

Winter Term 2021 Coordinating Committee

Final Report

Submitted by

Campus Coordinating Committee

4 November 2020

Table of Contents

Executive summary.....	3
Committee members and contributors.....	4
Timeline and sources of input	4
High-level background.....	5
Summary of community input.....	10
Students.....	10
Instructors.....	12
Staff	13
Student Life.....	14
Access to libraries, study spaces and experiential learning facilities.....	15
Curricular support.....	15
Policy modifications and enforcement, on and off campus.....	16
Recommendations for winter 2021.....	18
Concluding remarks.....	18
Appendix.....	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Document format and purpose

This document is organized into a memorandum intended to describe the committee's recommendations and process. Other information is found in the Appendix. Unless noted, recommendations made for students are for undergraduates, graduate students and professional students.

Committee charge

The winter 2021 planning committee was charged to complete the following:

- Review lessons learned from the fall 2020 semester;
- Gather input from the campus community to inform winter 2021 decisions; and
- Make recommendations to support decision making regarding winter 2021.

Summary of key findings - For fall 2020 semester

- Overall, the campus community sustained but did not thrive in a public health-informed residential semester.
- The campus experienced several challenges, some anticipated and some not, and adapted reasonably well while attempting to execute during a global pandemic.
- Given the wide diversity of disciplines at the University across the units, there is no consensus between instructors and students regarding the preferred mode of course delivery — most constituencies prefer having a choice.
- The workload for instructors, staff and students is substantially higher than normal. Stress and mental health issues persist to a very high degree in all groups.
- Testing availability and policies continue to persist as a source of concern in the community — concerns about public health dominate community behavior with respect to access to campus.
- Greater enforcement of proper public health behavior by undergraduates is desired by a majority of instructors and students.

Summary of recommendations - For winter 2021 semester

- The University should continue on its current path to offer a mostly remote but partially residential academic semester.
- A portfolio of in-person, hybrid and remote classes should be offered to ensure student and instructor choice in teaching modalities — hybrid is seen as the most demanding instructional mode.
- We should endeavor to maintain the same mix of in-person, hybrid and remote classes throughout the semester — “truth in advertising” and stability.
- Academic units should continue to have the flexibility in determining instructional mode mix and processes to conduct their academic missions; e.g., for accredited learning objectives or licensure.

- Where possible, the student experience should be enhanced with a focus on extra-curricular academic and research opportunities, top-notch virtual social activities (and exploring safe in-person options), and improved access to mental health support.
- Two mid-week break days should be incorporated into the winter 2021 academic calendar.
- COVID testing must be increased significantly and visibly — a robust program to increase student participation in on-campus testing is essential.
- Regarding enforcement, the campus should consider increasing the consequences of large unsanctioned student social activities.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND CONTRIBUTORS

Committee members:

Amy Dittmar	(Provost's Office/Ross)	Tim McKay	(LSA)
Alec Gallimore	(Engineering)	Elizabeth Moje	(Education)
Christine Gerdes	(Provost's Office)	Paul Robinson	(Provost's Office)
James Hilton	(Provost's Office)	Mike Solomon	(Rackham/Engineering)
Laura Blake Jones	(Student Life)	Lynn Videka	(Social Work)
Laurie McCauley	(Dentistry)		

Contributing organizations:

Office of the Vice President for Student Life – Janel Sutkus
 Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA) – MaryJo Banasik, Ivo Dinov,
 Martha McComas and Kentaro Toyama

TIMELINE AND SOURCES OF INPUT

Timeline of activities:

- Coordinating Committee reconvened 15 October
- Coordinating Committee community input 19 - 23 October
- Coordinating Committee planning meeting 26 October
- Academic Program Group (APG) discussion 27 October
- Document delivered to provost 29 October
- Final Coordinating Committee meeting 29 October
- Activities concluded and final product delivered 30 October

Sources of input

- Student input
 - Survey - Sent to all learners enrolled in the Ann Arbor campus
 - Focus group discussions - Conducted in select residence halls

- COVID19 Faculty Council
- Instructor survey - Sent to all tenure-track and clinical track faculty, lecturers, and GSIs
- Staff survey - Sent to student affairs/student life staff, budget administrators, and chief human resources officers in academic units
- Public Health Steering Committee
- Deans and directors (APG)

HIGH-LEVEL BACKGROUND

Higher education is being battered not only by the COVID-19 pandemic but also by social and political crises. Planning when uncertainty prevails is a daunting task. We should take advantage of this moment. We can go well beyond focusing simply on survival to explore practices that could elevate our campus to a new level for a new era of higher education. In the summer, decisions needed to be made with very little evidence. Looking forward to winter term, we have a small but growing base of experience and reflection to assist in guiding our choices.

Key dates in spring:

- Halfway through the winter 2020 semester, it became clear that the emerging COVID-19 pandemic threatened the campus community;
- On 11 March, the decision was announced to pause classes for two days, then move all instruction to fully online delivery from 16 March until the end of the term; and
- By 24 March, most of campus was shut down, with most faculty and staff (other than essential service providers) working remotely.

Because of the intense disruption during this term, new grading policies (e.g., P/NRC) were adopted by default for undergraduates and graduate students, with the opportunity to uncover reported letter grades. In the end, more than 70% of grades were uncovered. During the spring and summer, all classes were fully remote, and a gradual research ramp-up was successfully undertaken. This research activity has continued, with no sign of virus transmission in research spaces.

In April, the provost established and charged a set of seven committees with defining guiding principles and pathways for the Ann Arbor campus to deliver public health-informed, resilient instruction for fall 2020 in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the first tasks this group achieved was to develop a set of guiding principles:

- Deliver high-quality, engaged instruction for all students, whether on campus or remote, with as much in-person academic experiences as possible;
- Develop robust processes such that students will have adequate infrastructure (technology, internet connectivity) to engage fully in all course offerings;
- Equity, inclusion, accessibility, and student success will drive decisions and be central goals and success metrics for all courses and services;

- Optimize space for activities that require or benefit greatly from in-person engagements;
- Whether planning for an in-person, hybrid/hyflex, or fully remote course, maintain the caliber, integrity, and standards of instruction representative of a University of Michigan education;
- While maintaining high standards, also show compassion and concern;
- Effective, comprehensive, and thoughtful communication across the community will be integral to success; and
- Create a welcoming environment for all students, especially new students of all levels/units.

We believe these guiding principles remain germane for winter 2021 planning.

Key events that shaped the fall term:

- A decision to conduct a public health-informed, in-residence fall semester was announced on 22 June. Decisions about instructional modes for each fall course were made in various ways among the schools and colleges.
- Students began returning to campus on 24 August, and classes began on 31 August. With nearly 80% of courses fully online, the semester began smoothly, with campus density very low. To date there is little sign that in-person or hybrid instruction has caused virus transmission.

Over the summer, police killings of Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, and other African Americans led to widespread protests, adding to the stress in our community already created by the virus, its consequences, and a highly contested national election season.

