles need to be adjusted. Staff who do not live on-campus may also experience challenges reaching campus due to reduced public transportation options.
- Professionals of color are overrepresented in many “essential” positions on campus, including those situated in campus housing. When colleges/universities make the decision to return to campus, these staff members may feel at greater risk due to racial health disparity issues. Institutions will need to take very intentional steps to support these community members and provide them with resources.
- Many staff members are not aware of campus or community resources available to them through their positions to assist with their physical/mental health concerns, stress, or anxiety related to bias incidents or the pandemic.
Some institutions are laying off or furloughing staff due to budgetary constraints and reduced enrollments and occupancy levels.

Hiring freezes are in place for vacant/anticipated positions at many institutions.

Completing hiring and on-boarding processes for staff and helping candidates get a feel for the institution virtually so that they can make informed decisions regarding institutional fit.

COMMON/PROMISING PRACTICES IN THIS AREA:
Training options will vary by institution, but those currently being considered by professionals in the field include but are not limited to:

- All face-to-face training in one location that incorporates physical distancing.
- Mostly face-to-face training that includes remote presenters.
- Hybrid of face-to-face and online/remote training sessions.
- Entirely remote/virtual training completed individually or in staff teams with physical distancing.
- Separating student staff by staff teams (neighborhoods, areas, etc.) to allow for physical distancing with remote presenters.
- Separating student staff by staff teams (neighborhoods, areas, etc.) to allow for physical distancing with in-person presenters rotating to the teams.
- Covering basic and opening related training sessions virtually, and incorporating on-going training for other items throughout the semester.

Multiple platforms are also being considered to provide virtual training to staff before or when they return to campus. These include but are not limited to:

- Zoom
- Microsoft Teams
- Go To Meeting
- WebEx
- Crowdcast
- Loom with PowerPoint
- Google Classroom or Google Hangout
- Banner Collaborate
- H5P (as a possibility for virtual Behind Closed Door activities)
- Campus learning/educational management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, Moodle, etc.)

Campuses interested in utilizing established online training modules for live-in/live-on staff may wish to consider the following ACUHO-I courses:

- ACUHO-I RA 101 course [for new resident assistants]
- ACUHO-I RA 201 course [for returning resident assistants]
- ACUHO-I RA Supervision course
- ACUHO-I Student Mental Health course

OUTSTANDING/UNANSWERED QUESTIONS:

- The size of groups that will be able to meet together in August, which will likely vary by state/location.
- Campus decisions regarding physical distancing, PPE usage, visitation/guests, housing occupancy, usage of common areas (lounges, kitchens, etc.), use of shared bathroom facilities, and any CPR/medical response changes to incorporate into training.
- The ability of some departments to receive approval to fill positions during hiring freezes or whether restructuring will occur within departments.
- Expectations about the enforcement of campus housing policies and COVID-19 guidelines, and the appropriate levels of response by housing staff when on duty (e.g., should they enter into student rooms, etc.).
- Whether students will be living on campus or not. If they do, and a second wave of COVID-19 emerges, how will staff responsibilities/work change; where will live-in staff go; what will the spring semester look like, etc.
- How departments support the academic mission of their respective institution with potentially reduced staffing levels, funding, etc.
CONSIDERATIONS MOVING FORWARD:

- The number of people who can meet in groups will affect individual and entire staff teams’ abilities to meet and form working relationships. New/different team bonding opportunities will need to be identified and incorporated into training to create opportunities for this to happen.
- COVID-19 has increased stress levels and anxiety for many individuals. Departments and supervisors will need to make sure they are paying attention to their staff members to ensure they are managing all the changes and new expectations, and be prepared to assist or direct to resources when needed.
- The use of technology will be more important than ever and staff members will need to become comfortable using various platforms for online and virtual training, meetings with residents and staff, hiring and on-boarding processes, etc.
- Roles and responsibilities of nearly every position within residence life may change and staff members may need to take time to evaluate whether the “new” position is something they are interested in continuing.

