Causal Impacts of Teaching Modality on U.S. COVID-19 Spread in Fall 2020 Semester

Syed Badruddoza*

Modhurima Dey Amin**

* Corresponding author. Assistant Research Professor at Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409, United States. Email: syed.badruddoza@ttu.edu.

** Assistant Professor at Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409, United States. Email: modhurima.amin@ttu.edu.

Abstract

We study the impact of college openings and teaching modality on county-level COVID-19 cases and deaths using the information of 745 U.S. colleges. We group the colleges by their teaching modes in the fall 2020 semester: in-person, online, and hybrid; and employ a logistic model and a gradient boosting algorithm to estimate the propensity scores for the three groups to adjust the pre-treatment imbalances of college and county-level covariates. We find that greater enrollments, individual mask policies, and fewer republican votes in the county are major predictors of adopting online or hybrid modes. Treatment effects provide evidence that college reopenings, especially with in-person teaching elements, increase daily new cases and deaths.

JEL: I10, I23

Keywords: COVID-19, Coronavirus, Mode of teaching, College, Hybrid, Online, Multiple treatment effects

Badruddoza, Syed and Amin, Modhurima Dey. 2020. Causal Impacts of Teaching Modality on U.S. COVID-19 Spread in Fall 2020 Semester. medRxiv.

Causal Impacts of Teaching Modality on U.S. COVID-19 Spread in Fall 2020 Semester

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic and its containment measures have unprecedentedly affected human health and economic activities (e.g., McKibbin and Fernando, 2020; Atkeson, 2020). Countries across the world have implemented partial or full business and school closures to mitigate the infection spread (Panovska-Griffiths et al., 2020; Di Domenico et al., 2020). Many U.S. colleges temporarily closed or switched to online in the spring semester, and over six out of ten colleges reopened in the fall semester with an in-person or a combination of in-person and online teaching plans (Gallagher and Palmer, 2020; College Crisis Initiative, 2020). College students mainly fall in the age cohort of 18 to 29 years, which has a lower death rate (0.4%) from COVID-19 (Wrighton and Lawrence, 2020), but a greater chance of socialization than the other age cohorts. Although colleges are following best practices–including symptom screening, contact tracing, cleaning and disinfecting, and mandatory mask policies–there is a chance that reopening colleges may spread the virus among faculty and staff serving students, and in the region around the college (Hubler and Hartocollis, 2020).

Figure (1) and (2) respectively show daily new COVID-19 cases and deaths grouped by college teaching modality. Both series are shown as percentages of their values on August 10th, 2020 to eliminate the initial differences and make the figures comparable across groups. Median values are plotted to remove the influence of extreme observations. Figure 1 suggests that colleges teaching in- person are located in counties with rapidly increasing COVID-19 cases. Small bumps of cases right before the start dates indicate reopening-induced testing. In Figure 2, new deaths in counties with colleges teaching in person are growing faster than hybrid and online groups. Thus, the figures suggest that both COVID- 19 cases and deaths grow faster in counties where colleges started the fall semester with in-person mode.

Given the substantial risk of infection spread from college campuses to the community, a timely policy question is whether colleges should continue with in-person classes or switch to online or hybrid mode. The current study applies a quasi-experimental approach to find the impacts of teaching modality on infection spread onto the neighboring areas. We combine college and county information to predict the chance of a college adopting one of the three modes of teaching: in-person, online, and hybrid; and then estimate the effects of the decision on county COVID-19 outcomes. Results provide evidence that college reopenings, especially with in-person teaching elements, increase daily new cases and deaths. Most studies so far have looked into the impact of elementary and secondary school closure, optimal reopening plan, and teaching strategy (e.g., Di Domenico et al., 2020; Panovska-Griffiths et al., 2020; Gandolfi, 2020; Cohen et al., 2020; Panovska- Griffiths et al., 2020). Walke, Honein, and Redfield (2020) discuss the possible issues of U.S. college reopening and the prevention measures required on campuses. In a study close to ours, Andersen et al. (2020) investigate college openings' association with cellphone-tracked human mobility and COVID-19 cases in the counties of the campuses. Their preliminary results (as of September 23rd, 2020) suggest that reopenings with primarily in-person instruction increased county COVID-19 cases by 0.024 per thousand people, and no significant differences exist between online and in-person instructional modality. However, their study does not consider the fact that the choice of reopening and teaching modality is endogenous to observed cases. We use a matching method derived from multinomial logistic and machine learning to re-weight the sample based on the college's probability of selecting an instructional mode. This approach also unravels the predictors of choosing a particular teaching mode. In addition, Andersen et al. (2020) collect start dates from the fall 2019 semester that may not represent the actual scenario in 2020 because some college opened early to finish the semester before thanksgiving vacation, whereas some colleges delayed opening or opened with an online mode waiting for cases to decrease.

