Control of COVID-19 transmission on an urban university campus during a second wave of the pandemic

Davidson H. Hamer[1-3], Laura White[4], Helen E. Jenkins[4], Christopher J. Gill[1], Hannah N. Landsberg[5], Catherine Klapperich[6], Katia Bulekova[7], Judy Platt[5], Linette Decarie[8], Wayne Gilmore[7], Megan Pilkington[8], Trevor L. McDowell[7], Mark A. Faria[7], Douglas Densmore[9,10], Lena Landaverde[6], Wenrui Li[11], Tom Rose[12], Stephen P. Burgay[13], Candice Miller[14], Lynn Doucette-Stamm[14], Kelly Lockard[15], Kenneth Elmore[16], Tracy Schroeder[7], Ann M. Zaia[17], Eric D. Kolaczyk[11,18*], Gloria Waters[16,19*], Robert A. Brown[20,21*]

Affiliations

1. Department of Global Health, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts
2. Section of Infectious Disease, Department of Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine
3. National Emerging Infectious Disease Laboratory, Boston, Massachusetts.
4. Department of Biostatistics, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts
5. Student Health Services, Healthway, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts
6. Department of Biomedical Engineering, Boston University
7. Information Services and Technology, Boston University
8. Boston University Analytical Services & Institutional Research
9. Electrical and Computer Engineering, Boston University
10. Biological Design Center, Boston University
11. Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Boston University
12. Human Resources, Boston University
13. Office of External Affairs, Boston University
14. BU Clinical Testing Laboratory, Research Department, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts
15. Continuous Improvement & Data Analytics, Boston University
16. Office of the Provost, Boston University
17. Occupational Health Center, Boston University

18. Hariri Institute for Computing, Boston University
19. College of Health and Rehabilitation Services, Sargent College, Boston University
20. College of Engineering, Boston University
21. Office of the President, Boston University

*Contributed equally.

Key words: SARS-CoV-2, active surveillance, contact tracing, quarantine, isolation

Abstract

Importance: The COVID-19 pandemic had a wide-ranging impact on educational institutions across the United States. Given potential financial challenges and adverse psychosocial effects of campus closure, as done in the spring of 2020 in response to the first wave, many institutions of higher education developed strategies to allow campuses to reopen and operate in the fall despite the ongoing threat of COVID-19. Many however opted to have limited campus re-opening in order to minimize potential risk of spread of SARS-CoV-2. ***Objective:*** To analyze how Boston University (BU) fully reopened its campus in the fall of 2020 and controlled COVID-19 transmission despite worsening transmission in the city of Boston.

Design: Multi-faceted intervention case study.

Setting: Large urban university campus.

Interventions: The BU response included a high-throughput SARS-CoV-2 PCR testing facility with capacity to delivery results in less than 24 hours; routine asymptomatic screening for COVID-19; daily health attestations; compliance monitoring and feedback; robust contact tracing, quarantine and isolation in on campus facilities; face mask use; enhanced hand hygiene; social distancing recommendations; de-densification of classrooms and public places; and enhancement of all building air systems.

Main Outcomes and Measures: Between August and December 2020, BU conducted >500,000 COVID-19 tests and identified 719 individuals with COVID-19: 627 (87.2%) students, 11 (1.5%) faculty, and 212 (25.5%) staff. Overall, about 1.8% of the BU community tested positive. Infections among faculty and staff were mostly acquired off campus, while undergraduate infections were more likely acquired in non-classroom campus settings. Of 837 close contacts traced, 86 (10.3%) tested positive for COVID-19. BU contact tracers identified a source of transmission for 51.5% of cases with 55.7% identifying a source outside of BU. Among infected faculty and staff with a known source of infection, the majority reported a transmission source outside of BU (100% for faculty and 79.8% for staff).

Conclusions and Relevance: BU was successful in containing COVID-19 transmission on campus while minimizing off campus acquisition of COVID-19 from the greater Boston area. A coordinated strategy of testing, contact tracing, isolation and quarantine, with robust management and oversight, can control COVID-19 transmission, even in an urban university setting.

