medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Potential Community and Campus Covid-19 Outcomes Under University and College Reopening Scenarios

James C. Benneyan, Christopher Gehrke, Iulian Ilieş, Nicol Nehls
Healthcare Systems Engineering Institute, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA

Corresponding author: James C. Benneyan, PhD, Healthcare Systems Engineering Institute Northeastern University, 177 Huntington Avenue, 12th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, j.benneyan@northeastern.edu

Abstract

Background. Significant uncertainty exists about the safety of, and best strategies for, reopening colleges and universities while the Covid-19 pandemic is not well-controlled. Little also is known about the effects that on-campus outbreaks may have on local non-student and/or higher-risk communities. Model-based analysis can help inform decision and policy making across a wide range of assumptions and uncertainties.

Objective. To evaluate the potential range of campus and community Covid-19 exposures, infections, and mortality due to various university and college reopening plans and precautions.

Methods. We developed and calibrated campus-only, community-only, and campus-x-community epidemic models using standard susceptible-exposed-infected-recovered differential equation and agent-based modeling methods. Input parameters for campus and surrounding communities were estimated via published and grey literature, scenario development, expert opinion, Monte Carlo simulation, and accuracy optimization algorithms; models were cross-validated against each other using February-June 2020 county, state, and country data. Campus opening plans (spanning various fully open, hybrid, and fully virtual approaches) were identified from websites, publications, communications, and surveys. All scenarios were simulated assuming 16-week semesters and best/worst case ranges for disease prevalence among community residents and arriving students, precaution compliance, contact frequency, virus attack rates, and tracing and isolation effectiveness. Day-to-day student and community differences in exposures, infections, and mortality were estimated under each scenario as compared to regular and no re-opening; 10% trimmed medians, standard deviations, and probability intervals were computed to omit extreme outlier scenarios. Factorial analyses were conducted to identify inputs with largest and smallest impacts on outcomes.

Results. As a base case, predicted 16-week student infections and mortality under normal operations with no precautions (or no compliance) ranged from 472 to 9,484 (4.7% to 94.8%) and 2 to 61 (0.02% to 0.61%) per 10,000 student population, respectively. In terms of contact tracing and isolation resources, as many as 17 to 1,488 total exposures per 10,000 students could occur on a given day throughout the semester needing to be located, tested, and if warranted quarantined. Attributable total additional predicted community exposures, infections, and mortality ranged from 1 to 187, 13 to 820, and 1 to 21, respectively, assuming the university takes no additional

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

precautions to limit exposure risk. The mean (SD) number of days until 1% and 5% of on-campus students are infected was 11 (3) and 76 (17) days, respectively; 34.8% of replications resulted in more than 10% students infected by semester end. The diffusion first inflection "point of no return" occurred on average on day 84 (+/- 20 days, 95% interval). Common re-opening precaution strategies reduced the above consequences by 24% to 26% fewer infections (now 360 to 6,976 per 10,000 students) and 36% to 50% fewer mortalities (now 1 to 39 per 10,000 students). Perfect testing and immediate quarantining of all students on arrival to campus at semester start further reduced infections by 58% to 95% (now 200 to 468 per 10,000 students) and mortalities by 95% to 100% (now 0 to 3 per 10,000 students). Uncertainties in many factors, however, produced tremendous variability in all median estimates, ranging by -67% to +370%.

Conclusions. Consequences of re-opening college and university physical campuses on student and community Covid-19 exposures, infections, and mortality are very highly unpredictable, depending on a combination of random chance, controllable (e.g. physical layouts), and uncontrollable (e.g. human behavior) factors. Important implications at government and academic institution levels include clear needs for specific criteria to adapt campus operations mid-semester, methods to detect when this is necessary, and well-executed contingency plans for doing so.

1. Introduction

The SARS-CoV-2 virus and Covid-19 disease pandemic has had devastating human, financial, and logistical impacts worldwide, including an estimated 19 million infected and 722,000 deaths[1] (as of July 2020), radical changes to work and life routines, economic recession, and increased social inequities.[2-5] Among many other issues, significant concerns and uncertainties exist about the safety, benefits, and potential consequences of re-opening schools,[6-9] heightened by summer resurgences in infections and mortality and by potentially significant campus and community cross-exposure. [9,10] While initially a majority of debate and consternation focused on K-12 education, [11-13] decisions about college and university reopening – and processes and criteria by which such decisions might best be made – also remain uncertain. [9,10,14]

As the Covid-19 pandemic spread uncontrollably during the spring of 2020, nearly all K-12 and secondary schools suspended physical classes, with an estimated 50 million elementary [13] and 19 million college students[15] shifting to online learning, home schooling, and remote education. While experiences were varied and often lacking, [16-18] given the comprehensive extent and rapid pace of these transitions it is remarkable nonetheless that an entire sector of society could develop and implement significantly new ways to provide a social good and meet student needs (as best as possible under the circumstances). Equally remarkable is the current non-scientific urgency, with increasing exceptions, to return as quickly as possible to prior norms of how education is provided.

While early in summer 2020 a few universities decided to remain fully virtual for the 2020/2021 academic year, [19] including the largest public university system in the United States, [19,20] a significant majority of schools communicated their intent to re-open and started planning accordingly. During the summer months, four events have occurred of parallel import: a modest number of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

additional colleges and universities have announced full or partial on-line plans for the fall 2020 semester, the Covid-19 pandemic has resurged uncontrollably in many regions of the United States, other colleges and universities nonetheless have continued moving forward with plans to open as safely as possible, and debate has intensified as to what best balances education, safety, economic, and business needs, [21-26] as well as whether such tradeoffs even should be considered.[8]

Examples of university re-opening plans range from full on-campus operations with contact precautions, accelerated semesters ending at Thanksgiving holiday break to reduce travel-based geographic spread, hybrid virtual/physical formats with some courses (or class meetings within given courses) taught virtually and others taught in-person, having only first and/or second year students on campus with all others virtual, and student choice in taking all of any of their courses physically versus virtually. [27-29] Efforts to reduce on-campus exposures include reconfigured classrooms and dormitory spaces, precaution awareness campaigns, renting of hotel rooms to further reduce living density, testing and tracing plans of varied rigor, quarantining on arrival, dedicated temporary living spaces for students who test positive, and other efforts to attempt to reduce density and exposure rates. [21,23,27,30-32]

Significant uncertainty, however, exists about the effectiveness of any of these plans. [21,33,23,31] The best current diagnostic tests have variable and poor clinical sensitivity to detect positive individuals, [25,34] an estimated 30-40% of all positive individuals never exhibit symptoms or may not know (or admit) they are infectious, [25,34,35] incubation delays from exposure to symptomatic average 3-5 days, [35-37] sufficient student compliance to social distancing precautions on-campus and socially may be unlikely, [25,30,38,39] and student policy enforcement has rarely been successful across history. Contact tracing, while effective for other diseases and while certainly helpful for reducing risk here, nonetheless does not work nearly as well for Covid-19 given the above [9,33] and may be further limited in school settings in which an average student may interact with many-fold more individuals (many unknowingly or unknown by name) than more typical applications.

These uncertainties have prompted some to question the safety and efficacy of university reopening, [6,8,14,26,31,40 25] especially in urban multi-university settings with significant student transient and geographically dispersed populations.[41] Others have suggested Covid-19 might catalyze or necessitate a reinvention of higher education, [42-45] including criticisms of prioritizing economics, brand, and business survival over safety. [22,43,44,46] The president of Paul Quinn College, for example, recently stated "Rushing to reopen our society and our schools is a mistake that will ultimately result in hundreds of thousands of citizens falling sick and worse. We should not let our own financial and reputational worries cloud our judgment about matters of life and death." [8] As with business closings, not reopening colleges may have large economic and student social and emotional development effects, [47-49] although perhaps less so than K-12 schools, for which more rationally it might be argued to be important to balance child development needs. Some colleges and universities already were facing financial strains before Covid-19 emerged, and not reopening could be untenable for their survival. [48-50]

Although little empirical data exist yet on college reopening, experiences of pre-school, summer camp, and K-12 programs have been varied. While some have reported no problems, in other

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

cases, universities that already opened [40,51-56] and summer schools and camps have resulted in significant outbreaks, [57,58] often traced back to only a few index cases resulting in significant within- and between-setting spread. [21] Numerous social gatherings of college-age students during summer 2020 also have resulted in outbreaks, [38,58,59] including events and activities students were advised against but brazenly participated in nonetheless. [30,38] Despite early uncertainty about infectivity by age, increasing evidence is emerging that student-aged individuals readily can carry and transmit SARS-CoV-2 [35,58,60,61] and that significant student-to-student campus spread occurs at college and high school levels [35,58,61] (in contrast to suggestive evidence that less spread occurs among younger students in K-5 classroom settings). [35,47,61,62] The impacts of campus outbreaks on spread to other populations in the surrounding community, with higher percentages of at-risk individuals, has been less reported on beyond hypothetical conjecture and individual anecdotes.