2. Method

We are interested in finding the effects of teaching modality on two COVID-19 outcomes: (1) new daily COVID-19 cases per 100,000 people reported in the county, and (2) new COVID-19 related deaths per 100,000 people in the county. We specify the relationship between college reopening in the fall semester and the outcome as below,

$$Y_{it} = A_0 + \alpha(\text{Fall})_{it} + \beta X_{it} + A_i + e_{it} \tag{1}$$

where, Y_{it} is a COVID-19 outcome, $i = 1, \ldots, N$, and $t = 1, \ldots, T$ respectively indicate colleges and days, and A_0 is the intercept. Fall is a binary variable that takes value 1 when the college officially reopens for the fall 2020 semester, and zero for all previous dates. The vector *X* includes observed daily covariates such as population mobility, A_i is college fixed effects. Parameters to be estimated include α and β, and e_{it} stands for the error. Estimating α gives the average difference in Y_{it} between colleges that have reopened and colleges that have not, because different colleges reopened on different dates.

To measure the average treatment effects (ATE) of teaching modality, let the set {Online, Hybrid, In-person} denote the options a college can choose from. We re-specify the model as,

$$Y_{it} = A_0' + \alpha_1(\text{Online})_{it} + \alpha_2(\text{Hybrid})_{it} + \alpha_3(\text{In-person})_{it} + \beta' X_{it} + A_i' + e_{it}' \tag{2}$$

where, parameters α_1, α_2 and α_3 show the effects of respective treatments on Y_{it}. The parameters in equation (1) and (2) are technically different, hence the prime ($'$) sign, but have a similar interpretation. The intercept A_0' represents the overall mean of pre-semester Y_{it}. The causal effects of teaching modality on COVID-19 outcomes are identified if colleges were homogeneous and were randomly assigned a teaching mode (Barnow, Cain, and Goldberger, 1981). In practice, the treatment assignment is not random, because colleges choose the mode of teaching based on their distance education capacities, observed COVID-19 cases, and many other characteristics. The probability of adopting a teaching modality, e.g., online, should considerably vary across colleges.

Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983, 1984) discuss propensity score matching (PSM) to adjust the probabilities for the differences in pre-treatment variables. A propensity score is the conditional probability of receiving the treatment given the pretreatment variables. In our context, the probabilities of selecting a teaching mode can be obtained from the following specification.

$$\{\text{Online}_\text{i}, \text{Hybrid}_\text{i}, \text{In-person}_\text{i}\} = \text{f}(\text{College features, Regional features}) \quad (3)$$

The probabilities of treatments generated from equation (3) are used to create weights that adjust the effects of treatments in estimating equation (2). For example, if a college has a high probability of choosing online, then hybrid, then in-person, greater weights are assigned on in-person, then hybrid, followed by online during the estimation (McCaffrey et al., 2013).

The key difference between equation (3) and Rosenbaum–Rubin's matching model is that their model mainly deals with binary treatments, whereas we have three treatments. Imbens (2000) extends the concept to multiple treatments, and suggests a multinomial or nested logit for multivalued discrete response models where the ordering of the response does not matter (see Lopez and Gutman (2017) for a review). Recent works have also examined the application of machine learning approaches such as bagging or boosting, random forests, other tree-based methods, and neural networks (McCaffrey, Ridgeway, and Morral, 2004; Setoguchi et al., 2008; Lee, Lessler and Stuart, 2010; McCaffrey et al., 2013).