SHORT-TERM/COVID-19 SOLUTIONS THAT COULD BECOME A STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE:

- Virtual or remote training presentations by other presenters
- Online training for staff in the summer or portions of the fall
- Staffing reductions and/or restructured departments and new roles/expectations for staff
- Virtual meetings with staff and/or residents
- Remote working options for housing and residence life staff
- Greater reliance on virtual/online job search platforms and processes (e.g., The Placement Exchange Virtual)
- Less focus on academic initiatives (e.g., themed or learning communities) due to a greater focus on COVID-19 procedures and symptom monitoring.

COMMUNITY BUILDING

THE COMMUNITY BUILDING SUB-GROUP FOCUSED ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

- How do we build community programs during COVID-19?
- How are educational programs and activities conducted in a time when physical distancing is essential for safety?
- How will COVID-19 requirements impact learning communities and academic initiatives?
- In what areas should we encourage residential education programs to focus (e.g., social, educational, etc.)?
- Should the programming focus be on health education?

MAIN CHALLENGES THAT EXIST AROUND EVALUATING THIS ASPECT OF THE ISSUE:

- There is uncertainty about what we will be permitted to do around community gathering and in person experiences.
- For many institutions, there are limited funds to purchase software that might assist in building communities virtually.
- It is foreseeable that there could be a reduction in the workforce normally charged with community building responsibilities.

MAIN AREAS OF CONCERN FOR THE FIELD FOR THIS ELEMENT:

Building community helps establish students’ connection to campus resources and builds their sense of belonging with the broader campus community. These efforts are imperative for student retention and persistence. In an effort to keep residents safe, it is important to remember that community building continues to be an important pillar of the residential experience.
COMMON/PROMISING PRACTICES IN THIS AREA:
- Given our recent and expedient transition to a virtual college experience, we know that a vast majority of our staff and students have first-hand experience utilizing various online and virtual technologies. In this way, we've grown more accustomed to formulating and maintaining relationships beyond traditional face-to-face and real-time practices.
- Many campuses already utilize Educational Management Systems like Canvas and Blackboard to provide virtual and online experiences for the traditional curriculum. These same mechanisms are being leveraged for the co-curricular experience, as well.

OUTSTANDING/UNANSWERED QUESTIONS:
Guidelines being produced and promoted by various agencies, organizations, and governments are merely suggestions of what colleges and universities might do in their own campus environments. While this autonomy is in some ways empowering, it also leaves many questions unanswered. Question areas that rise to the top, include limited/eliminating face-to-face interactions, the use of common area spaces, programming expectations and guidelines, etc. It is clear that each campus is going to have to make the best decisions they can within the context of their environment and mission.

CONSIDERATIONS MOVING FORWARD:
- Rules guiding physical distancing should be reflected in the expectations for formal community-building experiences (i.e., floor meetings, programs, one-on-ones, etc.)
- Students should have a prescribed and safe manner to engage in informal community-building within the context of their residential facilities. This should include the ability to socialize utilizing guidelines of physical distancing. Whether this can happen in lounges, kitchenettes, and other common spaces, is yet to be determined, and again, will likely be an institutional decision.
- Practices that allow for face-to-face interactions with members of the housing and residence life team must be informed by health and safety guidelines.

SHORT-TERM/COVID-19 SOLUTIONS THAT COULD BECOME STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES:
- Reductions in traditional residence life activity, such as the creation of “door decorations” or other crafts. There won’t likely be time for this to occur before the start of the coming term. It is also difficult to imagine physical distancing in RA craft/resource rooms and the sharing of materials is also a problematic proposition.
- Individual registration process to attend events/programs. During COVID-19, this type of strategy assists practitioners in making sure we are not exceeding attendance guidelines.
- Enhanced expectations for how RAs are interacting with their residents; success around these expectations may lead to their continuation after the COVID-19 pandemic is over.