INTRODUCTION

The SARS-CoV-2 global pandemic resulted in nearly 1.8 million deaths worldwide in 2020.[1] After a major surge in cases in spring 2020 in the northeast United States, other parts of the country experienced continued transmission through the summer with a second wave arising in the northeast in fall 2020.[2] This mandated several mitigation actions, including, in spring 2020, the closure of in-person learning at public and private higher education institutions. Faced with potentially dire financial challenges and adverse social impacts associated with continued closure, some universities and colleges developed strategies in spring 2020 to allow campuses to reopen and operate in the fall despite the ongoing threat of COVID-19.[3,4]

Boston University (BU) is a private university with a student/staff/faculty population of around 40,000 individuals. BU is located in the center of a large US city, thus creating a scenario for potential widespread COVID-19 transmission. Despite these challenges, the BU administration pursued an aggressive risk mitigation strategy involving widespread asymptomatic screening for COVID-19, environmental modifications, de-densification strategies, and contact tracing, isolation and quarantine, all with the goal of providing its students the opportunity to return to in-person learning in the fall semester of 2020. Here we describe the BU experience as a case study that we believe offers important lessons that may be broadly applicable to other higher education institutions.

METHODS

Initial planning, starting in March 2020, determined an approach that centered on active surveillance for asymptomatic and symptomatic cases via on-site molecular testing for SARS-CoV-2 (Supplement). This involved setting up de novo systems for high throughput laboratory testing, timely communication of results, rapid contact tracing, isolation of infected individuals, and quarantine of close contacts (Figure 1).

Surveillance was complemented by additional control measures, including mask use, enhanced hygiene practices, social distancing recommendations, daily health attestations, de-densification of classrooms and public places, and enhancement of all building air systems. This process was

aided through mathematical modeling, and the use of multiple data systems and 24 hour/7 day per week monitoring and data-driven adaptation throughout the semester. This required a coordinated leadership and management structure (Figure S1). Efforts were coordinated through interlocking management committees and leadership groups across campus, as well a series of systematic and sustained communication strategies. Here, we briefly summarize each of the BU COVID-19 response components.

Setting

BU is a large urban higher education institution in Boston with two campuses: the larger main campus (Charles River Campus [CRC]) with over 30,000 members, and a smaller medical campus (BU Medical Campus [BUMC] consisting of the Schools of Dentistry, Graduate Medical Sciences, Medicine, and Public Health) with just under 10,000 members, adjacent to a large non-profit hospital and associated clinics and research laboratories. In fall 2019, there were 11,439 students living on campus, 23,150 off campus, 10,514 staff and 4,169 faculty (faculty and staff numbers exclude overseas operations). During the fall 2020 semester, the on-campus housing occupancy was 7,131 representing 67% of the fall 2019 capacity.

Management

Starting in spring 2020, several different groups were organized to coordinate all aspects of COVID-19 control on campus, including, but not limited to, monitoring incoming data, modifying campus operations, implementing best public health and medical practices, surveillance, and budgeting (Supplement 1.1, Figure S1).

Learn from Anywhere (LfA)

BU implemented hybrid teaching in which all undergraduate and graduate students could attend classes in-person or remotely. This blended modality allowed classes to accommodate on-line only students using Zoom software and in-person students simultaneously.[5] Accommodations for on-line only teaching were made for educators who were elderly or had medical conditions that increased their COVID-19 risk.

BU SARS-CoV-2 Testing

Testing laboratory. BU developed its own dedicated polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing laboratory. Test site staff observed sample collection by students, faculty, and staff, of self-collected anterior nares swabs (Supplement 1.2, 1.3).

Information Technology. A system was developed by the University's Information Services and Technology experts that linked the electronic medical record (EMR) systems for students, faculty, and staff, and the laboratory information system in our testing facility with the web-based system for daily symptom attestation of all community members on campus, reservations for tests and negative test reporting.

SARS-CoV-2 testing categories. Based on guidance from public health authorities, the University developed four SARS-CoV-2 testing categories, related to an individual's risk of becoming infected on campus. These categories determined frequency of testing, ranging from twice weekly for category 1 (e.g., on-campus undergraduates) to no testing for category 4 (e.g., students, faculty, or staff entirely off-campus) (Supplement 1.4).

Managing and responding to test results. All individuals with a negative test were automatically notified by email to access their test results through a secure, online portal when their results were available. Anyone with a positive test result was called by a healthcare professional.