We estimate a multinomial logit model for PSM (equation 3) using cross-sectional data of college and county features. The predicted probabilities of adopting a teaching mode for each college are then inverted and used as weights in a panel fixed effects (FE) regression following equation (2). The sources of variation are colleges for the cross-section, and college times days for the panel. For robustness, we repeat the task with a gradient booster model instead of multinomial logit. A logit model provides interpretable coefficient estimates, whereas gradient boosting offers greater predictive accuracy

(Ridgeway et al., 2014; Burgette, Griffin and McCaffrey, 2017). McCaffrey, Ridgeway, and Morral (2004) and Mc- Caffrey et al. (2013, 2015) discuss the technical details of the two approaches. In simple words, a gradient booster involves growing decision trees from randomly chosen college and county characteristics to predict the treatment group, and then repeating the process to explain the residuals and re-adjust the importance of predictors to achieve the optimal prediction. The algorithm penalizes complex and large decision trees in order to avoid overfitting (Chen and Guestrin, 2016). The importance factors on predictors from gradient booster are not as interpretable as coefficients from a multinomial logit, so we use the gradient booster to predict PSM only, and do not discuss the importance factors.

3. Data and Descriptive Statistics

We collected characteristics of four-year and two-year undergraduate degree-granting colleges and universities from the National Center for Education Statistics (2020). Most of the colleges available in the data are public or private non-profit. Data on teaching modality in the fall 2020 semester come from the College Crisis Initiative (2020). The College Crisis initiative reports fall reopening plans, which we categorize into three types: (1) in-person, (2) online, and (3) hybrid. Colleges in the “in-person” group conduct classes in person with certain exceptions for online delivery and open residence halls; colleges in the “online” group primarily conduct classes online with some exceptions for lab components and may have some students on campus; and colleges in the “hybrid” group either switch the teaching mode on a rolling basis, or offer courses with both in-person and online access. We manually collected the official start dates of the fall 2020 semester from respective college websites. County characteristics were extracted from the American Community Survey (2020). Merging all these data eventually gives

745 colleges in bordering states. Alaska and Hawaii were omitted to avoid large heterogeneity in regional features.

We obtain daily new COVID-19 cases and deaths at the county level from the New York Times (2020). The impact of teaching modality is assessed on county-level outcomes (and not on the college level) because students may spread the virus to non-students and immunocompromised people in the community, which is a pressing policy concern. We also merged the data with individual mask policies in county and state from HealthData.gov (2020). Finally, information on county-level shares of republican votes in Presidential Election 2016 is included from McGovern et al. (2017) to take residents' perception of COVID-19 risk into account (e.g., Tyson, 2020).

Table (1) provides variable descriptions and sources, and Tables (2) and (3) respectively present summary statistics of variables used in PSM and panel FE. For the panel regression, we chose August 10 as the starting point of data to spare two weeks before the start date of the fall semester. Maximum colleges (212 out of 745 in our sample) started the semester on August 24th. September 19th, 2020 was chosen as the endpoint based on data availability. The panel regression use college fixed effects, and controls for the percentage of county population stayed home daily, collected from the Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2020). Omitting stay-home makes the effects of a teaching mode on COVID-19 outcomes biased, because COVID-19 outcomes may increase if fewer people stay home regardless of campus reopening or teaching modality.

A required condition for estimating treatment effects is distributional similarities of pre-treatment covariates across the treatment groups McCaffrey et al. (2013). Table (2) and table (4) indicate considerable variation across treatment groups. The mean different t-tests are significant especially when variables are compared between online and in-person group. The difference justifies the use of

PSM in our analysis. In fact, comparing propensity scores across treatment groups is equivalent to comparing the pre-treatment covariates, which is done in the next section.

4. Results

To calculate the probability of choosing each teaching mode and re-adjust the weights, we use a multinomial logistic regression. The results in table (5) shows that colleges that chose online teaching mode over in-person have greater enrollment, endowment per student, and are public in nature. Online-teaching colleges are located in a county that has more population, on-going mask ordinance, and fewer republican votes. From hybrid and in-person comparison in table (5) column (2), hybrid-adopting colleges have more enrollment, a lower cost of attendance, fewer students per faculty and are located in a county with fewer republican votes. To summarize, greater enrollment, fewer republican supporters in the county, and prevailing individual mask ordinance are common predictors of adopting online or hybrid teaching modality over in-person.