Other key events that shaped the fall term include the following:

- Ann Arbor Public Schools announced on 23 July that they would offer only online instruction in the fall, which substantially (and in many cases negatively) impacted families throughout our community;
- On 8 September, the Graduate Employees Union began a strike, calling for the right to work remotely, enhanced COVID testing and defunding of the campus police. The strike was joined by a group of Resident Assistants on 9 September, also calling for enhanced COVID testing along with more personal protective equipment. The strike disrupted both online and in-person classes, and amplified emerging faculty dissent;
- The GEO strike continued until 16 September. On the same day the Faculty Senate held its largest ever meeting and passed several contentious resolutions;
- The week of 20 September brought the first signs that COVID infection was spreading in the student community, with 278 cases reported;
- Four weeks later on 20 October, amid a strong national increase in the number of new COVID cases, the Washtenaw County Health Department announced a stay-in-place order for all U-M undergraduates; and

- In response, hybrid and in-person classes were encouraged to move online beginning 21 October. Courses that benefit greatly from in-person/hybrid instruction were permitted to remain in that mode. This order is still in effect, and students are being offered the opportunity to leave campus for the remainder of the term.

Lessons learned:

What worked:

- The shift of most campus staff operations to remote work has been remarkably successful;
- The gradual return to research has succeeded and enabled research that requires access to campus to resume with low risk;
- The redesign of campus spaces for public health informed in-person instruction has enabled limited in-person instruction to be conducted safely;
- The Wolverine Culture of Care served as a strong foundation for community expectations initially supported by the Michigan Ambassador program that underwent significant modifications based upon community perception and input. The COVID Concerns Reporting Line remains an important aspect of accountability infrastructure;
- Our educational settings and in-person experiences have been orchestrated with compliance and aligned with public health recommendations. As a consequence, there is little evidence of viral transmission in our educational facilities;
- Essential in-person educational experiences, such as those required for accredited learning objectives or licensure, have been able to continue. Health science students have been likewise able to participate in required clinical work;
- The campus community has held together, with robust enrollment of both new and continuing students at every level;
- Most courses appear to be running well, with instructors finding ways to adapt to new instructional circumstances and experimenting with novel pedagogy;
- Outstanding IT support and effort has enabled both curricular and extracurricular technology-dependent academic programs as well as extra-curricular programs to engage and respond to students;
- Remote academic advising and on-campus study spaces have been used by more than half of students; and
- The provision of individualized approaches for units to deliver their educational curriculum in a manner most conducive for discipline and learner optimization. We recognize that some areas can be effectively delivered in a remote platform while others are clearly better or essential to be delivered in person.

What didn't work:

- The campus COVID testing program has been widely criticized for its initially limited scope and frustrations students have had with access to asymptomatic testing. Many students have elected and continue to elect to test off-campus and a subset have been non-responsive to case investigation and contact tracing efforts;
- We have been unable to completely restrict the spread of the virus, especially in the undergraduate student community, both on campus and off;
- A lack of clarity of how to deal with COVID+ cases and/or individuals exposed to COVID-19 persists;
- Concerns about housing conditions, food service options and the initial lack of amenities in isolation/quarantine housing were substantial (albeit addressed throughout the semester);
- Hybrid instruction has been very demanding for instructors and students;
- Community building and co-curricular activities were significantly and negatively affected in the residence halls due to fear and distrust among Michigan Housing ResEd staff;
- Residence hall student isolation and frustration were problematic due to strict enforcement of social gatherings;
- The Ambassador Program attempted to promote safe behavior while providing accountability for students in violation of public health guidance. Campus stakeholders did not support the program resulting in program reductions and this interfered with efforts to promote safe behavior and accountability;
- The workload for faculty and students is substantially higher than normal;
- Stress and mental health issues persist in all groups: faculty, staff and students;
- Instability in our delivery of services to students (in testing, quarantine space, options for social activity, in-person dining options, and courses due to the GEO strike and stay-in-place order) has undermined trust in our ability to deliver a safe, consistent and effective winter term;
- The abrupt change generated by the Washtenaw County Health Department order generated significant stress and anxiety among undergraduates and instructors; and
- The quality of the residential life experience.

Decision-making context:

Several factors complicate decision making for the winter 2021 semester.

First, on campus, until the recent order, public health conditions were as bad as they have been during the pandemic and were getting worse. Across this state, the nation and many other countries, the pandemic continues to spread. While local testing capacity is expanding rapidly, flu season adds to the challenge. Experience shows that coronaviruses are in general more active from December to April. The risk of an outbreak sufficient to require closing the campus again is significant.

Second, trust within the campus community has been eroded by repeated setbacks and shifts in direction experienced during the fall. There is deep disagreement among faculty, students and staff about the safety of in-person operation. Restoring this trust is an important goal.

Third, we approach the winter term in a climate of significant political uncertainty, awaiting the results of a highly contested national election, certain to have important consequences for the campus community and the University's future.

This combination of substantial uncertainty and fractured trust makes planning for winter 2021 both challenging and exceptionally important. Our plan should be designed with careful consideration of the full range of community input, a focus on undertaking a safe approach to instruction that is sustainable for the term, and attending to the desire of some for increased campus engagement.

Balancing important concerns:

In weighing possible approaches to winter 2021 planning, we stress four areas of concern.

1. **Academic mission:** We seek to ensure that all of our students and faculty can continue to advance their academic mission in as many ways as possible. This includes completing important coursework, engaging in undergraduate, graduate and faculty research and creative activities, receiving mentorship and advice, and preparing for our individual and collective futures.
2. **Student, staff and faculty experience:** Activities beyond the academic play an important role in student success, both in the moment and in the long-term. We need to ensure that student life on campus and off - and staff and faculty working conditions - are as safe, engaging and supportive as possible.
3. **Public health:** We must prioritize the physical health of our students, staff, faculty and the surrounding Ann Arbor community. This includes both responding to COVID-19 and maintaining the capacity to provide accessible care around other concerns.
4. **Mental health and community well-being:** The stresses experienced due to 2020's combination of threats have been unprecedented. We must support all members of our community as they work through them, both as individuals and family members, and as contributors to our campus community.

Our decision-making will affect each of these concerns both in the moment (during the winter 2021 term) and in the long-term.

Decision inputs to consider:

- **Stakeholder perspectives:** The fall planning process we undertook in the summer drew on input from a large number of individuals spread across campus. Unfortunately, it provided limited opportunities for direct input from the majority of our students, faculty

and staff. In contrast, our winter planning has drawn on more open input from the community. Campus-wide student and instructor surveys have been completed and summarized by this committee in partnership with student-life and SACUA, respectively. Staff input has been provided through a campus-wide survey of staff leadership.