OPERATIONS & PROCESSES

THE OPERATIONS AND PROCESSES SUB-GROUP FOCUSED ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
- What budget aspects should institutions consider as they make decisions?
- Are there increased costs to opening that should be evaluated? Are there any cost savings?
- How do we promote health, safety, and well-being among all residents through appropriate facilities considerations, training, cleaning strategies, and preventative measures?
- How do we allow for a move-in process that ensures appropriate physical distancing while limiting the number of people on campus in a safe and efficient way as possible?
- What decisions have been made in collaboration with dining services around food delivery that would have an effect on students within campus housing?

MAIN CHALLENGES THAT EXIST AROUND EVALUATING THIS ASPECT OF THE
ISSUE:

- Lack of recommendations, or recommendation inconsistency between federal, state, and local levels make decision-making difficult. Geographic location and institutional appetite for risk factor in, as well.
- Increased costs and possibly decreased revenue from opening should be evaluated, including but not limited to PPE costs, adjustments to building fixtures, testing costs, additional cleaning materials and human resource costs (e.g., more staff taking sick days or needing to be quarantined, etc).
- Older facilities (e.g., dated residence halls with communal restrooms) and older HVAC systems present ideal environments for virus spread.
- Institutions have various relationships and reporting structures with partners like facilities management or dining. If the departments are separate, consensus on plans may involve additional challenges.
- If a contract is in place with a dining vendor, there may be contractual limitations on adjustments to the dining program.
- There are inherent challenges with maintaining physical distancing on a residential campus and providing meals to a student population within a dining hall not designed for this.

MAIN AREAS OF CONCERN FOR THE FIELD FOR THIS ELEMENT:

- To maintain the safety of students and staff, there will be additional costs. These costs should be estimated and included in budget planning for the fall.
- Models for housing should also consider a budget model based on new/reduced capacities. If institutions are using reduced capacities, consideration should be given to prices of room types (e.g., is a double-occupancy room used as a single charged at the double price or single price?). In addition, if there end up being less lower-cost options, colleges/universities will need to work with their bursar or financial aid office to see if there is the ability to mitigate those costs for students.
- Establishing protocols that follow CDC guidelines and best practices for training and move-in.
- The return to campus will require institutions to provide various types of training to students, faculty, and staff. If possible, this should be completed online prior to their return to campus. Ideally, training would be offered virtually by each campus and would be mandatory for all housing staff (for delivery and tracking). Supplemental training may also be required for targeted audiences (e.g., residential students, supervisors, etc.).
- Move-in protocol should be a high priority area for planning, as an improper move-in could facilitate the spread of the virus within the community. This may require the quarantining of individual students who are arriving on campus from certain locations and/or who may have been exposed prior to arrival, as dictated by local public health officials.
- Traditionally, dining halls with large numbers of students grabbing food from serving lines, buffets or salad bars would have been a normal arrangement on campus. This is not the case in the COVID-19 environment. Institutions need to consider how they will feed an entire campus within certain windows of time, while maintaining physical distancing at the point of arrival, occupancy of space, and departure from the facility.
- Other food service related considerations include: policies for how food is handled at larger faculty and staff meetings/engagements; moving to disposable food containers only; where students can/should eat if grab-and-go meals are the only option; and the impact of this type of arrangement on trash removal -- both in and outside of the residential spaces.
- Medical transport procedures may need to be reevaluated if police are utilized for this service to ensure that all community members feel safe and supported.

COMMON/PROMISING PRACTICES IN THIS AREA:

- Modeling budgets around different housing capacity scenarios, and including additional costs of operation.
- Operationalizing physical distancing best practices, including the policy to maintain 6’ separation, wearing face coverings, and regular handwashing.
- Implementing 10’ separation between desks, workstations, computer terminals, individual study areas, and other single use equipment.
- Depending on institutional guidelines, residential environments may want to make certain spaces (e.g., common areas; shared kitchens; etc.) either unavailable or have guidelines for cleaning/sanitizing.
• Having signs posted in high visibility areas within each building, including common areas, restrooms, shared office spaces, classrooms, etc. The signs should be used to communicate:
  • Reminders of physical distancing, the use of cloth face coverings, and good personal hygiene practices.
  • Specific room or space occupancy limits, if applicable.
  • Additional precautions that must be observed for unique spaces.
  • Floor markings or barrier tape to promote physical distancing.
• Routine cleaning services should be augmented with additional cleaning and disinfection activities in all areas, with varying frequency depending on the number of occupants and the space type and usage. In general, spaces with higher levels of occupants and work activity will need a higher frequency of cleaning. Cleaning by institutional housekeeping services (Facilities Management, Housing and Residence Life, contracted services, etc.) should consist of various activities:
    • Routine cleaning: waste removal, floor cleaning and wipe-down of horizontal surfaces. If dining is going to a ‘grab-n-go’ format and students return food back to campus housing, more trash may accumulate within the floors and/or buildings.
    • Routine restroom cleaning: waste removal, cleaning and disinfection of floors, sinks, toilets, and urinals.
    • Routine cleaning of dining halls/restaurants: cleaning of food preparation areas, service lines, and dining facilities.
    • Enhanced cleaning: disinfection of high-touch surfaces and wipe down of high-frequency touch points (door handles, light switches, elevator buttons, shared equipment control panels, etc.) with EPA-approved disinfectants.
    • Enhanced disinfection: disinfection of horizontal work surfaces in classrooms and common areas using EPA-approved disinfectants.
  • Sanitizing wipes or other disinfection supplies (if available) should be provided for all designated common areas for employees or students to clean their study/work area.
• Housing departments should follow the institution’s plan for COVID-19 reporting and tracking.
• Create an extended schedule to accommodate the number of people needing to move in before classes start in the fall. Limit the number of individual helpers per resident for move-in.
• Consider a phased move-in processes that allows for check-in to happen in areas that allow for physical distancing; whether keys or access can be given ahead of time; offering staggered move-in times with limited numbers of individuals allowed in a building, on a floor, in a wing, etc. at a time; having people remain in their vehicles until it is their turn to move-in.
• Limit or eliminate move-in volunteers during this time. If volunteers are allowed, consider the training and supplies that will be needed.
• Consider whether or not moving bins will be utilized, and if so, how they will be cleaned, inventoried, and monitored during this time.
• Other consideration needs to be given to things like parking on campus during this time, guests being allowed (and consideration around types, numbers, restrictions around certain types of guests based on health factors, etc.), having giveaways, dealing with ID cards, keys, and more. Other items to be discussed would center around work orders, access issues, concerns/complaints being handled, residential room check ins, staff roles, and protocols around individuals being symptomatic during move-in.

OUTSTANDING/UNANSWERED QUESTIONS:
• There is still a lack of consensus on recommendations for room capacity and bathroom-use capacity. This clarity may or may not come as the impact of COVID-19 unfolds.
• Dining and food insecurity may be magnified if institutions move to a grab-n-go or take-out option for food.
• With limited dining options available, serving individuals with dietary needs/restrictions will need to remain top of mind.
CONSIDERATIONS MOVING FORWARD:

- Meeting with finance/CBO's office to discuss budget considerations for the fall, including increased costs of operating.
- Discussing food service considerations with Dining, and specifically additional food waste in the halls, food insecurity, etc.
- Creating a facilities plan for any physical changes needed for the halls and cleaning plans to ensure a coordinated effort in high-use spaces, in particular.
- Creating a comprehensive communications plan for institutional stakeholders (i.e., students, families, staff, faculty, etc.) so they have a clear understanding of the steps the institution is taking.

SHORT-TERM COVID-19 SOLUTIONS THAT COULD BECOME STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE:

- Modelling a variety of housing scenarios for safest return.
- Modelling a variety of dining scenarios to feed students in a safe and nutritious method.
- Adding physical distancing measures to all operations and procedures as an institutional expectation.