We use the multinomial logit model to calculate the propensity scores for each college. The scores need to be sufficiently similar across groups for causal estimation. Figure (3) compares the distributions of the propensity scores using box plots. The distributions are overlapping–an essential feature for causal estimation (McCaffrey et al., 2013). We invert the scores and use them as weights to adjust the difference of college and county characteristics across treatment groups. The maximum Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) statistic of distributional equality is 0.33 for the unweighted sample and 0.12 for the weighted sample, with p-values zero and 0.059, respectively. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis of distributional equality for the unweighted sample, but fail to reject the null for the weighted sample. That is, we use PSM to create a weighted sample such that any teaching mode is equally likely to be

chosen by a college. We now utilize the weighted sample to estimate the causal effects of teaching modality on COVID-19 cases and deaths.

Tables (6) and (7) present the results from the panel fixed effects regression. The dependent variables (1) daily new COVID-19 cases per 100,000 people and (2) daily new COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 people do not have autocorrelation. The adjusted t statistics from Levin, Lin, and Chu (2002) unit-root tests are -59.56 and -71.89 respectively, both significant at 0.01%.

Overall, daily new COVID-19 cases increased in the fall 2020 semester, by about 1.87 cases per 100,000 population. Cases increased the most where colleges adopted an in-person teaching mode, followed by hybrid, compared to the pre-semester benchmark (table 6 column 2). Online dummy is statistically insignificant– showing no difference in cases between online teaching and pre-semester situation. However, effects on COVID-19 cases become similar for online (+1.8) and hybrid (+1.6) modes when we control for the endogeneity (table 6 column 3). Most importantly, counties where colleges reopened with an in-person mode experienced a statistically significant rise of 2.5 new cases. The results remain robust when we estimate the propensity scores with Gradient Booster (table 6 column 4). Table (7) also show a positive effect of campus reopening on daily new COVID- 19 deaths–about 0.04 per 100,000 population. The mean effect is disentangled by teaching modes: in-person teaching mode raises the pre-semester death rate by 0.049, followed by hybrid (0.048), and online (0.035) (table 7 column 2). Online dummy becomes insignificant when PSM weights from multinomial logit are used, but the magnitude of the coefficient is similar to that of the hybrid dummy when weighted by gradient booster propensity scores. The effect of in-person teaching modes remains statistically significant and greater than other modes' in all specifications.

We find a mixed result on the effects of online and hybrid modes–none is consistently greater than the other. One explanation is that students might choose online when offered a combination (hybrid) of

online and in-person. Finally, a percent increase in the county population who stayed home decreases new COVID-19 cases by about 0.7, and new deaths by 0.035 per 100,000 population. The effect is consistent across the models.

5. Policy Implications

Our findings have several implications for higher education and health policy. First, results from the multinomial logit suggest that colleges with smaller endowments per student are less likely to choose online over in-person teaching mode. Moreover, the treatment effects show adopting an in-person mode instead of an online mode may increase COVID-19 cases and deaths. Therefore, colleges with small endowments need special policy attention to combat a disease-induced pandemic.

Second, campus reopening has a positive impact on COVID-19 cases and deaths that is primarily driven by in-person teaching modes, and cannot be avoided completely even when colleges choose online. However, the damage can be partially mitigated with an initiative from the colleges by increasing distance education elements in classes.

Third, we found a direct negative association between the percentage of county residents staying home and COVID-19 spread. Policies aimed at individual mask use might have an indirect negative effect on COVID-19 as well. Given other attributes, counties that start mandatory mask use in public places are likely to nudge college administration towards online or hybrid classes, which in turn reduce the virus spread in the community.

Finally, counties with more republican votes in Presidential Election 2016 are less likely to choose online or hybrid modes over in-person, ceteris paribus. The finding indicates that political affiliation might play a role in the containment of COVID-19.

References

American Community Survey. 2020. “American Community Survey Data.” Available https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data.html, Accessed 10/01/2020.

Andersen, Martin S, Ana I Bento, Anirban Basu, Chris Marsicano, and Kosali Simon. 2020. “College Openings, Mobility, and the Incidence of COVID-19 Cases.” medRxiv. (September 23: doi:10.1101/2020.09.22.20196048).