The input from these surveys should be apparent in the development of the winter 2021 plan. This input is essential because it reveals on-the-ground concerns of the individuals who will have to execute the winter term plan. While the results of this survey input are summarized elsewhere, we stress two general caveats to keep in mind:

- First, the response rates for the student/instructor surveys are not high, ~20% in most cases. It is unclear whether the responses here are fully representative of the views of each community. That said, the number of responses is quite large, so we have received input from many independent individuals; and
 - Second, it is clear there is substantial disagreement within our community about how best to safely and effectively operate the winter semester. When there is such a diversity of views, planning should consider both average responses and keep in mind the full distribution of views. For example, while it is promising that 73% of our undergraduates said it was ‘not at all’ or ‘a little’ difficult to connect to courses, we should not lose sight that 5% (nearly 300 respondents) found this ‘very’ difficult.
- **Expert input:** Campus expertise from a diverse set of fields should contribute in an important manner to this planning. Given the need to restore trust on campus, it would be helpful for diverse expert views informing planning to be shared as directly as possible with the community.
 - **Learning from experience:** Perhaps our principal advantage in planning for winter 2021 is the experience we have had in all aspects of operating during the fall term. Each aspect of winter term planning should seek to address the challenges encountered, and build on successes that were discovered during fall term. Our ambition should be to make the winter semester substantially safer, happier and more effective, despite taking place under perhaps even more extreme constraints than in the fall term.

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY INPUT

(Details in Appendix)

Students

BACKGROUND

All Ann Arbor campus degree-seeking students at the University of Michigan were offered the opportunity to respond to a survey of their experiences of the fall 2020 public health-informed semester. The survey was designed, administered, and analyzed by the Office of Student Life

Assessment and Research to address research themes identified by the Provost's Coordinating Committee, Student Life, and the Office of the Provost. A set of five focus groups of undergraduate housing residents was also conducted 13-15 October 2020.

FINDINGS

The survey found that slightly more than half of undergraduates had a course that offered an in-person experience in fall 2020. Among those students, approximately two-thirds had a remote option available in these courses and used it, while one-quarter had a remote option and did not use it. Thus, undergraduate participation in in-person instruction was low – with no more than about one-sixth of undergraduates participating in one or more courses in person.

The most common reasons for students choosing to attend remotely when in-person was available were concern for peer and instructors' health and concern for one's own health.

Nearly three-quarters of undergraduates and master's students reported that their workload is more than what they expected or experienced in the past. For doctoral and professional students, 42% and 59% reported a higher workload, respectively. When asked, "In general, how would you compare your remote learning experience to your in-person learning experience?" some 83% of undergraduates reported that the in-person experience is better than the remote experience. The comparison to the type of in-person experience is unclear in this case, especially as so few students are engaged in in-person learning this term. We surmise that the comparison is to a combination of the in-person experiences of this term as well as pre-pandemic in-person experiences.

Undergraduate students in underrepresented or traditionally marginalized populations (women, underrepresented races, first-generation, and below median income) feel less comfort than their peers who are men, majority races, continuing-generation, or above median income.

Finally, students were asked about their potential winter 2021 plans, given different instructional scenarios. Students reported that if the winter 2021 semester is in the same format as the fall 2020 semester, at least 85% at each degree level intends to remain enrolled. Undergraduates are least certain, with 11% not sure of their plans. No more than 4% at any degree level intends to take the semester off in winter 2021 under this scenario.

Uncertainty and intent not to enroll increase if winter 2021 is fully remote. For example, "not sure of their plans" and "take the semester off" increased to 17% and 8%, respectively for undergraduates for the fully remote scenario.

Finally, considering the fall 2020 living situation and their winter 2021 intentions, 21% of undergraduates who live in University Housing either plan to move out, are unsure of their plans, or intend not to enroll if the instructional scenario is the same in winter 2021.

Instructors

BACKGROUND

The instructor survey was designed, administered, and analyzed by a team comprising members of SACUA, the Office of the Provost and the Provost's Coordinating Committee. This team jointly prepared, distributed, and analyzed a survey for all instructors on their fall 2020 experiences and winter 2021 preferences. The survey was sent to four instructor groups (Tenured/Tenure-track, Clinical, Lecturer, and GSIs) in four separate batches, allowing viewing of the responses by track. All groups received the same survey content.

FINDINGS

The vast majority of respondents indicated that they were teaching in some form of virtual instruction (this includes those who responded "other").

The vast majority of respondents across all tracks indicated that concerns over safety (virus transmission) led them to change the medium of instruction. Graduate student instructors were less likely than all other tracks to indicate their own health concerns as a reason for changing the medium of instruction.

A very small number of respondents indicated that they changed their medium of instruction due to students not attending in person, although the T/TT faculty respondents (10%) were the most likely to indicate that students' absence from class shaped their decision to change the medium of instruction.

The majority of respondents indicated that their courses were going as expected (57%) or better than expected (26%), across all tracks, producing close to a normal distribution in responses, with the poles ("far exceeding expectations" and "well below expectations") representing extremely small numbers of responses. GSI respondents and clinical faculty were overrepresented in the response that the course was going "below expectations," both at 12%, compared to 8% for T/TT faculty respondents and 6% for lecturer respondents. A large segment of respondents (37%) reported that they needed no additional resources because they felt comfortable with the medium in which they were teaching. Approximately 14% of the respondents indicated that nothing would help because the medium would be ineffective.

The remaining responses were scattered across categories. Given that respondents could select more than one support and that responses were somewhat evenly distributed across the choices, it seems that instructors would appreciate any or all of the supports indicated, which included: (a) IT support or coaching; (b) a teaching assistant to monitor technology; (c) professional development in how to use particular tools; and (d) new or additional technologies. GSI respondents reported desiring the latter two supports in greater numbers (professional development 14% and new technologies 17%) and were less likely (7%) than faculty respondents (16%) to indicate a desire for a teaching assistant.

The majority of respondents (~68%) indicated a preference for some sort of virtual teaching in the winter semester.

Reasons for winter semester preferences are the same as those for fall choices of medium of instruction: Concerns over safety/virus transmission (71%), followed by lack of trust in public health protocols (23%) and concerns over student behavior (25%). Health concerns do appear to play a role in choice of medium, but in smaller numbers than other concerns (17% indicate personal health concerns; 22% family health concerns.)

Staff

BACKGROUND

In an effort to collect input from staff who are the directly engaged in student-facing work closely related to the academic experience, a brief “pulse” survey was distributed to 506 staff in the following groups:

- Student Affairs Network (SAN) (56)
- Vice President for Student Life (VPSL) (370, 3 overlap with SAN)
 - Student Life Leadership Assembly (managers and supervisors)
 - Up Close Group (front line/entry level staff)
 - Connect Group (mid-level, first level supervisors)
- Budget Administrators Group (BAG) (56)
- Chief Human Resources Officers of each Academic Affairs unit (HR) (28; 1 duplicate with BAG)

SAN/VPSL staff received a version of the survey focused on their own experiences, while HR/BAG received a version that focused on their role as reporters of what they are hearing from staff in their units. We acknowledge the limited sampling of the survey and that the results reported here may not be representative of how the staff as a whole feel.

FINDINGS

SAN/VPSL:

About half of respondents are splitting their time between onsite and remote work (another small percentage are back full-time, or remained onsite throughout). About 38% are working entirely remotely, despite having worked on campus pre-COVID. Some 90% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree that: (1) their unit has adapted well to changes in work conditions; and (2) their work is valued within their unit. About 77% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree that: (1) their work experience has been positive; and (2) feel confident in the strategic direction of their unit.

However, only 63% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree that they feel confident in the strategic direction of the University and 61% strongly or somewhat agree that they feel included in decisions that impact their work. A very high percentage of respondents have sometimes, often, or very often been concerned about the well-being of the student body (97%), their U-M colleagues (96%), their friends and family (95%) and their own health and well-being (89%).