EQUITY & INCLUSION

THE EQUITY & INCLUSION SUB-GROUP FOCUSED ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

- How pricing structures may affect housing offerings for students?
- What PPE will be accessible to professional and student staff members supporting on-campus residents?
- What institutions are doing to support students with housing insecurity, eligibility requirements, and housing exceptions?
- What resources housing/residence life professionals will need to support their teams with respect to bias, diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice in the time of COVID-19?

MAIN CHALLENGES THAT EXIST AROUND EVALUATING THIS ASPECT OF THE ISSUE:

- Each of these areas are dependent on institutional culture and capacity.
- Institutions may need to develop additional structures within their re-opening planning to address these questions.

MAIN AREAS OF CONCERN FOR THE FIELD FOR THIS ELEMENT:

- Disparity between institutions -- each institution is determining how to use their spaces based on local/state level ordinances or requirements.
- COVID-19 has already imposed significant financial strain on institutions; pricing models may provide limited opportunities for accessible housing models, as this may have long term financial implications for the upcoming fiscal year and beyond.
- Financial strain may affect access to PPE and how funds will be allocated for procurement and provisions.
- There is a significant need to support our Underrepresented Minority (URM) populations to help prevent bias and provide safe housing. URM are not only disproportionately impacted by COVID-19 but are also facing racial discrimination.

COMMON/PROMISING PRACTICES IN THIS AREA:

- Potential to build and establish more equitable pricing models to support students with higher financial need.
- Opportunities to review safety protocols for student and professional staff involved in crisis response.
- Opportunities to engage in more conversations around inclusion and social justice in the residential experience.
- Anti-Bias, allyship, and intergroup dialogue trainings for professional and student staff.
OUTSTANDING/UNANSWERED QUESTIONS:
• What are the most effective collaboration points with campus stakeholders, partners, and professional organizations for the development of resources related to bias, equity, inclusion, and social justice.

CONSIDERATIONS MOVING FORWARD
• How might ACUHO-I collaborate with other stakeholders to develop resources around bias, equity, and inclusion that will assist during the age of COVID-19 and beyond.

SHORT-TERM COVID-19 SOLUTIONS THAT COULD BECOME STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE:
• Develop collaborative housing assignment protocols to support students that experience housing insecurity and safety to secure on campus housing and receive coordinated support and care for their success.
• The provision of safety equipment for front-line staff.
• Greater flexibility around housing live-on requirements (e.g., instituting other opt-out opportunities to lower the overall cost of attendance).

STUDENT DISCIPLINE

THE STUDENT DISCIPLINE SUB-GROUP FOCUSED ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
• In what ways can campus housing officers engage with campus stakeholders to create a campus-wide commitment toward greater health and safety?
• What does the “adjudication” of a conduct case related to COVID-19 compliance look like?
• How can peer-to-peer interaction influence greater policy compliance towards a healthier and safer campus?

MAIN CHALLENGES THAT EXIST AROUND EVALUATING THIS ASPECT OF THE ISSUE:
• A variety of institutional philosophies around conduct and students’ rights & responsibilities.
• How staff in policy enforcement roles can perform their duties while following policy (e.g., physical distancing may be a more challenging proposition for a resident assistant who must confront resident behavior).
• Potential consistency issues inside versus outside of the classroom.
• Legal boundaries - what behavior can be compelled or not? What can you ask of your residential students?
• Balancing special needs with policy accountability
• Different (and sometimes conflicting) campus, town, state, etc. policies.

MAIN AREAS OF CONCERN FOR THE FIELD FOR THIS ELEMENT:
Health and safety policies due to COVID-19 will largely be a new concept and most housing officers have not had experience implementing or adjudicating cases where students are not compliant with these types of community expectations. Given that these policies are mainly about an individual’s behavior (e.g., wearing masks; maintaining social distancing; washing hands; disclosing health conditions; etc.), both the reporting of a violation and the adjudication process itself could be difficult to manage (e.g., proof; volume of cases; social distancing vs. remote conduct meetings; etc.).