Contact Tracing

The contact tracing protocol was based on CDC and Massachusetts Community Tracing Collaborative processes[6,7], with adaptation from BU academic programs and student input. Contact tracers followed a detailed script to identify all close contacts. A close contact was defined as someone within six feet of an infected person for 15 minutes or more over a 24 hour period (Supplement 1.5).

Isolation and Quarantine

Students who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 had to isolate for 10 days after symptom onset and resolution of fever for at least 24 hours, and with improvement of other symptoms, or for 10 days from the positive test date if asymptomatic.[8] Students identified as a close contact had to

quarantine for 14 days from the exposure date. Based on evolving data from the CDC, this period was reduced to 10 days of quarantine on November 20th.[9] Students living on campus were moved to units allocated by BU (650 units for quarantine and 342 for isolation) (Supplement 1.6-1.8).

Additional Campus Control Measures

Additional measures including face mask use, enhanced hand hygiene, social distancing recommendations, daily health attestations, de-densification of classrooms and public places, and enhancement of all building air systems including optimization of filtration units were implemented (Supplement 1.9-1.10).

Mathematical Modeling

We used probabilistic SEIR (susceptible-exposed-infectious-recovered) transmission modeling during summer 2020 to provide insight into the expected relative efficacy of potential interventions for reducing COVID-19 transmission and burden in the BU community with the goal of achieving only linear increases of cases from transmission outside BU (Supplement 1.11). We used a stochastic agent-based model, implemented using the COVID agent-based simulator (covasim) framework.[10]

Communications, Surveillance and data management

BU developed a dedicated COVID-19 external communications platform called Back2BU.[11] The pre-existing ecosystem of data warehousing and analysis systems that traditionally supported the university was augmented to support the data storage, management, and analysis requirements necessary to allow for near-real time surveillance of outcomes associated with BU's COVID-19 response. Surveillance efforts focused on monitoring not only standard metrics around incidence, isolation, and quarantine, but also metrics around testing, contact tracing, and compliance with the collection of campus control measures. An external dashboard was created and updated daily to allow the broader BU community and beyond to track now-standard, fundamental metrics (Supplement 1.12-1.15). In addition, an augmented, internal dashboard was created to aid the various groups working with BU leadership to not only monitor but adapt the BU COVID-19 response.

Compliance

Compliance with testing and attestation of symptoms were tracked beginning in October through dedicated electronic systems. Additionally, the dean of students collected reports of violations of other measures, including gatherings, masking, and physical distancing (Supplement 1.16). A separate study with monitors observing safe behaviors was conducted (Supplement 1.17).

Fall 2020 Move-In

A comprehensive phased move-in program was adopted to reduce crowding and lines, giving students the time to test and the university the time to respond to any positive cases on arrival (Supplement 1.18).

Ethics

The plan for this analysis was reviewed by the Boston University CRC Institutional Review Board (IRB) and was classified as non-human subjects research. The BUMC IRB reviewed the safe behavior quality improvement project (Supplement 1.17) and determined it to be exempt.

RESULTS

We structure our results to provide information on the: 1) operational aspects of the systems BU put in place to manage the epidemic, and 2) resulting epidemiological features of COVID-19 in BU and the surrounding community. In general, we describe results during the semester: September 3-December 19; however, we include some results from initialization of systems during the summer.

Operational Results

Overall, the systems designed in the summer to mitigate the pandemic performed well throughout fall semester, as detailed below.

Housing. While 99% (7266) of graduate students lived off-campus, most undergraduates lived in on-campus housing, including a total of 7,131 students as of October 13, 2020, representing 67% of the fall 2020 capacity. Due to de-densification efforts, 3453 (48%) of students lived alone and 3678 (52%) of students lived with one roommate (Supplement 1.5).

Testing. Initial operations, staffing and supplies were built for a maximum of 6200 tests per day (~42,000 tests per week) with the aim of reliably processing samples within 24 hours of collection. After an expected initial period of learning and improvement, the laboratory reached a stable run rate by October, averaging 5-6,000 tests per day, with lower volume on weekends. Testing turnaround times decreased dramatically over the semester, leveling off to around 12-15 hours between sample collection to receipt of results (Figure 2A). Ultimately, the BU testing laboratory conducted 467,382 tests for the BU population during the fall semester (517,357 including the pre-semester move-in).