When asked about plans for the winter 2021 semester, 56% of respondents somewhat (34%) or strongly (22%) agree that the approach to winter 2021 should stay the same as the public health-informed approach to fall 2020. When asked about areas of greatest concern if winter 2021 follows the same approach as fall 2020, the top 5 answers were:

- Student health and well-being (82%);
- Colleagues' health and well-being (66%);
- Employee morale (61%);
- Employee's own health and well-being (55%); and
- University financial impacts (49%).

The above results contrast with the areas of greatest concern if winter 2021 is fully remote:

- University financial impacts (65%);
- Student co-curricular experience (50%);
- Student academic experience (48%);
- Student success (46%); and
- Employee morale (44%).

BAG/HR:

All respondents somewhat or strongly agree that their unit has adapted well to changes in work conditions, and 97% somewhat or strongly agree that their work is valued within their unit. Some 82% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree that their work experience has been positive, and 85% feel confident in the strategic direction of their unit versus 72% feeling confident in the strategic direction of the University. About 85% somewhat or strongly agree that they feel included in decisions that impact their work (compared to only 61% of the SAN/VPLS group).

When asked about plans for the winter 2021 semester, 91% of BAG/HR respondents somewhat (49%) or strongly (42%) agree that the approach to winter 2021 should stay the same as the public-health informed approach to fall 2020.

STUDENT LIFE

For winter 2021, Student Life's co-curricular and essential services offerings align with and are informed by the viability of in-person classes and the same safety measures required for the delivery of in-person instruction. Given the fall 2020 experience with challenges around safety and student wellness, we should be realistic about the limitations associated with a residential experience during winter 2021. Weather preventing outdoor activities, increased virus spread and risk, intensified surveillance and disciplinary measures to prevent unsafe socializing will severely impact the capacity of staff to build community, connect students and deliver a residential experience that aligns with our institutional values. Inviting students to come to reside on campus for Winter presents inherent risks as doing so could threaten their well-being and as

they may be penalized for attempting to engage in social behavior that is normal and healthy for their developmental stage. The long-term consequences should be balanced with perceived short term benefits of being on campus this winter. Likewise the liability risk of minimized capacity for support is concerning. These challenges, combined with the likelihood that most academic courses will likely continue to be remote, support an approach that limits access to services and housing on-campus to graduate students, with exceptions for expanding access to certain undergraduate cohorts based on need.

ACCESS TO LIBRARIES, STUDY SPACES AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING FACILITIES

On-campus study spaces, modified to meet public health constraints, have played an important role in supporting students during the fall semester, especially for students living in University housing. Facilities and IT staff made these spaces reservable online in September. Examples include open study spaces like the LSA atrium, the Union, and the League, hundreds of individually reservable classrooms and meeting rooms, and spaces in libraries. Usage of these spaces has varied. While guidance about what will be prioritized for the winter term should be informed by usage experience from this fall, the final decision should bear in mind that cold weather will restrict the use of outdoor spaces, and that reduced dorm occupancy may alter demand. Moreover, input from the student survey clearly shows their expressed desire to have these spaces made available to them.

CURRICULAR SUPPORT

Curriculum support has been mostly online or hybrid this term, as have most extra-curricular activities, other than living-learning communities (some of those have also been mostly virtual). In most units, the instructional technology and instructional design staff have been the lifeline to learning this semester, both at the campus level (AI and CRLT) and at the academic unit level.

Most units improved technology-based pedagogy to support learning by adding synchronous, although remote, learning experiences to courses. Extra-curricular and curriculum support activities deployed technology to the extent possible. Most student services were offered remotely. Units and central academic and extracurricular support found it challenging to keep up with all students and to implement all-student contact programs, which are much needed. Improved technology and the knowledge to use it to its fullest effect is still needed. Student stress is high and CAPS and academic units are stretched beyond their limits.

Recommendations include the following:

- Continue strong support for curriculum support and extracurricular programs in the winter term;
- Support needed technology for every curriculum support and extracurricular unit;

- Continue CRLT's excellent resources for and engagement of faculty during the pandemic. Faculty should be encouraged to attend the "Building Community Online" sessions; and
- The guidelines for engaged learning have worked well and should be continued.

POLICY MODIFICATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT, ON AND OFF CAMPUS

Policy Enforcement - On and Off Campus

On Campus - Intensified Community Safety Measures for Winter Semester

The increased risks of virus spread in winter would require a sustained approach to addressing social gatherings that violate public health policies. Increased accountability to ensure referrals for violations is necessary.

Intensified accountability would include no tolerance for certain violations and specifically addressing large social gatherings of three or more with automatic probation whether the incident involved alcohol or not. This approach would include automatic contract termination for violations of public health violations in Quarantine/Isolation Housing and referrals to OSCR for off-campus students engaging in these behaviors.

Intensified measures for first-time offenses

For all first violations that do not result in automatic contract termination, we will explore parent/family notification, probation status and adapt the community circle program. The current practice is to send a Letter of Concern (LOC) for first-time offenses that do not include alcohol. While recidivism rates were low in the fall, we are finding that there is even less recidivism for students who engage with professional staff following COVID-19 violations.

The program would require residents to participate in four bi-weekly group meetings with community circle facilitators. Groups would be a support system for individuals who have violated public health guidelines, specifically helping them to build community, hold each other accountable, and discuss proactive steps to remain an active participant of the community. The space would also provide coaching to assist students with social group dynamics, as students have shared in conduct meetings that they struggle with setting boundaries, and help them be connected to opportunities on campus. For individuals who successfully complete the program, their first offense (warning or probation) would come off their internal housing record.

Off Campus - intensified community safety measures for winter semester

Maintain the COVID Concerns Reporting Line as a mechanism for students, faculty, staff and Ann Arbor community members to report off-campus concerns. Continue partnerships between

UMPD and the Ann Arbor Police Department in enforcement actions. Sustain partnership with Washtenaw County Public Health officials in enforcing county public health orders. Increased engagement and referrals by local police for violations is required.

For student organizations hosting social gatherings, continue to engage the relevant inter/national organizations (notify of violations and outcomes). Sustain practice where any COVID-19 violation results in immediate de-recognition by the University throughout the accountability process.

For individual students, consider initiating the Formal Conflict Resolution process (FCR by agreement → FCR arbitration) for the first time hosting of large (25+) social gatherings and elevate to Emergency Suspension with VPSL approval for hosting large (50+) social gatherings.

During the fall term, we learned a great deal about compliance and witnessed some successes such as student behavioral change in challenging circumstances and compliance that comes with pop-up testing, all of which kept the pandemic spread mostly at bay on campus. Despite these efforts, more enforcement is needed to increase compliance in public health measures. Moreover, community input clearly speaks to the desire for improved enforcement measures. These measures will be particularly true if we move to a frequent mandatory testing protocol for certain members of our community; e.g., students in on-campus housing. Thus, we recommend that the University commit to using both “carrots and sticks” to ensure compliance in winter 2021.