Given the above significant uncertainties as a whole, we developed and applied disease epidemic single and multiple population models to investigate and estimate the range of potential impacts on local community and campus infections under a representative wide range of scenarios and reopening plans. The intent is to provide model-based analysis to better inform, among other inputs, policy and decision-making at this profoundly critical time in the Covid-19 pandemic. Similar policy model analyses have been used extensively to study such infectious diseases as HIV, seasonal flu, pneumonia, and the CoV-SARS-2 coronavirus in general [63-66], although less such investigation has focused specifically on impacts of school and business reopenings (perhaps due to "model fatigue" or extrinsic motivations).

2. Methods

2.a. Model Development and Validation

We developed and validated mathematical epidemiology single and multiple population models of the spread of Covid-19 within and between defined groups of individuals, including standard ordinary different equation (ODE) and agent-based models. The general logic of each model was adapted from classic and well-accepted susceptible-exposed-infected-recovered (SEIR) frameworks [67,68] similar to those reported on elsewhere for HIV, [65] tuberculosis, [69,70] Zika, [71,72] Ebola, [73] drug abuse, [74-76] Covid-19, [66] and many other contagion or spread concerns [63,64]. The single population models describe spread dynamics within one defined population (e.g. on-campus students or local community residents) depending on input parameter values, whereas the multi-population models additionally include cross-exposure and subsequent infection between two or more groups. All models were adapted from well-developed and validated MatLab programming code used to study other epidemics over several years.

Figure 1 summarizes the logic of the ODE models used in this analysis. State variables at time t include the numbers of individuals in population j that are Covid-free and susceptible ($S_j(t)$), exposed to Covid but not yet infectious themselves ($E_j(t)$), Covid-positive and infectious to others ($I_j(t)$), recovered and not susceptible to re-infection ($R_j(t)$), and Covid-associated deceased

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

($D_j(t)$). Recovered individuals are assumed not to be able to re-infect, at least not with any appreciable rate within a one semester timeframe. [37,77] Multiple dynamic change points were included for all model parameters to allow for policy or behavior changes when fitting models to historical data.



Figure 1. Illustration of general logic of campus-x-community two-population Covid-19 disease spread model. (Suspectible: Individuals who are not currently infected but who can become infected; Exposed: Individuals who are exposed and potentially infected but not infectious yet to others; Infected: Individuals who are infected and can infect others; Recovered: Individuals who were infected, survived, and cannot become re-infected nor infect others within the study timeframe; Dead: Individuals who were infected and died from Covid-19 or complications).

At each time increment (hundreds per day), each state variable is updated numerically based on its previous value, the current values of all other state variables, and equations governing their interdependent relationships, with this process continuing iteratively for 16 weeks. For example, the number of individuals in the susceptible population ($S_j(t)$) is decremented by the number of newly exposed individuals ($S_j(t) \cdot expo_j$) and increased by the number who previously were exposed but did not develop infections ($E_j(t) \cdot expr_j$), where the daily exposure rate $expo_j$, the average risk of transmission multiplied by the average number of contacts per day, is back-computed from the basic reproduction number R_0 (average number of new infections per infected individual) and recovery and mortality rates, and the recovery rate of non-infectious exposed individuals $expr_j$ is calculated as the inverse of the corresponding recovery time $t_{rec,\, inc_j}$.

In turn, the number of exposed individuals is increased by $S_j(t) \cdot expo_j$ and decremented by the number who develop infections ($E_j(t) \cdot infe_j$), where the daily infection rate $expo_j$ is the ratio of the probability of becoming infected upon exposure p_j over the average incubation time t_{inc_j}. Infected individuals either recover or die at rates of $infr_j \cdot I_j(t)$ and $mort_j \cdot I_j(t)$, respectively, where the daily recovery and mortality rates are the inverse of the average recovery time $t_{rec,\, inc_j}$ and the ratio of the overall COVID case fatality rate for that population (CFR_j) over the average time from infection until death t_{i2d_j}, respectively.

The change in each state variable and their governing rate change dynamics at each time step during numeric evaluation thus are:

Susceptible $S_j(t)$	$\frac{dS_j(t)}{dt} = -\left(expo_j \cdot \frac{I_j(t)}{N_j(t)} + ri_j \sum_{i \neq j} \chi_{i,j} \cdot expo_i \cdot \frac{I_i(t)}{N_i(t)} \right) \cdot S_j(t) + expr_j \cdot E_j(t)$	+ Not-infected/infectious (nor immune) after exposure – New exposures due to within-population and between-population contact with infectious individuals	(1)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Exposed $E_j(t)$	$\frac{dE_j(t)}{dt} = \left(expo_j \cdot \frac{I_j(t)}{N_j(t)} + ri_j \sum_{i \neq j} \chi_{i,j} \cdot expo_i \cdot \frac{I_i(t)}{N_i(t)} \right) \cdot S_j(t) - \left(infe_j + expr_j \right) \cdot E_j(t)$	+ New exposures – Past exposures now infected/infectious – Past exposures now not infected/infectious (now susceptible)	(2)
Infectious $I_j(t)$	$\frac{dI_j(t)}{dt} = infe_j \cdot E_j(t) - \left(infr_j + mort_j \right) \cdot I_j(t)$	+ Past exposures now infected/infectious – Past exposures now not infected – deaths	(3)
Recovered $R_j(t)$	$\frac{dR_j(t)}{dt} = infr_j \cdot I_j(t)$	+ Infected individuals who recover (with immunity)	(4)
Dead $D_j(t)$	$\frac{dD_j(t)}{dt} = mort_j \cdot I_j(t)$	+ Covid-19 related deaths	(5)

where

	$expo_j = R_{0,j} \cdot \frac{infr_j + mort_j}{p_j}$	Rate at which people transition from susceptible to exposed	(6)
	$infe_j = \frac{p_j}{t_{inc\,j}}$	Rate at which people transition from exposed to infected	(7)
	$infr_j = \frac{1}{t_{rec,inf\,j}}$	Rate at which people transition from infected to recovered	(8)
	$expr_j = \frac{1 - p_j}{t_{rec,non\,j}}$	Rate at which people transition from exposed to recovered	(9)
	$mort_j = \frac{CFR_j}{t_{i2d\,j}}$	Rate at which people transition from infected to dead	(10)
and	$N_i = S_i(t) + E_i(t) + I_i(t) + R_i(t) + D_i(t)$	Sum of all sub-populations in region *i* at time *j*	(11)

where $\chi_{i,j}$ = 1 if populations i and j are connected and 0 otherwise and p_j = the proportion of exposed individuals that transition to infected (versus recovering to susceptible). The multi-population models allow for separate parameter values for each population, such as based on their demographics, with a cross-exposure parameter (ri_j) defining the relative rate at which infectious individuals in one population expose susceptible individuals in the other (typically lower than within-population exposure rates, assuming less interaction).