Contact Tracing, Quarantine and Isolation. On average within 6.4 hours (median: 3.0, range: 0-42 hours) after receipt of a positive test, close contacts of a positive BU case were notified of their exposure. However, this average conceals improvements to this process over time, falling from ~10.1 hours in September to 5.4 in December 2020. Students and employees (faculty and staff) identified 3.1 and 0.5 BU close contacts per case on average, respectively. The total number of individuals that needed to be traced increased with increasing case numbers throughout the semester (Figure 2B). If an individual did not meet criteria to be a close contact, but was part of a social group (e.g., Greek-life membership) or affiliation (e.g., sports team, music group) of recent cases, they were notified of their potential risk of COVID-19 exposure, reminded to follow public health guidelines, and required to increase testing frequency to 3 times per week.

Despite having quarantine and isolation capacities of 650 and 342 respectively, occupancy only reached a maximum of 13.7% and 12.9% respectively at any one time (Figure S3).

Compliance. On average 12% of on-campus students did not comply with testing or attestation protocols in October and November which was lower than off campus students during the same time (51.5% for off campus students in categories 1, 2 and 3 or 20% if including students in category 4) (Figure 3A). Reported violations of other control measures had an initial early semester burst, but gradually reduced throughout the semester (Figure 3B). Early semester

violations were largely off-campus gatherings, which reduced sharply by November. Face covering violations stayed roughly constant throughout the semester.

Classroom Density. Class attendance data were not collected systematically. An upper bound on attendance levels is given by the percentage of registered students indicating through LfA that they would attend in person. For medium, large, and "very large" classes, this number was on average approximately 45% in October (with medians similar) but dropped to roughly 25-30% in November. For small classes, while the mean was similar to the other groups, the variability was substantially greater, with the distribution as a whole being closer to a uniform (especially in October) (Figure 4). Limited survey data suggest that actual attendance figures tended to vary somewhat by class (undergraduate versus graduate), program, and campus. In addition, attendance changed (generally decreasing) throughout the semester.

Epidemiology of COVID-19 at BU and in Boston

Changing epidemiology of COVID-19 in Boston. Following the use of statewide control measures in spring 2020, case numbers in Suffolk County (including Boston) remained low throughout the summer, averaging around 0.1 reported case per 1000 population up to mid-October. As the state moved through the reopening phases[12] and the weather became colder (and people spent more time indoors), reported cases began to increase to 0.40/1000 by early November and rose to 0.75/1000 in early December, following Thanksgiving gatherings (Figure 2C). These increasing trends were observed statewide and also in collection of SARS-CoV-2 from Boston area wastewater, indicating that they were not just due to increased testing in the Boston area.[13,14]

COVID-19 Burden and Patterns at Boston University. During the fall semester, 719 individuals tested positive for COVID-19 in the BU community; including 627 (87.2%) students, 11 (1.5%) faculty, and 212 (25.5%) staff (Table 1). Cases increased following holidays, particularly Thanksgiving, and that was more pronounced for undergraduate students and non-faculty staff. While the incidence rate among students and staff tracked that of Suffolk County (Figure 2C), there were two distinctions. First, BU surveillance testing resulted in detection of many asymptomatic cases (37.7% of total cases) likely more than the passive testing regime in the

broader community. Secondly, particularly after Thanksgiving, the BU increase in cases preceded that of Suffolk county. This is most likely attributable to BU's vigorous testing regime.

Of the students who were close contacts and entered quarantine, 10.3% (86/837) tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 during their time in quarantine with lower overall test positivity rate of 2.1% due to multiple testing regimen in quarantine. The test positivity rate for those who self-attested having symptoms was notably higher (4.9%) than that of asymptomatic individuals (0.10%) indicating utility of this feature.

Sources and locations of transmission. BU contact tracers identified a source of transmission for 51.5% of cases with 55.7% identifying a source outside of BU (Table 1). Among infected faculty and staff with a known source of infection, the overwhelming majority reported a transmission source outside of BU (100% for faculty and 79.8% for staff). Students identified more BU contacts as sources of infection (39.8% for graduate students and 59.2% undergraduate students, Table 1). Notably, BU household contacts were identified as a source of infection less than 1% of the time (Table 1) and anecdotally, there were no sustained transmission events in on-campus housing, indicative of the efficacy of efforts to control spread in campus housing. When asked to identify their close contacts, students rarely identified close contacts in the classroom setting and most close contacts tended to be friends and, after Thanksgiving, family (Figure 2D). This indicates that while BU students tended to be more likely to identify another BU affiliate as a source of infection, the contacts leading to infection occurred in places that were not directly targeted by BU interventions.