Some possible options include:

- MCard access linked to getting any mandatory testing, this will provide a strong incentive to those in the residence halls as well as students with in-person classes or that use study space and thus are on campus;
- Spot checking at the entrance of residence halls, buildings and dining for the completion of the ResponsiBlue app;
- Encourage students to self-regulate their community via social media (e.g., Jackets Infect Jackets at Georgia Tech); and
- Increase the negative repercussions of major violations (e.g., expulsion) and communicate this policy shift to students, their parents/guardians, and the broader campus community to instill confidence as well as enhance compliance.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WINTER 2021

1. Construct the campus instructional plan to minimize the need for a change in instructional format mid-semester, because of the degree of disruption that ensues upon such a change.
2. Encourage only students who need the support of campus infrastructure and those taking in-person courses to come back to Ann Arbor for the semester.
3. Continue to offer campus support to instructors and programs offering in-person learning experiences that are essential to course or program learning objectives and/or necessary for accreditation and licensure requirements, especially in graduate, doctoral, and professional programs and in health sciences programs.
4. Continue to support student participation in on-campus research experiences, as per the comprehensive safety measures previously instituted.
5. Institute a comprehensive testing plan for students and (potentially) other community members.
6. Invite instructors to deploy the medium of instruction in which they feel most comfortable.
7. Continue to allow units to manage their mix of instruction/education modalities (i.e., including experiential learning) in accord with public health guidance.
8. Encourage instructors to maintain the medium of instruction of their courses as declared at registration, to provide greater consistency to students and other instructors teaching the course.
9. Increase teaching support for instructors for all teaching modes.
10. Add two midweek single-day "mental health breaks" throughout the semester, and make the required change to the academic calendar.
11. Continue to develop the framework to monitor and communicate progress throughout the semester to inform adjustments that may be needed to the winter 2021 plan in the most efficient and least disruptive manner possible.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Changing pandemic conditions and divergent community preferences ensure winter 2021 will retain many of the challenges of fall 2020. We have learned that while we must continue to be led by the latest public-health guidance, we must also be more mindful of the various stakeholders whose voices deserve to be heard. We should think of our plans for next term as a balancing act among: academic mission; student, staff and faculty experience; public health concerns; and greater attention to mental wellness and overall well-being.

Choice is the coin of the realm. Minimize constraints and restrictions where possible. Offering as many options as is possible will give the best opportunity to meet student, faculty and staff needs, as long as all community members are educated so they can make informed choices, and community health and safety standards are maintained.

These recommendations serve as a starting point for next term, yet likely will need to adapt to internal and external circumstances.

APPENDIX

INTRODUCTION

As referenced in the recommendation memorandum, the Coordinating Committee sought substantial input from the campus community. This outreach included:

- a survey of enrolled students and focus groups with undergraduate housing residents (See Tab A);
- a survey of tenure-track faculty, clinical track faculty, lecturers, and GSIs (See Tab B);
- a survey of student affairs/student life staff, budget administrators, and chief human resources officer in academic units (See Tab C);
- Discussions with the deans and directors.

Not surprisingly, the feedback reflected a range of views, from those who felt that a fully remote semester with virtually no on-campus presence was the only viable option to those who felt we must maintain on-campus classes, residence hall living, and opportunities for co-curricular and extra-curricular engagement.

While expressed differently across faculty, staff, students, and academic leaders, several themes emerged from the collective input:

- A clearer and more inclusive approach to testing is a predicate to a successful winter semester.
- Faculty, staff and students are concerned about their own health, as well as the health of their peers, colleagues and instructors. These concerns are heightened by the colder weather, which will drive people inside.
- Clearer and more consistent mechanisms to enforce public health guidance are needed.
- Workloads have increased substantially:
 - Students report a higher workload in their classes.
 - Faculty report the need to devote substantially more time to their courses based on new modalities, particularly hybrid courses.
 - Staff note a substantial increase in workload and burnout due to the blurred boundaries between work and non-work time.
- Feelings of anxiety and social isolation are common; more needs to be done to facilitate personal interactions between and among students, faculty and staff.
- The winter plan must acknowledge and accommodate the range of experiences across schools and colleges, and even between departments within a school or college; a one-size-fits-all approach is unlikely to be successful.
- Much attention has been focused on preserving “choice” for students and faculty with respect to how/where they learn and teach; the winter plan must find ways to better engage staff in similar discussions about their responsibilities.
- Everyone is continuing to adjust to multiple online platforms and intermittent technology glitches; many are fatigued and frustrated by the many technologies.

COMMUNITY INPUT

Students

BACKGROUND

All Ann Arbor campus degree-seeking students at the University of Michigan were offered the opportunity to respond to a survey of their experiences of the Fall 2020 public health-informed semester. The survey was designed, administered, and analyzed by the Office of Student Life Assessment and Research to address research themes identified by the Provost's Coordinating Committee, Student Life, and the Office of the Provost. A set of five focus groups of undergraduate housing residents was also conducted 13-15 October 2020.

The survey results were disaggregated by degree level – undergraduate, graduate, doctoral and professional. More than 9,000 students responded; the response rate of each degree level varied between 17.5% to 21.2%. The survey was completed October 16-20, 2020 – prior to the stay in place order of the Washtenaw Public Health Department. Survey responses were disaggregated by school and college in some cases.

FINDINGS

The survey found that slightly more than half of undergraduates had a course that offered an in-person experience in fall 2020. Among those students, approximately two-thirds had a remote option available in these courses and used it, while one-quarter had a remote option and did not use it. Thus, undergraduate participation in in-person instruction was low – with no more than about one-sixth of undergraduates participating in one or more courses in person.

The availability of and participation in courses with an in-person experience varied by school and college. In-person experiences were common in Dental Hygiene and Nursing (undergraduate), Music, Theatre and Dance (master's), Music, Theatre and Dance (doctoral), and Dental Hygiene and Medicine (professional). For example, in the undergraduate Nursing program, 72% of students reported one or more courses with an in-person experience. Of those students, 55% attended in person. Alternatively, at the master's degree level in Music, Theatre and Dance, 81% of students reported one or more courses with an in-person experience. Of those students, 60% attended in person.

In LSA, 45% of undergraduates reported one or more courses with an in-person experience. Of those, 64% chose to attend remotely. In 9 of the 14 schools and colleges with undergraduate programs, more than 2/3 of the students with an in-person option chose to attend remotely.

The most common reasons for students choosing to attend remotely when in-person was available were concern for peer and instructors' health and concern for one's own health.

Nearly three-quarters of undergraduates and master's students reported that their workload is more than what they expected or experienced in the past. For doctoral and professional students, 42% and 59% reported a higher workload, respectively. When asked "In general, how would you compare your remote learning experience to your in-person learning experience?" some 83% of undergraduates reported that the in-person experience is better than the remote experience. The comparison to the type of in-person experience is unclear in this case, especially as so few students are engaged in in-person learning this term. We surmise that the comparison is to a combination of the in-person experiences of this term as well as pre-pandemic in-person experiences.