2.b. Parameter Estimation and Calibration

Model accuracy was validated using standard methods, [65,78-82] cross-validation to each other, and varied national, state, and county empirical data sets from January to July 2020 (Figure 2). As shown, in all cases model results closely emulate historical data, with accuracy on par with or exceeding norms and results reported elsewhere[83-89] and with ≤ 1 change dynamic point generally providing good fits, both suggesting good prospective short-term prediction capability. While no model is perfect, for the cases of Dougherty (Georgia) and Suffolk (Massachusetts) counties – each exhibiting different epidemic patterns, magnitudes, and timings – our models sufficiently emulate community-based transmission to help inform policy-making decisions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 2. Examples of model accuracy; (a) U.S. state (shown: Massachusetts, California, and Florida) and (b) county (shown: Dougherty county GA, Eagle county CO, Suffolk county MA).

Table 1 summarizes inputs used in the community and campus models, estimated from published and grey literature, on-line reports, expert opinion, and scenario development. For inputs with uncertainty, we used Monte Carlo simulations to create 100 synthetic results across plausible ranges, using the most likely, maximum, and minimum values shown in the middle columns. For any parameters with no distributional information, we used asymmetrical triangular distributions to generate random inputs for each simulation replications. Since little data exist about on-campus spread, [21] we included in all baseline simulations the shown ranges of likely, low, and high values for "infective R_0" (the average number of people that an infected student infects), divided by the exposed-to-infectious percentage to produce the average number of people that an infected person exposes (R_0).

For community populations, we further calibrated input parameters within the tabulated ranges via meta-heuristic search algorithms (particle swarm, genetic algorithms, simulated annealing) to minimize root mean square error differences between historical and model-predicted infections and mortality. Since probabilistic search optimization can produce different input results based on starting conditions and search space topology, we ran each parameterization routine 100 times to produce 100 input sets that all result in optimal output fits. For model fits with change points, separate parameters for all inputs were optimized for each time segment, with state variables at the start of each new time segment set to their values at the end of the prior segment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

For initial disease prevalence in the local community and among arriving students, we also used expected values and probability intervals from a validated epidemic data curve fitting algorithm. In the latter case, we predicted Covid-19 community prevalence at the start of the semester and among arriving students using a proportionally weighted average of prevalence predictions based on home locations. Given uncertainties described above, representative ranges of community prevalence based on data reported in recent media also were used as starting conditions. Positive individuals at semester start-up were assumed distributed between exposed but not yet infectious (33%) and infectious (67%) groups based on approximate relative durations that an average infected individual might spend in each state. For statistical analysis, in all cases 10% trimmed medians, standard deviations, and percentile intervals were computed to reduce any extreme outlier scenario effects.

Parameter	Definition	Lower Bound	Most Likely	Upper Bound	Sources	Rank
$R_{0,1}$	Average number of students who become infected by infectious students	0.66	1	3.4	[90]	
$R_{0,2}$	Average number of residents who become infected by infectious residents	0.66	-	3.4	[90], parameter search	
ri_j	Cross-exposure parameter (campus x community)	0.005	0.008	0.02	estimated	
π_1	Proportion of student population that is initially infected at semester start	0.001	.01	.05	[91-93]	
π_2	Proportion of community population that is initially infected at semester start	0.0016	.01	.016	[94]	
p_j	Proportion of exposed people that become infected	0.5	0.9	1	estimated	
$t_{inc\,j}$	Incubation duration (in days)	2	4.5	14	[95,96]	
$t_{rec\,j}$	Recovery duration (days)	6	14	42	[97-99]	
CFR_1	Fatality rate for college population	0.001	0.0092	0.016	[97,100]	
CFR_2	Fatality rate for community population	0.01	0.06	0.15	[101,102]	
$t_{i2d\,j}$	Number of days from infection until death	14	35	56	[99]	

Table 1. Summary of model parameters in Covid-19 campus-x-community epidemic models, estimated values, and ranges used for parameter search and sensitivity analysis. "Rank order" indicates relative significance of each parameter on outcomes (16 week totals).

2.c. Reopening Scenario Analysis

Common university reopening scenarios were identified from literature and published surveys, [19] generally belonging to one of several categories (Table 2). A recent New York Times survey (date) [7] also summarized reopening plans of 271 colleges and universities, illustrating both wide variation and several general approaches. The most common included primarily or fully in-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

person (35%), primarily or fully online (32%), and hybrid (19%).For example, the University of Washington reopening plan [103] illustrates a common approach wherein more than 90% of classes will be taught online, with only classes that cannot be taught remotely (e.g. medical and health sciences classes) taught in person with safety precautions; the majority of student services and advising will take place remotely, and any staff who can work remotely will continue to do so. In contrast, Purdue University illustrates an opposite approach [104] wherein classes mainly will be taught on campus with contact precautions until Thanksgiving break and reliance on students to manage their personal safety.

Intervention Description	Examples	Source	Estimated Reduction in R_0*
Remote coursework for classes over 50, testing, contact tracing, health surveillance in dorms	University of Washington	[103, 105]	36%
Remote option available, social distancing, shortened semester, flexible start dates for international students	Rice University	[106]	25%
Face masks, social distancing, limited classes, some coursework online, fewer students living on campus, shorter semester	Stanford University	[107]	33%
More online classes, masks, social distancing, testing, health surveillance, sanitizing and washing stations	Ohio State University	[108, 109]	30%
Some classes online, expanded housing, social distancing, face masks, staggered hours, increased cleaning, testing, tracing	Northeastern University	[32, 110]	49%
Most classes online except those for which in-person instruction is deemed necessary	California State Universities	[111, 112]	12%
Students back on campus for a shortened fall semester as long as they follow CT Re-opening suggestions, linked below the table	Connecticut State Institutions	[113, 114]	46%

Table 2. Representative examples of university and college Covid-19 fall 2020 semester campus reopening plans (see appendix).

For each scenario in Table 2, the above models were run for campus alone, community alone, and campus-x-community together to estimate attributable additional cross-exposure impacts of each population on the other – e.g., additional infections in the community due to campus reopening and additional student infections due to community interactions. For the campus-only cases, 100 replications were run of the base case and each precaution policy, using the above Monte Carlo inputs, with results used to produce weekly and total exposures, infections, and mortality (medians and 95% probability intervals). For the community-only cases, 100 runs of the parameter search algorithm were run assuming the ranges in Table 1 and based on randomly generated values from the probability interval forecasts described in Section 2.b, producing median and interval results similar to above.

For the campus-x-community cases, each of the 100 community parameterizations were randomly coupled with the 100 random sets of campus inputs, with the two populations interacting using 100 random values of the cross-exposure parameter, *ri*, sampled from the range shown in Table 1. Overall results and pairwise differences were computed between the 100 campus results and their campus-x-community counterparts, and similarly between the 100 community results

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and their campus-x-community counterparts, in order to estimate attributable cross-exposure effects on community residents and students.

We assumed three local community sizes: (1) an urban campus setting of 10,000 students with 100,000 residents living the immediately surrounding residential areas and neighborhoods in which off-campus students tend to live, (2) the same size student body (10,000) but now with 40,000 residents living near campus, and (3) a smaller number of 2,000 students with 40,000 residents living near campus. Solely as illustrations, the first scenario might represent a large university in a major city such as Boston, New York, Chicago, Houston, Seattle, and others. The second scenario might represent a large land grant university in a less urban situated college town such as Amherst MA, Ann Arbor MI, Rayleigh-Durham NC, College Station TX, Akron OH, and others. The third scenario might represent a smaller undergraduate college in a non-urban setting such as William and Mary College (Williamsburg VA), Skidmore College (Saratoga Springs NY), Smith College (Northampton MA), and others. Note that, in terms of model mathematical mechanics and extrapolation to other settings, the student-to-community population size ratios (1:10, 1:4, 1:20) affects results, rather than the raw sizes themselves, and can be applied to consider any scenario with similar ratios.

All results were tabulated, plotted longitudinally, and verified independently. Inflection points (dates of steepest increases) for each outcome, scenario, and population were identified numerically (via secants and second derivatives) in order to identify "tipping points" beyond which, in spread and diffusion theory, interventions tend to be ineffective. Sensitivity analyses were conducted to identify factors to which results are most sensitive (via Box-Behnken experimental designs [115]) and therefore important to interventions, target setting, and contingency planning.