COMMON/PROMISING PRACTICES IN THIS AREA:
• Leveraging public health strategies to cultivate buy-in (e.g., community strategies; workplace strategies; individual behavioral strategies; family/parent strategies; etc.)
• Developing clear and congruent communications strategy that informs community members about the necessary practices to be performed by community members.
• Collaborating with students to encourage individual commitments that will increase the health and safety of the broader community.
OUTSTANDING/UNANSWERED QUESTIONS:
• How to develop policies regarding tracing and testing and their follow-up in the case of non-compliance. This issue will likely be answered by each institution, their campus health staff, and local public health officials.
• The degree to which students, as individuals or as student groups, will comply.
• Will the implementation of these policies be similar to when campuses established “smoke-free” campuses (i.e., most will comply and those who don’t become the exception).

CONSIDERATIONS MOVING FORWARD:
• How stringent university policies can/should be when working with a student who refuses to comply.
• The level of stakeholder collaboration in the creation of policies and adjudication processes around COVID-19.
• The implementation of health and safety policies related to student behavior while participating in student activism and protests both on and off campus.

SHORT-TERM COVID-19 SOLUTIONS THAT COULD BECOME STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE:
• The development of campus commitment statements or codes for residential and non-residential students.
• The development of public health-like campaigns to educate students on necessary policies.

RISK MANAGEMENT, LIABILITY, AND COMMUNICATION

THE RISK MANAGEMENT, LIABILITY, AND COMMUNICATION SUB-GROUP FOCUSED ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
• What are the various types of risk SHOs (senior housing officers) need to be thinking about?
• What mitigation strategies can be considered to lower the identified risk?
• How can communication strategies also serve as mitigation strategies?
  • There is benefit of speaking with one institutional voice.
  • SHOs need to work closely with campus health and local health officials to craft reasonable and attainable public health goals.
  • Accuracy and consistency of information is critical to limit liability: say what you will do, do what you say.

MAIN CHALLENGES THAT EXIST AROUND EVALUATING THIS ASPECT OF THE ISSUE:
• The unique context of each institution: size, mission, region/country, resources.
• Identifying the types of risk to be assessed within that unique institutional context.
• Helping leadership and constituencies understand the limits of what can be done to mitigate risk and still fulfill our main mission of supporting the academic experience, building community, and being holistic in our approach with students.

MAIN AREAS OF CONCERN FOR THE FIELD FOR THIS ELEMENT:
• “Group Think” dominating the narrative; how to be a voice of reason without the perception of having a defensive posture.
• Decision-making based on “first-mover” announcements that may not be fully detailed in the headlines and over-committing to expectations that may not be achievable.
• Losing sight of the multiple forms of risk we are trying to mitigate (i.e., a myopic focus on the virus); the central areas of risk, include:
  • Public Health (Student Health)
  • Mental Health
  • Fiscal Solvency
  • Reputational Risk
  • Liability Risk
  • Unmet Expectation Risk
COMMON/PROMISING PRACTICES IN THIS AREA:
• Using a checklist to ensure the various risks get defined, prioritized, and expectations for mitigation are set and shared.
• Understand the various mitigation tools and the pros/cons of each for your campus -- is a change in policy best, or should you focus on updating protocols and procedures that are more fluid? Is changing the language in your housing contract/agreement/license the right path, or is an addendum or liability waiver more appropriate?
• Asking questions that might still be left unspoken (avoiding “Group-Think”); what long-term or hidden ramifications are there to each pathway we are considering?

OUTSTANDING/UNANSWERED QUESTIONS:
• Many campuses haven't confirmed final plans for re-opening.
• Off-campus life is still a consideration, especially for institutions with no live-on requirement.
  • Reputational risk of making on-campus life so restrictive that students want to live off campus
  • Housing insecurity risk if reduced on-campus occupancy pushes student off campus where housing might be insufficient to meet demand.

CONSIDERATIONS MOVING FORWARD:
• To what level can you reasonably enforce the following:
  • Restrictions on lounges and other common spaces.
  • Guest Policy modifications or elimination of guests.
  • Enforcement of face coverings, temperature taking, contact tracing.
  • Expectations of self-isolation for traveling students.