Undergraduate and master's students are accessing remote academic resources – such as online tutoring and advising – at greater rates than in-person resources. About 37% of undergraduates report using on-campus study spaces in fall 2020. Looking to winter 2021, the availability of in-person study spaces and libraries are of greatest importance to undergraduate respondents. Master's and professional students responded similarly. These interests are well matched by the availability of study space on campus; utilization of study spaces in fall 2020 was far below the capacity that had been created in the libraries and in the schools and colleges.

The level of comfort of students in attending in-person activities and events was almost evenly distributed across the four response categories for undergraduates, master's and professional students. Undergraduate students in underrepresented or traditionally marginalized populations (women, underrepresented races, first-generation, and below median income) feel less comfort than their peers who are men, majority races, continuing-generation or above median income. Doctoral students' degree of comfort is very different from other degree levels, with more than half indicating "not at all." In this context, we note that a difference between students at the doctoral degree level and those at other degree levels is their participation in instruction.

When asked whether they feel valued as an individual at U-M, 60% of undergraduates reported 'not at all' or 'a little', while only 8% said 'very.' At every grade level, less than 50% responded that they felt 'somewhat' or 'very' valued. These responses should be understood in the broader context of the student reports of sense of belonging. For example, 60% of undergraduates also responded "somewhat" or "very" when asked how much they see themselves as part of the U-M community. Likewise, 67% responded "somewhat" or "very" when asked how much they feel they belong at UM.

In each degree level, no less than half believe that it is "very" important that there be stronger enforcement of safety measures in Winter 2021. In this context, we understand students to be expressing strong preference for higher compliance with safety measures, with stronger enforcement being one of a number of possible means to achieve higher compliance.

Finally, students were asked about their potential Winter 2021 plans, given different instructional scenarios. Students reported that if the Winter 2021 semester is in the same format as the fall 2020 semester, at least 85% at each degree level intends to remain enrolled. Undergraduates

are least certain, with 11% not sure of their plans. No more than 4% at any degree level intends to take the semester off in winter 2021 under this scenario.

Uncertainty and intent not to enroll increase if Winter 2021 is fully remote. For example, “not sure of their plans” and “take the semester off” increased to 17% and 8%, respectively for undergraduates for the fully remote scenario.

These responses combine factors of enrollment and living circumstances. Therefore, a student having selected 'not sure' could mean either 'not sure of enrollment decision' or 'remaining enrolled but not sure of living situation.' The focus groups that were performed in the residential halls provide insight here. Those students reported an intention to remain enrolled, but were uncertain of (and had great anxiety around) where they would live. The general sentiment in the focus groups was that they would prefer not to go back to their permanent residences, which they described as distracting and not conducive to a positive learning environment.

Finally, considering the fall 2020 living situation and their Winter 2021 intentions, 21% of undergraduates who live in University Housing either plan to move out, are unsure of their plans, or intend not to enroll if the instructional scenario is the same in Winter 2021.

Instructors

BACKGROUND

The instructor survey was designed, administered, and analyzed by a team comprising members of SACUA, the Office of the Provost and the Provost's Coordinating Committee. This team jointly prepared, distributed, and analyzed a survey for all instructors on their Fall 2020 experiences and Winter 2021 preferences. The survey opened Monday, 19 October 2020 and closed Thursday, 22 October 2020. The survey was sent to four instructor groups (Tenured/Tenure-track, Clinical, Lecturer, and GSIs) in four separate batches, allowing viewing of the responses by track. All groups received the same survey content. Some 9,923 instructors received the survey:

- 3,022 GSI
- 1,486 Lecturers
- 2,196 Clinical
- 3,219 TT

The survey consisted of approximately 23 questions for respondents who taught one (1) fall 2020 course, with approximately 8 questions for respondents to address for each course taught that semester. Exact number of questions answered by any given respondent depended on how many courses respondents taught in the fall, whether respondents were teaching in both semesters and respondent choice.

The response rate is only 22% of the entire set of possible instructors ($n = 9,923$) for fall and winter. By track, response rates were as follows:

- T/T = 25.9%
- Clinical = 7.3%
- Lecturer = 32.8%
- GSI = 23.7%

The respondents were overwhelmingly from LSA (n = 956 or 43.5%) with the next highest group being from Engineering (n =237 or 10.8%).

FINDINGS

The vast majority of respondents indicated that they were teaching in some form of virtual instruction (this includes those who responded “other”).

Averaged across responses for three courses and across tracks, 43.9% of respondents indicated that the medium in which they were teaching at the point of taking the survey was not the medium in which they had intended to teach at the beginning of the semester. The percentage responding that the medium changed did not vary significantly by course offering. A greater percentage of clinical faculty respondents (58.3%) than respondents in all other tracks indicated that they were currently teaching in a medium other than that which they intended, whereas a lesser percentage GSI respondents (37.6%) than all other tracks indicated that they had changed their medium of instruction.

The vast majority of respondents across all tracks indicated that concerns over safety (virus transmission) led them to change the medium of instruction. Graduate student instructors were less likely than all other tracks to indicate their own health concerns as a reason for changing the medium of instruction.

A very small number of respondents indicated that they changed their medium of instruction due to students not attending in person, although the T/TT faculty respondents (10.4%) were the most likely to indicate that students’ absence from class shaped their decision to change the medium of instruction.

The majority of respondents indicated that their courses were going as expected (57%) or better than expected (25.5%), across all tracks, producing close to a normal distribution in responses, with the poles (“far exceeding expectations” and “well below expectations”) representing extremely small numbers of responses. GSI respondents and clinical faculty were overrepresented in the response that the course was going “below expectations,” both at 11.5%, compared to 8.2% for T/TT faculty respondents and 5.6% for lecturer respondents. A large segment of respondents (37%) reported that they needed no additional resources because they felt comfortable with the medium in which they were teaching. Approximately 13.6% of the respondents indicated that nothing would help because the medium would be ineffective.

The remaining responses were scattered across categories. Given that respondents could select more than one support and that responses were somewhat evenly distributed across the choices, it seems that instructors would appreciate any or all of the supports indicated, which included: (a) IT support or coaching; (b) a teaching assistant to monitor technology; (c) professional development in how to use particular tools; and (d) new or additional technologies.

GSI respondents reported desiring the latter two supports in greater numbers (professional development 14.2% and new technologies 16.7%) and were less likely (7.3%) than faculty respondents (15.8%) to indicate a desire for a teaching assistant.

The majority of respondents (~67.6%) indicated a preference for some sort of virtual teaching in the winter semester.

Reasons for winter semester preferences are the same as those for fall choices of medium of instruction: Concerns over safety/virus transmission (70.6%), followed by lack of trust in public health protocols (~23%) and concerns over student behavior (25%). Health concerns do appear to play a role in choice of medium, but in smaller numbers than other concerns (17% indicate personal health concerns; 21.6% family health concerns.) About 11% of respondents indicated that they are choosing virtual media for instruction due to students not attending in person.

The following list summarizes open-ended responses to the question: “Which of the following would help you with your boundary setting when working from home?”

- Support for childcare
- Encouragement to reduce frequency and length of meetings; also encouragement to restrict meetings to typical workday hours
- Allow faculty to work in their offices as needed
- Reduce or compensate service demands
- Consider changes to tenure expectations:
 - Place higher value on teaching and service;
 - Reduce expectations for number of publications and grants (but not for quality)
- Increase administrative support for the idea of a moratorium on email communication (but also attend to the fact that some students are in different time zones and will need to communicate at varied times).