3. Results

3.a. On-Campus/Student Impact

For the base, best, and worst-case scenarios for Covid-19 prevalence among arriving students and semester initialization precautions, Figure 3 summarizes the predicted number of students per 10,000 who could be exposed, infectious, and dead over a 16-week semester. Due to the combined uncertainties discussed above, by the end of a semester student outcomes under the base case (no precautions implemented and/or followed) may range from 472 to 9,484 infections (median: 2,752, standard deviation: 2,511) and 2 to 61 deaths (median: 7, standard deviation: 12). The realistic case reduces these consequences, as would be expected, to a median (SD) of 1,534 (2,126) infections and 4 (10) deaths, with the greatest increases in exposures and infections typically occurring somewhere near the beginning of November and semester end, respectively.

While the most likely scenario in practice may be somewhere between the realistic and base cases, the idealistic and worst-case scenarios were included for comparison. The idealistic case would further reduce consequences to a median (SD) of 171 (736) infections and 0 (3) deaths, with the steepest increases now typically occurring later near the semester end, with important implications on contributing to non-local spread as students return to their home communities. For the worst-case scenario, the steepest increases typically occur earlier, after the middle of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 3. Predicted number of students per 10,000 who are exposed day-to-day, total infected, and total mortality over a 16-week semester. Top row: base case scenario assuming no semester initiation precautions and disease prevalence of 2% among arriving students equal to national and regional averages. Middle two rows: realistic (1%) and idealistic (0.1%) initial prevalence scenarios assuming good or great screening-on-arrival precautions, adherence, and effectiveness. Bottom row: worst case scenario (5%) assuming summer trends in home state prevalence and little-to-no arrival precautions, compliance, or effectiveness.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

October (infections) and beginning of November (mortality). Depending on assumptions, the total number of true exposures that under a contact tracing approach should be identified range from 629 to 12,645, with maximums at any given time of 17 to 1,488 occurring from early November onwards, with these wide ranges having implications on resource planning and viability.

Table 3 provides monthly details of all results (95% intervals shown in parentheses). As shown here and above, under the two most likely scenarios (top two rows) by mid-October consequences could reach as high (mean plus one standard deviation) as 895 student infections and 3 student deaths, or conversely as low (mean minus one standard deviation) as 200 student infections and 0 student deaths per 10,000 students. Whereas many model-based studies struggle to report single accurate results, these large variabilities in all results here conversely underscore the equally important conclusion that the impacts of campus openings on infections and mortality are vastly uncertain, but with near certainty are non-zero.

scenario	September			October			November			December		
	Expo	Infect	Mort	Expo	Infect	Mort	Expo	Infect	Mort	Expo	Infect	Mort
Base Case	107 (27, 337)	424 (252, 825)	1 (1, 2)	162 (25, 952)	984 (354, 2,795)	3 (1, 9)	205 (25, 1,181)	1,853 (447, 6,210)	5 (2, 26)	248 (25, 1,134)	2, 742 (508, 8,403)	7 (2, 40)
Realistic Precautions	55 (14, 178)	215 (126, 424)	0 (0, 1)	85 (13, 617)	509 (178, 1,574)	1 (1, 5)	122 (12, 1,159)	993 (225, 4,368)	2 (1, 17)	176 (13, 1,168)	1,534 (257, 6,945)	4 (1, 30)
Idealistic precautions	6 (1, 19)	22 (13, 43)	0 (0, 0)	9 (1, 80)	53 (18, 179)	0 (0, 0)	15 (1, 311)	106 (23, 718)	0 (0, 2)	25 (1, 67)	171 (26, 1,819)	0 (0, 7)
Worst case	247 (67, 719)	1,020 (624, 1,915)	3 (1, 5)	358 (58, 1,276)	2,233 (867, 5,236)	7 (3, 19)	322 (56, 1,165)	3,837 (1,087, 8,377)	11 (4, 39)	274 (55, 1,056)	5,206 (1,229, 9,525)	14 (5, 51)

Table 3. Predicted median number of monthly exposures, infections, and mortality per 10,000 students. Expo: exposures; Infect: infections; Mort: mortality. Values in parentheses indicate 95% probability ranges on actual values given the noted uncertainties in many assumptions and inputs.

Figure 4 summarizes the same results now for various semester operation precautions, with the same base case included (top row) for comparison. In general, reducing the risk of contact exposure is very effective, as is intuitive. However, even after reducing exposure risk significantly, a substantial number of students still can become infected or (albeit fewer) die. For example, in the very optimistic case with a 75% reduction in close contact, a total of 98 to 182 infections (median: 127) and 1 death per 10,000 students may be likely by the end of October, increasing to 100 to 236 infections and 0 to 2 deaths per 10,000 students by winter break.

3.b. Surrounding Community Resident Impact

Figure 5 similarly summarizes the impact of reopening on additional community (fig. 5a) and campus (fig. 5b) exposures, infections, and mortality due to campus-x-community cross-exposure, assuming the same urban university setting, student arrival scenario, and the campus precaution scenarios described above; for comparison also shown in the top row of Figure 5a is the baseline number of community exposures, infections, and mortality without any campus reopening. As shown, with little-to- no precautions and/or adherence, the impact of opening an urban

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

university might range from 13 to 820 additional community resident infections (median: 124, standard deviation: 221) and 1 to 21 additional community resident deaths (median: 5, standard deviation: 6). With a 50% reduction in exposure risk, opening campus might result in a predicted additional 3 to 63 community resident infections (median: 15, standard deviation: 18) and 0 to 3



Figure 4. Relative effectiveness of reopening and precaution strategies on reducing campus exposures, infections, and mortality per 10,000 students (assuming 1% of students are infected or exposed at the start of the semester). Top row: base case from Figure 3 for comparison; Lower rows: increasingly idealistic precaution effectiveness and compliance cases.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 5. Additional (a) community and (b) campus exposures, infections, and mortality per 10,000 community residents or students due to community-x-campus cross-exposure (student arrival assumption: 1% infected or exposed; top row of figure 5a: total resident exposures, infections, and death assuming no interaction with schools). Top row: additional exposures, infections, and deaths due to campus reopening assuming no precautions during semester operations and disease prevalence among arriving students equal to national and regional averages. Rows 2-3: same results assuming reasonable and ideal cases for campus operation precautions, adherence, and effectiveness. Bottom row: worst case scenario assuming little-to-no campus operation precautions, compliance, or effectiveness.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

additional community resident deaths (median: 1, standard deviation: 1). For completeness, the idealistic best-case scenario causes a predicted additional 6 to 300 community resident infections (median: 48, standard deviation: 77) and 0 to 8 additional community resident deaths (median: 2, standard deviation: 2). Table 5 similarly tabulates month-to-month results. See the Appendix for similar community impact results assuming various scenarios for prevalence among arriving students and semester initialization precautions/effectiveness.

Scenario (Exposure Risk)	September			October			November			December		
	Expo	Infect	Mort	Expo	Infect	Mort	Expo	Infect	Mort	Expo	Infect	Mort
a. Community Outcomes Assuming no University Interaction (per 10,000)												
All Cases	11 (0, 64)	158 (122, 362)	6 (4, 18)	4 (0, 30)	175 (122, 455)	7 (4, 26)	1 (0, 14)	181 (122, 486)	7 (4, 28)	1 (0, 8)	182 (122, 495)	7 (4, 29)
b. Additional Community Outcomes Due to Reopening (total)												
Base case	6 (1, 24)	9 (2, 26)	0 (0, 1)	11 (1, 69)	32 (6, 126)	1 (0, 4)	13 (1, 148)	78 (10, 415)	3 (0, 10)	14 (1, 180)	124 (14, 755)	5 (1, 19)
25% reduced exposure	3 (1, 14)	6 (2, 17)	0 (0, 1)	4 (0, 23)	17 (4, 56)	1 (0, 2)	6 (0, 42)	32 (5, 147)	1 (0, 5)	6 (0, 57)	48 (7, 263)	2 (0, 7)
50% reduced exposure	1 (0, 4)	3 (1, 7)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 3)	6 (1, 16)	0 (0, 1)	1 (0, 3)	9 (2, 23)	0 (0, 1)	0 (0, 2)	10 (2, 29)	1 (0, 1)
75% reduced exposure	0 (0, 1)	1 (0, 2)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 3)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 4)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 4)	0 (0, 0)
c. Additional University Outcomes Due to Reopening (total)												
Base case	0 (0, 5)	1 (0, 10)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 8)	3 (0, 30)	0 (0, 0)	0 (-1, 10)	5 (0, 56)	0 (0, 0)	0 (-1, 8)	6 (0, 76)	0 (0, 0)
25% reduced exposure	0 (0, 4)	1 (0, 9)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 5)	2 (0, 22)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 5)	3 (0, 36)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 5)	4 (0, 46)	0 (0, 0)
50% reduced exposure	0 (0, 3)	1 (0, 7)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 2)	1 (0, 14)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 1)	1 (0, 19)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 1)	2 (0, 21)	0 (0, 0)
75% reduced exposure	0 (0, 2)	1 (0, 6)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 1)	1 (0, 11)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 13)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 13)	0 (0, 0)