Atkeson, Andrew. 2020. “What will be the economic impact of COVID-19 in the us? Rough estimates of disease scenarios.” National Bureau of Economic Research. No. w26867.

Barnow, Burt S, GS Cain, and Arthur S Goldberger. 1981. “Issues in the Analysis of Selectivity Bias”, Evaluation Studies Review Annal” (W. Stromdorfer and G. Farkas, Eds). Pg. 43-59. Sage Press, Beverly Hills.

Bureau of Transportation Statistics. 2020. “Daily travel during the COVID-19 public health emergency.” Available https://www.bts.gov/browse-statistical-products-and-data/trips-distance/daily-travel-during-covid-19- pandemic, Accessed 10/01/2020.

Burgette, Lane, Beth Ann Griffin, and Dan McCaffrey. 2017. “Propensity scores for multiple treatments: A tutorial for the mnps function in the twang package.” R package. Rand Corporation.

Chen, Tianqi, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. “Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system.” Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, pages 785–794. ACM.

Cohen, Jamie A, Dina Mistry, Cliff C Kerr, and Daniel J Klein. 2020. “Schools are not islands: Balancing COVID-19 risk and educational benefits using structural and temporal countermeasures.” medRxiv. doi:10.1101/2020.09.08.20190942.

College Crisis Initiative. 2020. “Fall 2020 Plans.” Available https://collegecrisis.shinyapps.io/dashboard/, Accessed 10/01/2020.

Di Domenico, Laura, Giulia Pullano, G Pullano, Niel Hens, and Vittoria Colizza. 2020. “Expected impact of school closure and telework to mitigate COVID-19 epidemic in France.” Technical Report. Epicx Lab.

Gallagher, Sean, and Jason Palmer. 2020. “The pandemic pushed universities online: the change was long overdue.” Harvard Business Review, September 29. Available https://hbr.org/2020/09/the-pandemic-pushed-universities-online-the-change-was-long-overdue, Accessed 10/01/2020.

Gandolfi, Alberto. 2020. “Planning of school teaching during COVID-19.” Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 415(January 2021): 132753.

HealthData.gov. 2020. “COVID-19 state and county policy orders.” https://healthdata.gov/dataset/covid-19-state-and-county-policy-orders, Accessed: 2020-09-30.

Hubler, Shawn, and Anemona Hartocollis. 2020. “How colleges be- came the new COVID hot stops.” The New York Times, September 11. Available https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/11/us/college-campus-outbreak-covid.html, Accessed 10/01/2020.

Imbens, Guido W. 2000. “The role of the propensity score in estimating dose- response functions.” Biometrika, 87(3): 706–710.

Lee, Brian K, Justin Lessler, and Elizabeth A Stuart. 2010. “Improving propensity score weighting using machine learning.” Statistics in medicine, 29(3): 337–346.

Levin, Andrew, Chien-Fu Lin, and Chia-Shang James Chu. 2002. “Unit root tests in panel data: asymptotic and finite-sample properties.” Journal of econometrics, 108(1): 1–24.

Lopez, Michael J, and Roee Gutman. 2017. “Estimation of causal effects with multiple treatments: a review and new ideas.” Statistical Science, 32(3): 432–454.

McCaffrey, Daniel F, Beth Ann Griffin, Daniel Almirall, Mary Ellen Slaughter, Rajeev Ramchand, and Lane F Burgette. 2013. “A tutorial on propensity score estimation for multiple treatments using generalized boosted models.” Statistics in medicine, 32(19): 3388–3414.

McCaffrey, Daniel F, Greg Ridgeway, and Andrew R Morral. 2004. “Propensity score estimation with boosted regression for evaluating causal effects in observational studies.” Psychological methods, 9(4): 403.

McCaffrey, Daniel F, Lane F Burgette, Beth Ann Griffin, and Craig Martin. 2015. “Propensity scores for multiple treatments: a tutorial for the mnps macro in the twang SAS macros.” RAND Corporation. June 16, 2016. TL-169/1-NIDA.

McGovern, Tony, Stephen Larson, Bill Morris, and Matt Hodges. 2017. “Presidential Election Results.” Available https://github.com/tonmcg/US_County_Level_Election_Results_08-16, Accessed 2020-09-30.