Staff

BACKGROUND

In an effort to collect input from staff who are the most directly engaged in student-facing work closely related to the academic experience, a brief “pulse” survey was distributed to 506 staff in the following groups:

- Student Affairs Network (SAN) (56)
- Vice President for Student Life (VPSL) (370, 3 overlap with SAN)
 - Student Life Leadership Assembly (managers and supervisors)
 - Up Close Group (front line/entry level staff)
 - Connect Group (mid-level, first level supervisors)
- Budget Administrators Group (BAG) (56)
- Chief Human Resources Officers of each Academic Affairs unit (HR) (28; 1 duplicate with BAG)

The survey, which was distributed as follows, opened on Monday, 19 October and closed on Thursday, 22 October:

- 423 SAN/VPSL staff received the survey, and 324 responded, for a response rate of 76%.
- 83 HR/BAG staff received the survey, and 33 responded, for a response rate of almost 40%.
- The overall response rate (357 out of 506) was 70%.

SAN/VPSL staff received a version of the survey focused on their own experiences, while HR/BAG received a version that focused on their role as reporters of what they are hearing from staff in their units.

FINDINGS

SAN/VPSL:

About half of respondents are splitting their time between onsite and remote work (another small percentage are back full-time, or remained onsite throughout). About 38% are working entirely remotely, despite having worked on campus pre-COVID. Some 90% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree that: (1) their unit has adapted well to changes in work conditions; and (2) their work is valued within their unit. About 77% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree that: (1) their work experience has been positive; and (2) feel confident in the strategic direction of their unit.

However, only 63% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree that they feel confident in the strategic direction of the University and 61% strongly or somewhat agree that they feel included in decisions that impact their work. A very high percentage of respondents have sometimes, often, or very often been concerned about the well-being of the student body (97%), their U-M colleagues (96%), their friends and family (95%) and their own health and well-being (89%).

When asked about plans for the Winter 2021 semester, 56% of respondents somewhat (34%) or strongly (22%) agree that the approach to winter 2021 should stay the same as the public health-informed approach to Fall 2020. When asked about areas of greatest concern if Winter 2021 follows the same approach as Fall 2020, the top 5 answers were:

- Student health and well-being (82%);
- Colleagues' health and well-being (66%);
- Employee morale (61%);
- Employee's own health and well-being (55%); and
- University financial impacts (49%).

The above results contrast with the areas of greatest concern if winter 2021 is fully remote:

- University financial impacts (65%);
- Student co-curricular experience (50%);
- Student academic experience (48%);
- Student success (46%); and
- Employee morale (44%).

BAG/HR:

All respondents somewhat or strongly agree that their unit has adapted well to changes in work conditions, and 97% somewhat or strongly agree that their work is valued within their unit. Some 82% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree that their work experience has been positive, and 85% feel confident in the strategic direction of their unit versus 72% feeling confident in the strategic direction of the University. About 85% somewhat or strongly agree that they feel included in decisions that impact their work (compared to only 61% of the SAN/VPLS group).

When asked about plans for the Winter 2021 semester, 91% of BAG/HR respondents somewhat (49%) or strongly (42%) agree that the approach to Winter 2021 should stay the same as the public-health informed approach to fall 2020.

BAG/HR respondents were asked to identify the 2-3 key questions they are hearing from staff in their units regarding the winter 2021 semester. The most frequent answers are summarized below (in order):

- How long will we have to work remotely/will staff be required to work in-person?
- Will winter 2021 be fully remote for students?
- What impact will the ongoing pandemic have on jobs/job security?
- How long will the budget constraints/hiring freeze remain in effect?
- Will UM provide additional paid time off to help parents manage impacts of K-12 education disruptions?
- How can we address the (lack of) work-life balance and employee burnout due to increased workloads?
- Will the flexibility for remote work continue post-pandemic?
- Can we find ways to acknowledge/reward staff, to demonstrate equity with faculty?

Thoughts about the Winter 2021 Semester

All respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement: “The U-M approach to winter 2021 should stay the same as the public health-informed approach to fall 2020.”

About 55% of VPSL/SAN respondents and 91% of BAG/HR respondents somewhat or strongly agreed with this statement. Respondents were offered the opportunity to explain why they chose the response they did. Not surprisingly, the reasons varied widely, and often represented two sides of the same coin. Many respondents acknowledged the complexity of the decision-making, and the often-competing demands between and among constituent groups.

Examples of these tensions included the following:

Student wellness and mental health are best served by a residential, public-health informed semester similar to fall 2020.	The limitations on in-person engagement makes the residential experience isolating, which negatively impacts student wellness and mental health.
Clear enforcement mechanisms are needed to ensure that students follow public health guidance, and will change student behavior.	Many 18-22 year old students will choose not to follow the public health guidance in favor of social interactions, an assumption that must underlie our planning.
Additional opportunities for in-person connections/engagement are necessary to address students' feelings of isolation.	Winter semester offers many fewer opportunities for in-person interactions given the colder weather and resulting loss of outdoor activities/spaces.
We need a residential semester to preserve jobs of many Student Life employees and to ensure the University's financial stability.	The increases in COVID cases, the upcoming flu season, and the move to more indoor activities mean we should de-densify campus and move to all or nearly-all remote instruction.
Our hybrid approach is the best solution to a complex set of circumstances.	The additional workload created by the hybrid approach is leading to staff burnout and is not sustainable.
We do not yet have enough information to make decisions about winter 2021.	Decisions are reactive, and made too late.

Many respondents noted variations on the following themes:

- We need a more robust testing protocol and increased access to testing; some respondents recommend mandatory testing for students who live in residence halls;
- Staff, like students, are exhausted, anxious, and feeling isolated; and
- Several respondents also highlighted disparities between employee groups (e.g., faculty versus staff; staff who are required to work in-person for "optics" versus those allowed to continue to work remotely).

CONTEXT

Context - Student Experience

This fall semester has called for new and innovative strategies to connect students to all that U-M has to offer. Student Life has been actively engaging with students, aligning our programs, services, and resources to meet the needs of our campus community. Our core work of health and well-being has been an essential focus as students experience the impact of so many changes to their campus experience. Through innovative approaches like tele-counseling, tele-health, and virtual coaching and by shifting community building and educational efforts to hybrid platforms, we are continuing to provide impactful outlets for students to access support, celebrate accomplishments, and continue to teach and learn in diverse communities. This approach will continue in the winter semester 2021.

Context - Staff and Faculty

Based on faculty survey feedback, we are recommending two steps to reduce administrative burden and instructional challenges. First, leadership at the University and individual S/C/U levels should encourage fewer and shorter meetings, and limiting meetings to standard workday hours. Additional time could be used by faculty members to prepare for instruction and devote to research. To be successful, this effort would require leadership by example. Second, technologies that have proven effective and efficient this fall should be explored for wider use during the winter. Both of these efforts could prove helpful and also financially bearable.