Table 4. Predicted monthly (a) total community outcomes (per 10,000) assuming (a) no university interaction, (b) additional community resident outcomes, and (c) additional university student outcomes. Expo: exposures; Infect: infections; Mort: mortality. Tabulated values are medians; parentheses indicate 95% probability ranges given the noted uncertainties in many assumptions and inputs.

3.c. Sensitivity Analysis

To estimate the impact of school size, location (urban, rural), and student-to-community population sizes, Figure 6 compares changes in the above results given other representative population sizes, assuming the realistic arrival prevalence and campus operation precautions, compliance, and effectiveness scenarios. As shown, while differences exist in raw totals, as is intuitive given difference population sizes, results also appear similar and scale-invariant after adjusted for population size. For example, multiplying results by 2.5 for the second case of 40,000 residents

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

produces similar curves to those for the first case of 100,000 residents. Insights from most above results therefore can be viewed as generalizable to many other settings until further analyses can be conducted for any specific university and city size.



Figure 6. Impact of campus-to-community population sizes on predicted additional community (red) and student (blue) current exposures, total infections, and total deaths, assuming 1% prevalence among returning students and effective campus operations precautions (50% R_0 reduction). Urban large university: 10,000 students, 100,000 community residents; Non-urban large university: 10,000 students, 40,000 community residents; Small college non-urban: 2,000 students, 40,000 community residents.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

4. Discussion

The U.S. Covid-19 pandemic continues to be a significant public health crisis, with current infection and mortality rates meeting or exceeding those in March 2020 before physical distancing and work/school closures were determined to be the best courses of action. Model-based analyses, similar to as used to inform early policy decisions, now also can help inform decisions as to best courses of action at this critical time. Most immediately, results summarized herein can provide useful insights to inform immediate decisions regarding university voluntary or mandatory closing of physical campuses.

One of the most important insights of this study is that predicted community and student infections and mortality from campus opening are highly variable, depending on a combination of random chance and input, scenario, effectiveness, and compliance assumptions. It is nearly impossible with any certainty to know what resulting outcomes will be, and scrutiny (and skepticism) should occur of claims otherwise. What appears clearer is that anything close to "regular" (pre-Covid-19) campus operations could be disastrous and that community and student harm even under best likely scenarios, while dramatically reduced, still could be non-negligible. Under all scenarios, moreover, semester-long trends tend to manifest by weeks 8-to-10.

Implications of these results are significant. First and foremost, decisions to reopen should be revisited immediately given these potential community and student risks, including updated projections of local semester-start conditions, scenarios, and any new efficacy data. Conditions may exist under which reopening is fairly safe or introduces minimal risks, but since at the time of this analysis these appear more the minority than majority, heightened due diligence seems appropriate and important. It also is important to underscore that no decisions should be based on average results alone, since any single trajectory potentially could occur, but rather on the range (perhaps discounting extreme outliers); given that the fall of 2020 will occur once and only once, averages in this sense are less relevant without their probabilistic context.

Second, given the vast uncertainty and uncontrollability of what actually happens over any reopened semester or scenario, clear criteria should be established in advance under which a campus would tighten policies or close altogether, whether voluntary or mandated, including strong validated methods for rapidly detecting when such conditions are approaching and rapid initiation of existing contingency plans. Absent these *a priori*, any campus reopening might be considered a breach of public trust if not negligent. Since it appears as probable as not, moreover, that schools may need to transition to operating fully virtually by mid-semester or Thanksgiving break, families and public health officials should plan accordingly. A related implication is epidemic outbreaks that might be caused elsewhere by students traveling home upon such a transition but after SARS-CoV-2 has spread among the student body, underscoring the importance of rapid trend detection and action.

Fourth, contact tracing infrastructure and effectiveness should be examined and addressed if needed. For most scenarios, large numbers of potential student exposures occur weekly, manyfold beyond most described university conduct tracing capacities (a critical piece of some plans) within 24 hours of becoming infectious. This includes near immediate identification of positive

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

students upon becoming infectious (ignoring high asymptomatic rates that limit self-reporting). While many schools report creating impressive test capacities (ignoring poor sensitivity and between-test periods), it is unclear whether sufficient capacity exists then to trace contacts, presupposing detected positive students can (or are willing to) identify most contacts since their last negative test (or past 14 days), including community interactions. Based on predicted infections per week, revisiting whether sufficient dedicated isolated living space exists for the subset of positive students who are detected also seems prudent but perhaps doubtful.

Finally, viable alternatives to the historical mental model of 16-week on-campus semester should be further developed and refined to be better prepared to provide something other than the "old normal". As with other aspects of Covid-19 (e.g., insufficient protective equipment, delayed response, hospital capacity, etc), it might be argued that many were and remain similarly unprepared to develop and deploy new educational models. Dozens certainly exist or could be identified,[1] suggesting problems of complacency or paralysis. In other socioeconomic sectors, most notably healthcare and remote work, Covid-19 disruptions resulted in creation and refinement of significantly new ways to meet needs, some becoming permanent improvements and continuing to evolve over time.

Like any model-based analysis, results herein have some limitations and simplifications. A common barrier in using such models is data availability for input estimation and results validation (hence our search-based approach). The deterministic ODE modeling framework also ignores inherent variability and population heterogeneity,[116] motivating our use of Monte Carlo analysis, parameter search repetitions, and varied potential scenarios. Standard model simplifications include limiting the number of populations (e.g., one overall homogenous community population), limiting spread to just SARS-CoV-2 (e.g., ignoring seasonal influenza, the substance abuse co-epidemic, [75,76] and co-spread impacts), and not time-varying precaution compliance as concerns relax or heighten over time. Some modeled scenarios also were included for their potential insights rather than being feasible in practice (e.g., 80% reduction in virus infectivity, near 100% student compliance to protocols). Results nonetheless offer valuable insights into the range of potential community and student impacts, intervention effectiveness, and inflection criteria at which, if approaching, campuses rapidly should be closed.

Further work could expand on these results, including addressing some of these modeling simplifications made in the interest of time. Since over-detailing any model, however, can result in reduced accuracy,[117] generally only medium-fidelity models should be pursued. Work also could occur to determine, via modeling rather than "natural experiments" putting individuals at risk, acceptable combined conditions (reduced prevalence, vaccine effectiveness, improved precaution methods, etc.) under which different approaches are safer and less uncertain. City- or state-wide decision-making also might be considered in the future, such as coordinating across schools (voluntarily or mandated) as to alternating on-campus periods, numbers of allowed students by

[1] Single course short 4-week semesters, simultaneous integration of work and school, decentralized/distributed campuses (computing moved this direction decades ago), workplace-based education, alternating time periods, freshmen only on-campus, alternating class years, city- or state-wide density coordination and optimization, etc).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

semester and school, or otherwise in order to reduce total regional campus-x-community impacts; such scenarios and variations easily could be informed by similar modeling.