WHAT SHORT-TERM COVID-19 SOLUTIONS MIGHT BECOME A STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE:
• More Public Health language in housing contracts.
• Force majeure clauses in contracts: Force majeure clauses allocate risk between contracting parties by relieving obligations under exceptional and/or unforeseeable circumstances deemed beyond the control of the parties. These clauses expand upon the common law doctrines of impracticability and impossibility, which also may relieve parties of their contractual obligations (even in the absence of an express force majeure clause).

MITIGATION STRATEGIES

THE MITIGATION SUB-GROUP FOCUSED ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:
• How should institutions plan for quarantine/isolation space needs?
• What facility and policy changes are needed for mitigating contact and the possible spreading of the virus within their campus community?
• How institutions should plan and manage systems for potential outbreaks after students have moved in?

MAIN CHALLENGES THAT EXIST AROUND EVALUATING THIS ASPECT OF THE ISSUE?
• Mitigation strategy implementation is a topic that relies upon a number of other decision points and criteria, including the institutional capacity decision, residential live-on requirement/population on campus, and institutional resources (e.g., budget; available buildings, etc.), to name a few.
• Mitigation strategies implemented on any given campus will have a strong tie to locality, and specifically, public health determinations within that environment.
MAIN AREAS OF CONCERN FOR THE FIELD FOR THIS ELEMENT:

- Testing, tracing, and tracking are critical elements to a successful and sustained recovery and re-opening plan. However, many campus and local health authorities cannot guarantee the resources will be in place to support these activities.
- Safety protocols and supplies for staff who will work within facilities.
- Managing off-campus students in quarantine/isolation space planning, and different student types (graduate students with dependents, etc.). A central question is whether the institution will manage these populations, even if they do not live on-campus property.
- Similarly, there is the question of whether the institution will manage fraternity and sorority COVID-19 issues and whether institutional housing will serve these populations who traditionally live off-campus.
- Campuses will need to decide if revenue beds can be removed from usable capacity for quarantine/isolation space.
- Institutional decision-makers will also need to examine the financial pro forma requirements for campus housing and/or partner contracts (P3) relative to changes in usable capacity.
- Housing departments will need to develop plans, policies, and protocols for usage of common spaces in residential facilities.

COMMON/PROMISING PRACTICES IN THIS AREA:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR QUARANTINE PLANNING
For students who are notified of COVID-19 exposure, the best course of action is to move that student to a designated quarantine area where there is ideally one student per room and restroom ratio. With approval of the public health department and/or student health services and appropriate oversight/controls, students may be allowed to quarantine in pairs or groups of like-exposed individuals and share restroom facilities. This living situation should remain in place for 14 days (per current CDC guidance) and should only be discontinued if the student has a negative PCR/antigen test and shows no signs of infection on the release day. Clearance should be given by a qualified member of the student health center staff.

While separate quarantine facilities are highly recommended by the CDC and the American College Health Association (ACHA) and considered the best possible option, if campuses are unable to provide separate quarantine space, students may be allowed to quarantine in their residential facility. However, that student must have access to a private restroom, and meals and other needs must be provided to the student. These needs could include mental health services, academic support, and laundry services among others. Students may quarantine together with roommates if it is established that both students have been exposed and require quarantine.

Under no circumstances should exposed/quarantined students remain in a residential facility where there is no private restroom option for quarantined individuals.

Campuses must be prepared to work with concerned parents about plans to meet the health and academic needs of quarantined students.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ISOLATION PLANNING
For students who have tested positive for COVID-19, the best course of action is to move that student to a designated isolation area where there is ideally one student per room and restroom ratio. With approval of the public health department and/or the student health service and appropriate oversight/controls, students may be allowed to isolate with other confirmed COVID-19 positive students and share restroom facilities. The amount of time in isolation for each student will vary according to symptoms and test results.

Per CDC guidelines, isolation may be discontinued when:
- At least 3 days (72 hours) have passed since recovery defined as resolution of fever without the use of fever-reducing medications and improvement in respiratory symptoms (e.g., cough, shortness of breath); and,
- At least 10 days have passed since symptoms first appeared.