DISCUSSION

Although many institutions of higher education across the US reopened in fall 2020, some experienced large COVID-19 outbreaks compelling them to revert to on-line only or remote education.[15–17] The BU experience is important because it has an urban campus situated in a community that experienced high and increasing COVID-19 incidence from August to December 2020 with no option for the university to isolate from the wider community. Despite this challenge, the university benefited from having substantial resources including funding to establish and run a SARS-CoV-2 testing laboratory and sampling centers, a hybrid learning

approach (LfA), and diverse expertise among university faculty in staff in the fields of medical epidemiology, modeling, biostatistics, and public health control measures. In addition, strong central leadership; internal communication to students, staff, and faculty; frequent and adaptive testing of students[18,19]; short turnaround time on testing; highly effective contact tracing coupled with isolation and quarantine; and vigorous enforcement all combined to prevent widespread campus outbreaks of COVID-19 despite the worsening situation in the greater Boston area.

The interventions that were designed over the summer were supported by a strong leadership structure with multiple subcommittees targeting important aspects of the response. There was frequent communication and coordination between these groups to ensure that, if a cluster of cases was emerging, all parties were aware. This meant that testing cadences could be adapted, compliance efforts could be modified, and messaging adapted to blunt any potential risk of an outbreak. This coordinated effort was key to ensuring a high level of compliance and the success of planned interventions.

Short turnaround time of results followed by rapid isolation of infected individuals, contact tracing and quarantine of close contacts resulted in limited transmission in the BU community. Faculty and staff were almost always infected outside of the university campus. While the majority of students with a known source of infection reported another BU affiliate as their contact, these infectious events appeared to occur outside of BU housing and instructional settings, where interventions were targeted. When clusters of cases did appear in settings the university could not directly target, e.g., due to social gatherings or other off campus gatherings, these were quickly controlled, due to our vigorous testing regime, rapid contact tracing, and strict enforcement measures, and consequently no major outbreaks were observed. This meant that the resulting numbers of cases throughout the semester were consistent with our goal of maintaining a linear, rather than exponential, increase in cases, which was manageable with our intervention strategies.

Surveillance testing allowed us to identify and isolate many close contacts in advance of contact tracing efforts. Importantly, we note that due to the surveillance testing system, BU tended to detect increases in cases in advance of the surrounding community where people were mostly

only tested once symptomatic. This is supported by the fact that 37.7% of positive individuals were asymptomatic at the time of isolation indicating that BU was detecting cases early in the disease course. This finding is in direct contrast to recently published research suggesting that BU cases led the surrounding area in a causal manner.[20] There were several limitations to the latter study including the selection criteria for inclusion of universities that resulted in only one Boston-area institution of higher education in the analysis and assuming that transmission in the community arose from the university campus rather than the converse, which did not account for evidence from the BU contact tracing efforts, as described above, that suggested 55.7% of the transmission was exogenous (i.e. arising in the community).

BU's success is consistent with current understanding of best practices for COVID-19 control. In fact, these strategies of aggressive testing, contact tracing, and quarantine and isolation have been successfully implemented in many countries, including Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan.[21–23] However, unlike these countries, the BU setting did not allow the restriction of travel between the campus and nearby community, making this a strong demonstration of the utility of these approaches even despite substantial importation of cases from the surrounding community. This can potentially serve as a model for other institutions nested within a broader community.

The semester was not without challenges. There were times when the contact tracing team was unable to identify contacts due to some students' reluctance to divulge information regarding where they had been or who they had been with. In these cases, coordination between the dean of students and the contact tracing team was critical in identifying other students who were associated with the infected student(s) through team or club membership so increased frequency of testing (adaptive testing) could be performed.