5. Conclusion

Controlling the U.S. Covid-19 pandemic this fall is extremely critical. Computer models can offer valuable insights to important decisions *a priori*, including the range of possible community outcomes from reopening and other important questions. The best use of such models is not to replace other forms of decision-making but rather to help inform such discussions in real-time, understand complex dynamics and data, and provide a framework for sense-making when significant uncertainties exist. While used more in early stages of the Covid-19 pandemic, [X-X] more recent decisions appear to be less informed by model-based analysis, and with most debate focusing on student impact but not local communities additionally.

In the case of university openings, such analysis makes three things clear: (1) exact outcomes over a 16-week semester can differ very significantly under different assumptions, (2) impacts on local communities could be significant, and (3) even under the best assumptions student and community outcomes appear highly uncertain and risky. Worst case scenarios, moreover, while less likely, could cause significant harm elsewhere upon student travel home. Similar analyses thus could investigate other ways to provide university education beyond return to old normals. As with healthcare and other businesses, strong and similar motivations exist to re-invent a large and important sector of our society.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (CMMI-1742521) and National Institute of Drug Abuse (R21DA046776-01). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not represent official views of the NIH nor NSF. The authors thank Basma Bargal for help with references.

References

1. World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. 2020; https://covid19.who.int/.
2. Bonaccorsi G, Pierri F, Cinelli M, et al. Economic and social consequences of human mobility restrictions under COVID-19. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* 2020;117(27):15530-15535.
3. Whitney P. Racial capitalism: A fundamental cause of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic inequities in the United States. *Health Education and Behavior.* 2020;47 (4):504-508.
4. Di Renzo L, Gualtieri P, Pivari F, et al. Eating habits and lifestyle changes during COVID-19 lockdown: an Italian survey. *Journal of Translational Medicine.* 2020;18(1):1-15.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

5. Baker SR, Bloom N, Davis SJ, Terry SJ. *Covid-induced economic uncertainty.* National Bureau of Economic Research;2020. 0898-2937.

6. Michael S. Colleges Are Deluding Themselves. May 15. 2020, 2020.

7. Weiyi CD, Ivory; Mitch, Smith; Alex, Lemonides; Lauryn, Higgins;. More Than 6,600 Coronavirus Cases Have Been Linked to U.S. Colleges. *The New York Times.* July 29, 2020.

8. Yascha M. Cancel College: Reopening universities will accomplish little and endanger many. August 8, 2020, 2020.

9. Panovska-Griffiths J, Kerr CC, Stuart RM, et al. Determining the optimal strategy for reopening schools, the impact of test and trace interventions, and the risk of occurrence of a second COVID-19 epidemic wave in the UK: a modelling study. *The Lancet Child and Adolescent Health.* 2020.

10. Vermund SH, Pitzer VE. Asymptomatic transmission and the infection fatality risk for COVID-19: Implications for school reopening. *Clinical Infectious Diseases.* 2020.

11. Di Domenico L, Pullano G, Sabbatini CE, Boëlle P-Y, Colizza V. Expected impact of reopening schools after lockdown on COVID-19 epidemic in Île-de-France. *medRxiv.* 2020.

12. Rich BGH, Cassell; Matthew E., Downs; John, Halamka; Shayri M., Kansagra; Leavitt, Partners; Rakhee, Palekar; Neelima, Ramaraju; Kunal J., Rambhia; Kippy, Rudy; Jay, Schnitzer; Taylor, Wilkerson; . *Planning For On-Campus K-12 Education During Covid-19.* Healthcare Coalition;2020.

13. Bond E, Dibner K, Schweingruber H. *Reopening K-12 Schools During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Prioritizing Health, Equity, and Communities.* Washington, DC2020.

14. Graeme W. There's No Simple Way to Reopen Universities. In. The Atlantic.

15. Erin D. College enrollment in the United States from 1965 to 2018 and projections up to 2029 for public and private colleges 2020; https://www.statista.com/statistics/183995/us-college-enrollment-and-projections-in-public-and-private-institutions/.

16. Barton DC. Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on field instruction and remote teaching alternatives: Results from a survey of instructors. *Ecology and evolution.* 2020.

17. North R, Vitto C, Hickam G, Santen SA, Messman A. Remote Learning in the Time of COVID-19. *AEM education and training.* 2020;4(3):280-283.

18. Gross LM. Learning Together During the COVID-19 Experience. *Journal - American Water Works Association.* 2020;112(8):81-83.

19. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Here's Our List of Colleges' Reopening Plans 2020; https://www.chronicle.com/article/Here-s-a-List-of-Colleges-/248626?bc_nonce=8pp81a34069hr195uggyf&cid=reg_wall_signup.

20. Hai D. Largest University System in US, Cal State, Moves Fall Classes Online *VOA News.* May 13, 2020, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

21. Weeden K, Cornwell B. The Small-World Network of College Classes: Implications for Epidemic Spread on a University Campus. *Sociological science.* 2020;7(9):222-241.

22. Chris Q. COVID-19 will hit colleges when students arrive for fall semester. So why open at all? Money is a factor. *USA Today.* August 17, 2020, 2020.

23. Massey CN, Duan; Alyf, Janmohamed; Jiayue, Wan; Yujia, Zhang; Shane, Henderson; David, Shmoys; Peter, Frazier;. *COVID-19 Mathematical Modeling for Cornell's Fall Semester.* Cornell University; June 15,2020 2020.

24. Jyoti M. 'Ethically troubling.' University reopening plans put professors, students on edge. In. *Science*. American Association For the Advancement of Science2020.

25. Shweta BC, Carlson; John, Kraemer;. There is no safe way to reopen colleges this fall *The Washington Post.* June 30, 2020, 2020.

26. Emma W. August Wave of Campus Reopening Reversals. *Inside Higher Ed.* August 12, 2020, 2020.

27. Joey H. What The Top 25 Colleges and Universities In The US Have Said About Their Plans to Reopen In Fall 2020, From Postponing The Semester To Offering More Remote Coursework. *Business Insider.* July 28, 2020, 2020.

28. Ron K. Stanford's plan for fall quarter: Most classes online, half the students on campus. *San Francisco Chronicle.* June 29, 2020.

29. Elinor AS, Zwickel;. In Person, Online Classes or A Mix: Colleges' Fall 2020 Coronavirus Reopening Plans, Detailed. *USA Today.* June 22, 2020, 2020.

30. Emily BZ, Murdock;. UConn revokes on-campus housing for students captured on video partying in a packed dorm room without face masks. *Hartford Courant.* August 18, 2020.

31. Emily C. BU Should Go Fully Online This Fall *BU Today.* July 9, 2020, 2020.

32. Northeastern University. Reopening Northeastern. 2020; https://news.northeastern.edu/coronavirus/.

33. Hellewell J, Abbott S, Gimma A, et al. Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases and contacts. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2020;8(4):e488-e496.

34. Oran DP, Topol EJ. Prevalence of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection: A Narrative Review. *Annals of internal medicine.* 2020.

35. Brüssow H. COVID-19: test, trace and isolate-new epidemiological data. *Environmental microbiology.* 2020;22(7):2445-2456.

36. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (Covid-19) from Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. *Annals of internal medicine.* 2020;172(9):577-582.

37. Harvard Health Publishing. If You've Been Exposed to The Coronavirus 2020; www.health.harvard.edu/diseases-and-conditions/if-youve-been-exposed-to-the-coronavirus.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

38. Mitch A. Young people and bars are a recipe for coronavirus. *The Daily Herald.* June 29, 2020, 2020.

39. Caroline K. Virginia Tech confirms five total positive COVID-19 cases ahead of first day of classes *ABC News.* August 18, 2020, 2020.

40. Wilson W. UNC-Chapel Hill goes to remote learning after 135 COVID-19 cases within week of starting classes. *NBC News.* August 18, 2020, 2020.

41. Bono G, Reil K, Hescox J. Stress and wellbeing in urban college students in the US during the COVID-19 pandemic: Can grit and gratitude help? *International Journal of Wellbeing.* 2020;10(3).

42. Gurukkal R. Will COVID 19 Turn Higher Education into Another Mode? *Higher Education for the Future.* 2020;7(2):89-96.