Another option to evaluate a student’s readiness to be released from isolation, per CDC guidelines, is
- Resolution of fever without the use of fever-reducing medications, and
- Improvement in respiratory symptoms (e.g., cough, shortness of breath), and
• Negative results of PCR/antigen testing from at least two consecutive respiratory specimens collected ≥24 hours apart (total of two negative specimens).

Clearance should be given by a qualified member of the student health center staff and/or county health department. The specific protocol and approval process should be specified in advance of a campus reopening and transparently promoted everywhere.

It is further recommended that each campus have plans regarding how they are able to meet accommodation requirements (ADA, ESA, etc.) within its various quarantine and isolation plans.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS EACH CAMPUS SHOULD EXPLORE:

• Country/state/local/county health departments should be consulted for all quarantine/isolation plans, including testing and tracing models.
• Determine if a campus can designate available beds for quarantine/isolation or contract with local hotels.
• Update policies, handbooks, contracts, and addendums to reflect new changes to your housing program.
• Modify/change policies that eliminate residency requirements.
• Consult with the local health department on enforcement guidelines for quarantine violations.
• Develop social norming campaigns and community standards in partnership with health promotions/student health services and/or other health professionals that are aligned with appropriate health and safety guidelines.
• Provide positive reinforcement to students for following guidelines and supporting other community members to do the same (prizes, giveaways, etc.).
• Examine evacuation protocols to manage social distancing.
• Stairwell, elevator, and door access changes that manage wayfinding direction.
• Reducing high-touch surface areas.
• Consider whether students will be required to subscribe to a tracing app.
• Proper training and support of housing staff for managing health issues and identifying best practice to managing asymptomatic residents with support, care, and confidentiality.

OUTSTANDING/UNANSWERED QUESTIONS:

• Development of effective plans to manage a second surge/campus outbreak of COVID-19, that would require closing of campus residence halls/apartments.
• HIPPA/FERPA and other record keeping issues related to contact tracing, tracking, quarantine and isolation information sharing.

CONSIDERATIONS MOVING FORWARD:

• Establish continuity documentation, such as guiding principles for the institution, as a part of its recovery and re-opening plans. An example would be the University of Alabama at Birmingham.
**RECOMMENDED RESOURCES**

**GENERAL:**

[https://www.acuho-i.org/resources/cid/7284](https://www.acuho-i.org/resources/cid/7284)

ACHA (May 7, 2020). Considerations for reopening institutions of higher education in the COVID-19 era.  
[https://acha-test.app.box.com/s/k202537ahi3w27b0w6cdhqxynr3vljif](https://acha-test.app.box.com/s/k202537ahi3w27b0w6cdhqxynr3vljif)


**CAPACITY & ASSIGNMENTS:**

NSSE (2020). Campus Housing, Student Engagement and Persistence.  
[https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/handle/2022/25168](https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/handle/2022/25168)

WBUR (June 5, 2020). To reopen campus, colleges prepare to take on contagious students.  
[https://www.wbur.org/edify/2020/06/05/college-plan-contagious-students](https://www.wbur.org/edify/2020/06/05/college-plan-contagious-students)

**STAFFING & HR:**

ACUHO-I Courses: [https://www.acuho-i.org/online-learning/courses-and-certificates](https://www.acuho-i.org/online-learning/courses-and-certificates)  
• ACUHO-I RA 101 [for new resident assistants]  
• ACUHO-I RA 201 [for returning resident assistants] -- COMING SOON  
• ACUHO-I RA Supervision  
• ACUHO-I Student Mental Health

**OPERATIONS & PROCESSES:**


MITIGATION STRATEGIES:


CDC (August 2020). Infectious SARS-CoV-2 in Feces of Patient with Severe COVID-19

The Hill (May 28, 2020). Pentagon considers cutting coronavirus quarantines to 10 days.

UAB (n.d.). Guide to Re-entry - Coronavirus
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