Large percentages of staff groups feel their units have adapted well to the new working conditions. To address concerns about community well-being and financial impacts, regular status updates and communication about available resources should remain a priority.

STUDENT AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Health & Well-being

- **Wolverine Wellness** is providing intentional and strategic promotion of student well-being site that students can access via Canvas Learning Portal. It gives students access to searchable resources and virtual well-being offerings.
- Individual and group Wellness Coaching sessions are providing students with much needed space to examine how personal well-being impacts their values, goals and motivations. Wellness Coaching groups offered this Fall include “Taking Care of Ourselves and Others: Well-being and Civic Engagement,” “First-Year Transition,” and “Undergraduate Transfer Student.”

- Drop-in Mindfulness Sessions are offered on Wednesdays, providing 15 minute guided meditation to help students feel a sense of stillness and ease, get grounded, build their resilience, and get ready for whatever comes their way.
- **CAPS** is now offering online scheduling, making it easier for students to access tele-counseling, crisis support, and virtual outreach. The CAPS website "Your Mental Health and COVID-19" provides resources and information as students navigate this difficult time in which so many individuals and communities are being impacted.
- CAPS services include: Counseling Services, Virtual Individual Counseling, Virtual Same Day Counseling/Crisis Appointments, Virtual Group Therapy Offerings (N-20), CAPS After Hours, SilverCloud, Stressbusters App and other online tools, Virtual Educational Workshops, Peer Support Groups via Wolverine Support Network, Consultation for faculty, parents and others; Faculty Toolkit available as iPhone App; 1st Year Undergraduate Toolkit.
- **Recreational Sports** is offering a variety of Fall engagement opportunities, including in-person programming such as small group training, club sports, intramural sports, and adventure leadership programs. Group-X classes and personal training sessions are available for via Zoom and featured classes include Zumba, PiYo, Tabata, Yoga and more. These classes are interspersed throughout the day to fit into participants' schedules.
- Recreational Sports is also offering Virtual Teambuilding and Adventure-based small-scale in-person programs, Intramural Sports Leagues (small scale in-person and at-home competitions), Esports offerings to all undergraduate students.
- Students have been getting active outdoors through spikeball tournaments, hike and bike events for first-year and graduate students, and through the use of our many open outdoor fields which also house tracks, basketball courts, and tennis courts.
- Michigan Dining and Student Life Facilities supports students with learning opportunities around social and environmental sustainability and our food system. Currently providing paid internships, advising on over 30 student projects, UMSFP and Planet Blue Ambassadors
- Michigan Dining supports social justice and sustainability learning at the Maize & Blue Cupboard by currently supporting 22 student employees and over 1100 volunteer hours

Student Advocacy, Support, & Intervention

- The Dean of Students Office is providing direct support to students, parents/families, and faculty/staff who have questions and concerns related to COVID-19 through helping to navigate such things as quarantine or isolation needs, academic support, financial concerns, campus climate concerns, and by providing referrals and resources.
- DOS provides regular check-ins (by phone and email) with students in Q&I Housing throughout duration of their stay including distribution of evaluation tool; response to concerns raised by students in Q&I Housing; emergency funding requests for items related to COVID, virtual learning (technology requests), and other emergency financial concerns; ongoing case management and support for student issues and concerns; response to

student and parent/family concerns and assistance navigating resources and reporting test results.

- **Services for Students with Disabilities** is providing tele-conference meetings as well as virtual peer assisted study sessions, academic coaching, and advocacy meetings. Resources and Advice from Peers for Remote Learning is just one of the ways that SSD is helping students continue to share knowledge and connect with one another.
- SAPAC's Peer-led Support Groups provide confidential healing space for survivors of sexual assault, intimate partner violence, stalking, and/or sexual harassment. Facilitated by student staff, POC PLSG is a place for survivors at UM to find not only community but healing opportunities, including anxiety-reduction, self-care activities, and mindfulness.
- In support of the current and growing need for equitable access to healthy, nutritious and nourishing food to students, faculty and staff on campus the Maize and Blue Cupboard has expanded, opening a mobile food distribution center on North Campus.

Community Development

- The Welcome to Michigan program, a cross campus collaboration of events and activities, was introduced to students this year through a Canvas course which connected them with many opportunities to explore involvement, learn about our campus traditions and resources, and engage with one another. Examples of activities include Go Blue Virtual 5k, virtual organization festivals, and opportunities for students to learn about student organizations.
- The new Community Matters Cohort Program provides incoming students with the opportunity to meet people and make friends. Program participants are matched with a pair of upperclassmen facilitators and a small group of other incoming students who are interested in finding community. Students connect through cohort social events and conversations about cultivating support networks during our time at U-M.
- Students continue to gather around shared identity through ongoing support and community building spaces including Spectrum Center's CenterSpace Drop-in Groups, MESA's Social Connectivity and Community programming, and the International Center's International Coffee Hours and Friday Forums.
- Through their Fall 2020 Planning Guide for Student Organizations, the Center for Campus Involvement is supporting student leaders navigating new and challenging restrictions through offering resources on virtual meeting best practices, engaging members and the campus community, event and program planning, and leadership transitions and elections.
- Students have been engaging in fun campus traditions through social events such as those leading up to the first football game including Game Day Spirit Photo Contest, Fight Song Sing-along Video Contest, Game Day Bingo, and Game Day Student Package Pickup including snacks and Michigan spirit items.

Educational Offerings

- Social justice education and intercultural development offerings have expanded, offering synchronous and asynchronous learning opportunities for students, staff, and faculty. These include signature programs such as IGR's Common Ground Workshops and Spectrum Center Allyhood Development Training and new opportunities such as MESA's Anti-Racism Peer Led Teach-ins and the launch of a new online Interfaith learning series.
- The Ginsberg Center's stewardship of campus-wide education around the 2020 election has included such things as working with partners to deliver on the Democracy and Debate theme semester, providing up-to-date voter information, encouraging spaces for community conversations, providing resources for classroom conversations, and connecting our entire community with opportunities for civic engagement.
- The University Career Center has focused support on the virtual job search, providing students with opportunities to learn about virtual job and internship fairs, skills for virtual job interviews, virtual networking, and recommendations for job searching during COVID-19.

Faculty, staff and student well-being have been severely challenged this term. The cold weather and lessened ability to spend time outdoors is likely to accentuate mental health needs during the winter term. Health and mental health needs will continue to need strong support during the winter term. Recommendations include the following:

- Ensure that CAPS is fully staffed and that units have access to embedded counselors. The FY21 budget allocated 8 additional counselors to CAPS so filling these positions will be important.
- Each academic and administrative unit should focus on community building activities or faculty and staff during the winter term.
- Ensure clear communications to students for COVID testing and health services. These will reduce the stress in accessing appropriate services.
- Have better registrar reporting on students' locations (Ann Arbor area or away from campus). It is important to think about the circumstances of remote students as well as those on campus. Curriculum support and co-curricular units could then better prepare special messaging and support for fully remote students who are physically isolated and away from Ann Arbor. Their challenges are different.
- Think about offering a winter residential experience to the students who need it most *only*. "Need" can be defined in many ways, including housing insecurity, senior thesis demands, and more.