McKibbin, Warwick, and Roshen Fernando. 2020. “The economic impact of COVID-19.” Economics in the Time of COVID-19, (Richard Baldwin and Weder di Mauro eds.), p. 45. London: CEPR Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2020. “Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.” Available https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/use-the-data, Accessed 10/01/2020.

New York Times. 2020. “COVID in the U.S.: Latest Map and Case Count.” https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/coronavirus-us-cases.html, Accessed: 2020-09-30.

Panovska-Griffiths, Jasmina, Cliff C Kerr, Robyn M Stuart, Dina Mistry, Daniel J Klein, Russell M Viner, and Chris Bonell. 2020. “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 & Adolescent Health, 4(11): 817–827.

Ridgeway, Greg, Daniel F McCaffrey, Andrew R Morral, Lane F Burgette, and Beth Ann Griffin. 2014. “Toolkit for weighting and analysis of nonequivalent groups: a tutorial for the R TWANG

package." RAND Corporation. Available https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/twang/vignettes/twang.pdf. Accessed 10/01/2020.

Rosenbaum, Paul R, and Donald B Rubin. 1983. "The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects." Biometrika, 70(1): 41–55.

Rosenbaum, Paul R, and Donald B Rubin. 1984. "Reducing bias in observational studies using subclassification on the propensity score." Journal of the American statistical Association, 79(387): 516–524.

Setoguchi, Soko, Sebastian Schneeweiss, M Alan Brookhart, Robert J Glynn, and E Francis Cook. 2008. "Evaluating uses of data mining techniques in propensity score estimation: a simulation study." Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety, 17(6): 546–555.

Tyson, Alec. 2020. "Republicans remain far less likely than Democrats to view COVID-19 as a major threat to public health." Fact Tank by Pew Research Center, 1(1): 1. Available https://www.pewresearch.org/fact- tank/2020/07/22/republicans-remain-far-less-likely-than-democrats-to-view- covid-19-as-a-major-threat-to-public-health/, Accessed 10/24/2020.

Walke, Henry T, Margaret A Honein, and Robert R Redfield. 2020. "Preventing and responding to COVID-19 on college campuses." JAMA, September 29. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.20027.

Wrighton, Mark S, and Steven J Lawrence. 2020. "Reopening Colleges and Universities During the COVID-19 Pandemic." Annals of Internal Medicine. October. https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-4752.

Figures



Figure 1. Growth of COVID-19 cases by college teaching modality

Note: Daily data from August 10th to September 19th 2020. See the data section for details.

Source: Cases are obtained from the New York Times (2020), and teaching modality from the College Crisis Initiative (2020).



Figure 2. Growth of COVID-19 deaths by college teaching modality

Note: Daily data from August 10th to September 19th 2020. See the data section for details.

Source: Deaths are obtained from the New York Times (2020), and teaching modality from the College Crisis Initiative (2020).



Figure 3. Overlap assessment of propensity scores by treatment group

Note: Horizontal axis shows observed values of treatment, the vertical axis shows the estimated propensity scores, and tabs on the top represent the response variable in the matching model.

Source: Estimation of equation (3).

355 Tables

356 Table 1. Variable description

Variable	Unit	Source	Details
Time-invariant variables used in cross-sectional matching			
Online	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 if the college holds classes primarily online for fall 2020, zero otherwise
Hybrid	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 if the college adopts a combination of online and in-person modes, zero otherwise
In-person	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 if the college holds classes primarily in person for fall 2020, zero otherwise
Enrollment	Count	IPEDS (2020)	Total student count in fall 2018 semester, including graduate and remote students
Cost of attendance	USD	IPEDS (2020)	Total price for in-state students living on campus for 2019-20
Endowment per student	USD	IPEDS (2020)	Endowment assets per FTE enrollment at the end of 2018
Student-faculty ratio	Ratio	IPEDS (2020)	Enrollment divided by total full-time instructional staff
Public	Binary	IPEDS (2020)	The institution is primarily funded by a state government
Total population	Count	ACS (2020)	Total population in the county where the college is located (2018)
Black population	Percentage	ACS (2020)	Percentage of African American population in the county (2018)
Household income	USD	ACS (2020)	Median real household income in the past 12 months (2018)
Republican votes	Percentage	McGovern et al. (2017)	Percentage of votes for the Republican Party at the county level in Presidential election 2016
Mask ordinance	Binary	HealthData.gov (2020)	The county has an ongoing mandatory mask policy for individuals in public places
Cases in spring	Count	NYTimes (2020)	Total COVID-19 cases in the county by May 15, 2020
Deaths in spring	Count	NYTimes (2020)	Total COVID-19 deaths in the county by May 15, 2020
Time-varying variables used in panel fixed-effects regression			
New cases	Numeric	NYTimes (2020)	Daily new COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population in the county
New deaths	Numeric	NYTimes (2020)	Daily new COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 population in the county
Fall semester	Binary	College websites	Takes 1 when the college officially started fall semeseter classes
Online	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 when the college starts classes primarily online for fall 2020, zero otherwise
Hybrid	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 when the college starts a combination of online and in-person modes, zero otherwise
In-person	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 when the college holds classes primarily in person for fall 2020, zero otherwise
% stayed home	Percentage	BTS (2020)	Percentage of county population that did not go outside home for longer than 10 minutes
Time	Day		Calendar days from August 10, 2020 to September 19, 2020