This approach to infection control on a university campus carries a high financial cost[24]; BU had to implement budget adjustments, including hiring freezes, salary freezes, and several other cost-cutting measures, to meet the cost of these services and respond to declining revenue because of pandemic-related changes to operations. While we do not attempt a cost effectiveness analysis here, we note that the university was able to meet its financial obligations and avoid large layoffs

or other consequential financial impacts in the fall. Also, providing students an in-person option was beneficial for varying learning styles and meeting immigration requirements. The remote option also benefitted students who were unable to attend in person, either due to health considerations or travel restrictions.

We recognize that BU benefited from being a large research university with much of the required expertise for our strategy available within the university, saving money and facilitating substantial control over the operations. This is clearly not feasible for all institutions of higher education. This implies that broader efforts in the community, supported by government public health agencies, are required to control spread.

PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS

We demonstrate the efficacy of a multipronged response in controlling the spread of SARS-CoV-2 on an urban university campus, despite rising community burden of disease. This approach relied on the main axioms of infection control: frequent testing, vigorous contact tracing, and rapid isolation and quarantine, and a strong leadership structure to ensure nimble decision-making and rapid adaption to emerging data.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the members of the Augmented Budget Committee, Medical Advisory Group, Community Health Oversight Group, Healthway team, and all Boston University faculty, staff, and students who played important roles in keeping the campus safe and healthy during the 2020 fall semester.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization (WHO). *COVID-19 Weekly Epidemiological Update*.; 2020.
2. Leidman E, Duca LM, Omura JD, Proia K, Stephens JW, Sauber-Schatz EK. COVID-19 trends among persons aged 0 – 24 years — United States, March 1-December 12, 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70:1-7.
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Considerations for Institutions of Higher Education. Published 2020. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/colleges-universities/considerations.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fcommunity%2Fguidance-ihe-response.html
4. Mass.gov. Reopening: Higher Education. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.mass.gov/info-details/reopening-higher-education
5. University B. Learn from Anywhere Faculty Resources. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://digital.bu.edu/lfa/
6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Contact tracing for COVID-19. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-plan/contact-tracing.html
7. Mass.gov. Community Tracing Collaborative overview. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.mass.gov/info-details/learn-about-the-community-tracing-collaborative#community-tracing-collaborative-overview-
8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Duration of Isolation and Precautions for Adults with COVID-19. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/duration-isolation.html
9. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. When to Quarantine. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/quarantine.html
10. Kerr CC, Stuart RM, Mistry D, et al. Covasim: An agent-based model of COVID-19 dynamics and interventions. *medRxiv*. Published online 2020:1-24. doi:10.1101/2020.05.10.20097469
11. Back2BU website. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.bu.edu/back2bu/
12. Mass.gov. Reopening Massachusetts. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.mass.gov/info-details/reopening-massachusetts

13. Mass.gov. COVID-19 Response Reporting. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.mass.gov/info-details/covid-19-response-reporting#covid-19-daily-dashboard-
14. Authority MWR. Wastewater COVID-19 tracking. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.mwra.com/biobot/biobotdata.htm
15. Frances Robles. Notre Dame and Michigan State Shifting Online as Campus Outbreaks Grow. *Times, New York*. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/18/us/notre-dame-coronavirus.html. Published August 20, 2020.
16. Fox MD, Bailey DC, Seamon MD, Miranda ML. Response to a COVID-19 Outbreak on a University Campus - Indiana, August 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021;70(4):118-122. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7004a3
17. Wilson E, Donovan C V, Campbell M, et al. Multiple COVID-19 clusters on a University Campus - North Carolina, August 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(39):1416-1418.
18. Chang JT, Crawford FW, Kaplan EH. Repeat SARS-CoV-2 testing models for residential college populations. *Health Care Manag Sci*. 2020;(Published on-line 17 November 2020). doi:10.1101/2020.07.09.20149351
19. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 screening strategies to permit the safe reopening of college campuses in the United States. *JAMA Netw open*. 2020;3(7):e2016818. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.16818
20. Lu H, Weintz C, Pace J, Indana D, Linka K, Kuhl E. Are college campuses superspreaders? A data-driven modeling study. *Comput Methods Biomech Biomed Engin*. 2021;0(0):1-11. doi:10.1080/10255842.2020.1869221
21. Ng Y, Li Z, Chua YX, et al. Evaluation of the effectiveness of surveillance and containment measures for the first 100 patients with COVID-19 in Singapore — January 2–February 29, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(11):307-311. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6911e1
22. Park Y, Choe Y, Park O, et al. Contact tracing during coronavirus disease outbreak, South Korea, 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26(10):2465-2468. doi:10.3201/EID2610.201315
23. Cheng HY, Jian SW, Liu DP, Ng TC, Huang WT, Lin HH. Contact tracing assessment of COVID-19 transmission dynamics in Taiwan and risk at different exposure periods before and after symptom onset. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020;180(9):1156-1163.

doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.2020

24. Losina E, Leifer V, Millham L, et al. College campuses and COVID-19 mitigation: clinical and economic value. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021;doi:10.732. doi:10.7326/m20-6558

Table 1. Number of Boston University individuals testing positive for COVID-19 during the fall semester.

		Students (n=496)			Employees (n=223)	
	Total, N (%)	Undergrad, n (%)	Undergrads in BU housing, n (%)	Graduate, n (%)	Staff, n (%)	Faculty, n (%)
N (%)	719 (100.0)	315 (43.8)	131 (18.2)	181 (25.2)	212 (29.5)	11 (1.5)
Asymptomatic, n (%) *	271 (37.7)	113 (35.9)	55 (42.0)	51 (28.2)	104 (49.1)	3 (27.3)
Exposure, n (%)						
BU HHCC	6 (0.8)	3 (1.0)	1 (0.8)	2 (1.1)	1 (0.5)	0 (0.0)
BU CC	158 (22.0)	105 (33.3)	39 (29.8)	37 (20.4)	16 (7.6)	0 (0.0)
Non-BU HHCC	62 (8.6)	13 (4.1)	5 (3.8)	15 (8.3)	33 (15.6)	1 (9.1)
Non-BU CC	84 (11.7)	31 (9.8)	9 (6.9)	28 (15.5)	22 (10.4)	3 (27.3)
Outside BU exposure**	44 (6.1)	22 (7.0)	10 (7.6)	13 (7.2)	8 (3.8)	1 (9.1)
Travel^	16 (2.2)	9 (2.9)	2 (2.3)	3 (1.7)	4 (1.9)	0 (0.0)
Unknown	349 (48.5)	132 (41.9)	64 (48.9)	83 (45.9)	128 (60.4)	6 (54.6)
The following percentages are calculated out of cases with a known source of transmission.						
Known Exposure, n (%)	370 (51.5)	183 (58.1)	67 (51.2)	98 (54.1)	84 (39.6)	5 (45.5)
BU Exposure (HHCC + CC), n (%)	164 (44.3)	108 (59.0)	40 (59.7)	39 (39.8)	17 (20.2)	0 (0.0)
Non-BU Exposure (HHCC + CC), n (%)	206 (55.7)	75 (41.0)	27 (40.3)	59 (60.2)	67 (79.8)	5 (100.0)

* 2 cases refused to provide data on symptoms, reducing sample side to N=717 for the Asymptomatic variable
**Outside BU Exposure includes cases that have not been on campus and have no known close contact, or recent engagement on campus or with BU community members.
^Travel indicates case returned from out-of-state travel via public transportation (plane, bus, train) 48 hours prior to symptom onset or positive test.
HHCC: household close contact
CC: close contact

FIGURES

Figure 1. Schematic of the major components of the campus COVID-19 control strategies. (Figure credit: Gina Mantica, Boston University)



Figure 2. A) Average daily testing turnaround time. B) The number of close contacts traced by week. C) BU COVID and Suffolk county cases per 1000 from August 25, 2020 to December 24, 2020 with a seven day smoother applied. Cases are shown overall, and by key subpopulations, as noted in the legend. D) For students who tested positive, the affiliation of their close contacts: classmate, faculty, coworker, friend, family, and other.



Figure 3. A) Weekly percentage of off-campus (top) and on-campus (bottom) students in violation of testing and/or attestation requirements. Off campus compliance only considers students in categories 1-3, who had a testing and attestation requirement. **B)** Total weekly number of reported compliance violations for control measures other than testing or attestation, by type of violation. (Inset: Total number of violations by type over the Fall semester.)





Figure 4. Percentage of registered students indicating through LfA that they would attend class in person, over all BU classes, by size of class, for October (A) and November (B). Class size is based on total number of registered students: small (3 to 25); medium (26 to 50); large (51 to 100); and "very large" (greater than 100).

(A)



(B)