43. Catherine T. Why coronavirus-battered universities may not be able to use their endowments. *ABC News.* April 25, 2020, 2020.

44. Lee G. Colleges Face a No-Win Dilemma: To Cut or Not to Cut Tuition? *Chronicle of Higher Education.* July 15, 2020, 2020.

45. Cameron M. How COVID- 19 Can Reinvent Higher Education. May 5, 2020, 2020.

46. Sullivan R. College Towns and COVID-19: The Impact on New England. In: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston; 2020.

47. Viner RM, Bonell C, Drake L, et al. Reopening schools during the COVID-19 pandemic: governments must balance the uncertainty and risks of reopening schools against the clear harms associated with prolonged closure. *Archives of disease in childhood.* 2020:archdischild-2020-319963.

48. Andrew D. Here's A Look At The Impact Of Coronavirus (COVID-19) On Colleges And Universities In The U.S. *Forbes.* April 30, 2020, 2020.

49. Doug L. Low-Income Students Top Presidents' COVID-19 Worry List. *Inside Higher Ed.* April 27, 2020, 2020.

50. Doug L. COVID-19's Forceful Financial Hit: A Survey of Business Officers. *Inside Higher Ed.* July 10, 2020, 2020.

51. Gabriella BN, Layne;. North Carolina university is latest U.S. school to roll back campus reopening. *Reuters.* August 17,2020, 2020.

52. Tracking COVID-19 at Notre Dame. *The Observer.* August 15, 2020.

53. William M, Samara L. Significant number of Navy midshipmen test positive on return to school. *ABC News.* August 15, 2020, 2020.

54. Rachel T. Michigan State And Notre Dame Suspend In-Person Learning Over COVID-19 Concerns. *NPR.* August 18, 2020, 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

55. Athena J. 19 states see Covid-19 outbreaks on college campuses. 2020; https://www.cnn.com/videos/health/2020/08/21/coronavirus-daily-wrap-colleges-vaccine-jones-dnt-lead-vpx.cnn.

56. *High Schools Scramble to Contain Coronavirus outbreaks*. CBS2020.

57. Lois P. "This is exactly what we've been warning about": Why some school reopenings have backfired. In. *Vox*2020.

58. David A. At least 31 percent of children tested in Florida are positive for COVID-19: report. *FOX News.* July 15, 2020, 2020.

59. Public Affairs. Social Gatherings Produce Increase in Student Covid-19 Cases. https://news.berkeley.edu/2020/07/08/social-gatherings-produce-increase-in-student-covid-19-cases/.

60. Zachariah P, Johnson CL, Halabi KC, et al. Epidemiology, Clinical Features, and Disease Severity in Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) in a Children's Hospital in New York City, New York. *JAMA pediatrics.* 2020:e202430.

61. Liu Y, Gu Z, Xia S, et al. What are the underlying transmission patterns of COVID-19 outbreak? An age-specific social contact characterization. *EClinicalMedicine.* 2020;22:100354.

62. Kristin M. What Should I Know About Coronavirus and Children? In. *WCVB-TV channel 5*: Boston Children's Hospital; 2020.

63. Prosper O, Saucedo O, Thompson D, Torres-Garcia G, Wang X, Castillo-Chavez C. Modeling control strategies for concurrent epidemics of seasonal and pandemic H1N1 influenza. *Mathematical Biosciences Engineering.* 2011;8(1):141.

64. Choi YH, Jit M, Flasche S, Gay N, Miller E. Mathematical modelling long-term effects of replacing Prevnar7 with Prevnar13 on invasive pneumococcal diseases in England and Wales. *PLoS One.* 2012;7(7):e39927.

65. Mishra S, Pickles M, Blanchard JF, Moses S, Shubber Z, Boily M-C. Validation of the modes of transmission model as a tool to prioritize HIV prevention targets: a comparative modelling analysis. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(7):e101690.

66. Yang Z, Zeng Z, Wang K, et al. Modified SEIR and AI prediction of the epidemics trend of COVID-19 in China under public health interventions. *J Thorac Dis.* 2020;12(3):165-174.

67. Kermack WO, McKendrick AG. A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. *Proceedings of The Royal Society Of London.* 1927;115(772):700-721.

68. Hoppenstaedt F. *Mathematical theories of populations: demographics, genetics and epidemics.* SIAM; 1975.

69. Ramli M, Chaira Zulfa S, Ayuningtia Chaniago N, Halfiani V. Mathematical analysis on SEIR-type model of the Tuberculosis disease spread with vaccination and treatment elements. *Journal of physics Conference series.* 2019;1235:12120.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

70. Side S, Mulbar U, Sidjara S, Sanusi W. A SEIR model for transmission of tuberculosis. Paper presented at: AIP2017.

71. Dantas E, Tosin M, Cunha Jr A. Calibration of a SEIR–SEI epidemic model to describe the Zika virus outbreak in Brazil. *Applied mathematics and computation.* 2018;338:249-259.

72. McGee A. Zika Virus Transmission Using Two Overlapping SEIR Models. In: ProQuest Dissertations Publishing; 2018.

73. Lekone PE, Finkenstädt BF. Statistical Inference in a Stochastic Epidemic SEIR Model with Control Intervention: Ebola as a Case Study. *Biometrics.* 2006;62(4):1170-1177.

74. Wakeland W, Nielsen A, Schmidt TD. System dynamics modeling of medical use, nonmedical use and diversion of prescription opioid analgesics. Paper presented at: 30th International System Dynamics Conference2012; St. Gallen, Switzerland.

75. Wayne W, Alexandra N, Teresa DS, et al. Modeling the Impact of Simulated Educational Interventions on the Use and Abuse of Pharmaceutical Opioids in the United States: A Report on Initial Efforts. *Health Educ Behav.* 2013;40(1_suppl):74S-86S.

76. White E, Comiskey C. Heroin epidemics, treatment and ODE modelling. *Math Biosci.* 2007;208(1):312-324.

77. Kang H, Wang Y, Tong Z, Liu X. Retest Positive for SARS-CoV-2 RNA of "Recovered" Patients with COVID-19: Persistence, Sampling Issues, or Re-infection? *Journal of Medical Virology.* 2020.

78. Naylor TH, Finger JM. Verification of Computer Simulation Models. *Management Science.* 1967;14(2):B-92-B-101.

79. Law AM. *Simulation modeling and analysis.* 2nd ed. ed. New york: New york : McGraw-Hill; 1991.

80. McHale M, Friedman J, Karian J. Standard for verification and validation in computational fluid dynamics and heat transfer. *The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.* 2009:20-2009.

81. Sargent RG. *A New Statistical Procedure for Validation of Simulation and Stochastic Models.* Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University;2010.

82. North American CRO Council. Model Validation Principles Applied to Risk and Capital Models in the Insurance Industry. 2012; http://www.crocouncil.org/images/CRO_Council_-_Model_Validation_Principles.pdf.

83. Edlund S, Kaufman J, Lessler J, et al. Comparing three basic models for seasonal influenza. *Epidemics.* 2011;3(3):135-142.

84. González-Parra G, Arenas AJ, Aranda DF, Segovia L. Modeling the epidemic waves of AH1N1/09 influenza around the world. *Spatial and spatio-temporal epidemiology.* 2011;2(4):219-226.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

85. Venkatramanan S, Lewis B, Chen J, Higdon D, Vullikanti A, Marathe M. Using data-driven agent-based models for forecasting emerging infectious diseases. *Epidemics.* 2018;22:43-49.

86. Ameri K, Cooper KD. A Network-Based Compartmental Model For The Spread Of Whooping Cough In Nebraska. *JAMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings.* 2019;2019:388.

87. Mahdizadeh Gharakhanlou N, Mesgari MS, Hooshangi N. Developing an agent-based model for simulating the dynamic spread of Plasmodium vivax malaria: A case study of Sarbaz, Iran. *Ecological informatics.* 2019;54:101006.

88. Montalan JR, Estuar MRJ, Teknomo K, Gardon RW. Measles Metapopulation Modeling using Ideal Flow of Transportation Networks. Paper presented at: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Software Engineering and Information Management2019.