357

358

359

360

361 Table 2. Summary statistics of variables used in matching

Variable	(1) Online	(2) Hybrid	(3) In-person	(4) Overall
College features				
Enrollment	8,088	5,715	4,438	6,109
	(9,959)	(7,439)	(7,107)	(8,492)
Cost of attendance	45,768	46,196	43,010	44,827
	(21,017)	(19347)	(16,237)	(18,930)
Endowment per student	64,685	77,841	51,170	62,836
	(328,815)	(337,832)	(366,540)	(345,508)
Student faculty ratio	26.65	22.40	24.75	24.86
	(16.50)	(12.15)	(19.94)	(17.05)
Public	0.35	0.25	0.23	0.28
	(0.48)	(0.43)	(0.42)	(0.45)
County features				
Total population	1,377,642	560,900	392,161	799,380
	(2,488,077)	(841,262)	(781,868)	(1,702,115)
Black population (%)	15.11	13.20	11.48	13.26
	(15.99)	(14.64)	(13.49)	(14.81)
Household income	62,695	59,828	57,620	60,052
	(17,270)	(14,701)	(15,076)	(15,968)
Republic votes (%)	40.45	47.38	53.02	46.95
	(16.62)	(17.42)	(14.64)	(16.99)
Mask ordinance	0.85	0.81	0.70	0.78
	(0.36)	(0.40)	(0.46)	(0.41)
Cases in spring	11,686	5,499	3,412	6,998
	(21,383)	(10,907)	(8,854)	(15,553)
Deaths in spring	576.51	304.42	195.70	363.92
	(969.17)	(613.06)	(502.09)	(751.41)
Colleges (N)	276	186	283	745

Note: Standard deviations in parentheses. Table (1) provides variable description.

362

363

364

365 Table 3. Summary statistics of variables used in panel fixed effects

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)
	mean	sd
New cases/100,000 population	12.85	18.51
New deaths/100,000 population	0.245	0.732
Fall semester	0.641	0.480
Online	0.223	0.416
Hybrid	0.159	0.366
In-person	0.259	0.438
% stayed home	25.27	4.292
Colleges	745	
Days (t)	41	
Observations (Colleges × Days)	30,545	

Note: Daily data from August 10, 2020 to September 19, 2020.

366

367

368

Table 4. Mean difference t-tests of variables used in matching

Variable	Hybrid-Online	In-person-Online	In-person-Hybrid
Enrollment	-2373***	-3649***	-1276
Cost of attendance	428	-2758*	-3186*
Endowment per student	13155	-13515	-26670
Student faculty ratio	-4.25***	-1.89	2.35
Public	-0.10**	-0.11***	-0.02
Total population	-816742***	-985481***	-168738
Black population (%)	-1.91	-3.62***	-1.71
Household income	-2867*	-5075***	-2208
Republican votes (%)	6.92***	12.56***	5.64***
Mask ordinance	-0.04	-0.15***	-0.11***
Cases in spring	-6187***	-8273***	-2086
Deaths in spring	-272***	-380***	-108

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Columns show difference between group means. Observations=745.