89. Naserpor A, Niakan Kalhori SR, Ghazisaeedi M, Azizi R, Hosseini Ravandi M, Sharafie S. Modification of the Conventional Influenza Epidemic Models Using Environmental Parameters in Iran. *Healthc Inform Res.* 2019;25(1):27-32.

90. Systrom K, Vladeck T, Krieger M. Rt COVID-19. In. *Rt.Live*2020.

91. Gaskins N. CU Boulder: Increase In COVID-19 Positive Tests Expected. In. *Yahoo! News*2020.

92. Maccabe T. One percent of Purdue students test positive for COVID-19. In. *WRTV Indianapolis*2020.

93. Mansell W, Lynn S. Significant number of Navy midshipmen test positive on return to school. In. *Yahoo! News*2020.

94. Rahmandad H, Lim T, Sterman J. Estimating COVID-19 Under-Reporting Across 86 Nations: Implications for Projections and Control. *SSRN.* 2020.

95. COVID-19 Coronavirus Incubation. In. *Worldometer*2020.

96. Interim Clinical Guidance for Management of Patients with Confirmed Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19). In. *CDC*2020.

97. Maragakis L. Coronavirus Diagnosis: What Should I Expect? *John Hopkins Medicine.* 2020. https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/health/conditions-and-diseases/coronavirus/diagnosed-with-covid-19-what-to-expect. Accessed July 7.

98. Sakurai A, Sasaki T, Kato S, et al. Natural History of Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *The New England Journal of Medicine.* 2020:1-2.

99. *Report of the WHO-China Joint Mission on Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19).* World Health Organization;2020.

100. Mortality Analyses. In. *John Hopkins Medicine Coronavirus Resource Center*2020.

101. Perez-Saez F, Lauer S, Kaiser L, et al. Serology-informed estimates of SARS-COV-2 infection fatality risk in Geneva, Switzerland. In. *OSFPREPRINTS*2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

102. Wiersinga WJ RA, Cheng AC, Peacock SJ, Prescott HC. Pathophysiology, Transmission, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Review. *JAMA.* 2020.

103. University of Washington. Novel coronavirus & COVID-19: facts and resources. 2020; https://www.washington.edu/coronavirus/?utm_source=uwhp&utm_medium=tiles&utm_campaign=covid-safe-start.

104. Purdue University. Chronology of Purdue's Response to COVID-19. 2020; https://protect.purdue.edu/timeline/.

105. Richards M, Janes J. Resiliency planning for autumn quarter. In. *University of Washington*2020.

106. Rice University. Return to Rice. 2020; https://coronavirus.rice.edu/.

107. University S. COVID-19 Health Alerts. 2020; https://healthalerts.stanford.edu/covid-19/.

108. Ohio State University. Safe and Healthy Buckeyes. 2020; https://safeandhealthy.osu.edu/.

109. Harter K, Raudins S. President Drake says on-campus transition could begin in coming weeks. In. *The Lantern*2020.

110. Aoun J. University Messages: Our path forward. In. *News@Northeastern*2020.

111. California State University. Latest Information About Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19). 2020; https://www.csub.edu/covid-19.

112. Smith A, Burke M, Gordon L. Quick Guide: California colleges and universities respond to the coronavirus. In. *EdSource*2020.

113. Conneticut State University. Eastern Fall Reopening. 2020; https://www.easternct.edu/reopening/index.html.

114. Hladky G. State college and university campuses to reopen for start of fall semester. In. *ct mirror*2020.

115. Box GEP, Behnken DW. Some New Three Level Designs for the Study of Quantitative Variables. *Technometrics.* 1960;2(4):455-475.

116. Hurd HS, Kaneene JB. The Application of Simulation Models And Systems Analysis In Epidemiology: A Review. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine.* 1993;15(2-3):81-99.

117. Murdoch WJ, Singh C, Kumbier K, Abbasi-Asl R, Yu B. Definitions, methods, and applications in interpretable machine learning. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2019;116(44):22071-22080.

118. Coronavirus (Covid-19) Data in the United States. In. *Github*.

119. Population Estimates. In. *United States Census Bureau*.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix

Community impact of campus opening based on various disease prevalence assumptions among arriving students (i.e. starting semester); alternate analysis to Figure 5 and Table 4, based on different campus operations precautions and compliance assumptions (i.e. throughout semester).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure A1. Additional (a) community and (b) campus exposures, infections, and mortality per 10,000 community residents or students due to community-x-campus cross-exposure (student arrival assumption: 1% infected or exposed; top row of figure 5a: total resident exposures, infections, and death assuming no interaction with schools). Top row: additional exposures, infections, and deaths due to campus reopening assuming no intake precautions and disease prevalence among arriving students equal to national and regional averages. Rows 2-3: same results assuming reasonable and ideal cases for arrival prevalence, precautions, adherence, and effectiveness. Bottom row: worst case scenario assuming high arrival prevalence and little-to-no precautions, compliance, or effectiveness.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.29.20184366; this version posted September 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Scenario	September			October			November			December		
	Expo	Infect	Mort	Expo	Infect	Mort	Expo	Infect	Mort	Expo	Infect	Mort
a. Community Outcomes Assuming no University Interaction (per 10,000)												
All Cases	11 (0, 64)	158 (122, 362)	6 (4, 18)	4 (0, 30)	175 (122, 455)	7 (4, 26)	1 (0, 14)	181 (122, 486)	7 (4, 28)	1 (0, 8)	182 (122, 495)	7 (4, 29)
b. Additional Community Outcomes Due to Reopening (total)												
Base case	12 (2, 48)	18 (5, 51)	1 (0, 2)	20 (2, 116)	60 (11, 228)	2 (0, 7)	24 (2, 186)	138 (19, 633)	6 (1, 18)	26 (2, 203)	230 (26, 1000)	8 (1, 29)
Reasona-ble pre-cautions	6 (1, 24)	9 (2, 26)	0 (0, 1)	11 (1, 69)	32 (6, 126)	1 (0, 4)	13 (1, 148)	78 (10, 415)	3 (0, 10)	14 (1, 180)	124 (14, 755)	5 (1, 19)
Idealistic precau-tions	1 (0, 3)	1 (0, 3)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 9)	4 (1, 14)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 32)	10 (1, 63)	0 (0, 1)	2 (0, 71)	18 (1, 170)	1 (0, 3)
Worst case	27 (4, 112)	44 (11, 124)	1 (0, 4)	42 (4, 207)	141 (27, 457)	5 (1, 17)	42 (4, 240)	263 (45, 970)	11 (2, 38)	36 (3, 217)	377 (58, 1376)	17 (3, 57)
c. Additional University Outcomes Due to Reopening (total)												
Base case	0 (0, 5)	1 (0, 10)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 6)	2 (0, 27)	0 (0, 0)	0 (-1, 6)	4 (0, 46)	0 (0, 0)	0 (-1, 5)	3 (0, 56)	0 (0, 0)
Reasona-ble pre-cautions	0 (0, 5)	1 (0, 10)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 8)	3 (0, 30)	0 (0, 0)	0 (-1, 10)	5 (0, 56)	0 (0, 0)	0 (-1, 8)	6 (0, 76)	0 (0, 0)
Idealistic precau-tions	0 (0, 5)	1 (0, 10)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 10)	3 (0, 33)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 22)	8 (0, 70)	0 (0, 0)	1 (0, 27)	13 (0, 122)	0 (0, 1)
Worst case	0 (0, 4)	1 (0, 9)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 4)	2 (0, 21)	0 (0, 0)	0 (0, 3)	1 (0, 29)	0 (0, 0)	0 (-1, 2)	1 (0, 32)	0 (0, 0)

Table A1. Predicted monthly (a) total community outcomes (per 10,000) assuming (a) no university interaction, (b) additional community resident outcomes, and (c) additional university student outcomes. Expo: exposures; Infect: infections; Mort: mortality. Tabulated values are medians; values in parentheses indicate 95% probability ranges on actual values given the noted uncertainties in many assumptions and inputs.