Table 5. Results from multinomial logistic regression

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)
	Online	Hybrid
Log enrollment	0.328**	0.285*
	(0.143)	(0.147)
Log cost of attendance	-0.425	-0.948*
	(0.549)	(0.529)
Log endowment per student	0.183**	0.0747
	(0.0889)	(0.0927)
Log student-faculty ratio	0.184	-0.657*
	(0.307)	(0.342)
Public	1.022*	-0.141
	(0.530)	(0.502)
Log total population	0.403**	0.0855
	(0.158)	(0.148)
Black population (%)	-0.00560	-0.00116
	(0.00956)	(0.00924)
Log family income	-0.202	0.229
	(0.550)	(0.569)
Republican votes (%)	-0.0382***	-0.0176*
	(0.00930)	(0.00989)
Mask ordinance	0.591**	0.487**
	(0.252)	(0.247)
Log spring cases	-0.253	-0.187
	(0.165)	(0.158)
Log spring deaths	0.176	0.182
	(0.124)	(0.128)
Constant	-0.949	6.360
	(8.178)	(8.004)
Observations	745	745

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. In-person teaching is the benchmark group.

377 Table 6. Impact of teaching modality on new COVID-19 cases

	Dependent variable			
	Daily new COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population			
VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Fall semester	1.874***			
	(0.384)			
Online		0.596	1.847***	1.579***
		(0.593)	(0.696)	(0.595)
Hybrid		2.019***	1.595**	1.862***
		(0.715)	(0.743)	(0.678)
In-person		3.088***	2.515***	2.459***
		(0.659)	(0.666)	(0.691)
% stayed home	-0.721***	-0.719***	-0.698***	-0.710***
	(0.0775)	(0.0773)	(0.0739)	(0.0691)
Constant	29.88***	29.75***	28.99***	29.21***
	(1.915)	(1.913)	(1.812)	(1.704)
PSM weights	No	No	MLogit	GB
College FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	30,545	30,545	30,545	30,545
Colleges	745	745	745	745

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Daily data from August 10 to September 19, 2020. FE=Fixed Effects, PSM=Propensity score matching, MLogit=Multinomial Logistic, GB=Gradient Booster.

378

379

380

Table 7. Impact of teaching modality on new COVID-19 deaths

	Dependent variable			
	Daily new COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 population			
VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Fall semester	0.0440***			
	(0.0114)			
Online		0.0353**	0.0277	0.0396**
		(0.0142)	(0.0279)	(0.0188)
Hybrid		0.0484***	0.0450**	0.0369**
		(0.0162)	(0.0207)	(0.0178)
In-person		0.0498**	0.0599***	0.0475**
		(0.0234)	(0.0216)	(0.0206)
% stayed home	-0.0353***	-0.0352***	-0.0391***	-0.0341***
	(0.00319)	(0.00318)	(0.00664)	(0.00355)
Constant	1.108***	1.107***	1.200***	1.070***
	(0.0783)	(0.0779)	(0.166)	(0.0874)
PSM weights	No	No	MLogit	GB
College FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	30,545	30,545	30,545	30,545
Colleges	745	745	745	745

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Daily data from August 10 to September 19, 2020. FE=Fixed Effects, PSM=Propensity score matching, MLogit=Multinomial Logistic, GB=Gradient Booster.


Median county-level growth of COVID-19 deaths
by college reopening and teaching modality
New COVID-19 deaths as % of August 10, 2020 deaths
0
10
20
Number of colleges reopened for the fall semester
0
50
100
150
200
Aug 15
Sep 01
Sep 15
Date (2020)
County-level deaths by teaching mode
Online
Hybrid
In-person
Number of colleges reopened by teaching mode
Online
Hybrid
In-person


Median county-level growth of COVID-19 cases
by college reopening and teaching modality
New COVID-19 cases as % of August 10, 2020 cases
Number of colleges reopened for the fall semester
Date (2020)
Aug 15
Sep 01
Sep 15
0
10
20
30
40
0
50
100
150
200
County-level infections by teaching mode
Online
Hybrid
In-person
Number of colleges reopened by teaching mode
Online
Hybrid
In-person


Overlap assessment of propensity scores by treatment group
hybrid
inperson
online
Propensity scores
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
hybrid
in-person
online
Treatment