

1 Impact of Shifting University Policies During the COVID-19 Pandemic on Self-Reported
2 Employee Social Networks

3 Stephanie S. Johnson¹, Katelin C. Jackson¹, Eric T. Lofgren¹

4 ¹Paul G. Allen School of Global Health, College of Veterinary Medicine, Washington State University,
5 Pullman, WA

6 **Abstract:**

7 Objectives: To ascertain if faculty and staff were the link between the two COVID-19 outbreaks
8 in a rural university county, and if the local university's COVID-19 policies affected contact rates
9 of their employees across all its campuses.

10 Methods: We conducted two anonymous, voluntary online surveys for faculty and staff of a
11 PAC-12 university on their contact patterns both within and outside the university during the
12 COVID-19 pandemic. One was asked when classes were virtual, and another when classes were
13 in-person but masking. Participants were asked about the individuals they encountered, the
14 type and location of the interactions, what COVID-19 precautions were taken – if any, as well as
15 general questions about their location and COVID-19.

16 Results: We received 271 responses from the first survey and 124 responses from the second.
17 The first survey had a median of 3 contacts/respondent, with the second having 7
18 contacts/respondent ($p < 0.001$). During the first survey, most contacts were family contacts
19 (Spouse, Children), with the second survey period having Strangers and Students having the
20 most contact ($p < 0.001$). Over 50% of the first survey contacts happened at their home, while
21 the second survey had 40% at work and 35% at home. Both respondents and contacts masked
22 42% and 46% of the time for the two surveys respectively ($p < 0.01$).

23 Conclusion: For future pandemics, it would be wise to take employees into account when trying
24 to plan for the safety of university students, employees, and surrounding communities. The
25 main places to be aware of and potentially push infectious disease precautions would be on
26 campus, especially confined spaces like offices or small classrooms, and the home, as these
27 tend to be the largest areas of non-masked close contact.

28 **Background**

29 The COVID-19 pandemic has taken over a million American lives, and has left many more
30 disabled since its arrival on American soil in early 2020(1). When the pandemic started
31 spreading across the country, many higher education institutions shifted to online learning, and
32 had most non-essential employees work from home (2–4). Universities swiftly postponed,
33 cancelled, or severely limited all campus-related activities, including research, administration,
34 exams, sports, and special events. If an activity could be done remotely (e.g., administrative
35 affairs, office hours, committee meetings) this was by and large the only, or at the very least
36 strongly preferred, route.

37 After the federal government declared the COVID pandemic a national emergency on March
38 13, 2020, public health experts and authorities recommended or imposed social isolation as a
39 primary measure to ‘flatten the curve’ and mitigate the spread of SARS-CoV-2.(5) People of all
40 ages were asked to avoid physical social contact, gatherings outside their immediate
41 household, and to self-isolate even further if traveling. They were also recommended or
42 mandated to wear a mask and separate up of six feet in public places (e.g. check out lines,
43 restaurant tables)(6–8).

44 As the COVID-19 pandemic matured, economic worry and political considerations eroded public
45 health measures. State education institutions guidelines and requirements were usually set by
46 state health guidelines in addition to economic hardships – especially in regard to sporting
47 events, on-campus housing, and teaching style- and as the state decided to lift measures, so
48 would universities (9–11). This has led to universities teaching and staffing styles to change
49 from virtual, to hybrid, to in-person – either with or without an accompanying mask mandate.

50 While the majority of attention on university campuses during these tumultuous school years
51 has been on students, faculty and staff have also been affected by the shifting university
52 policies.

53 Faculty and staff tend to be the bridge between university students and the surrounding
54 communities, especially in rural universities. While students tend to socialize with each other,
55 employees enter and exit the community and university campus daily, and tend to have more
56 community involvement (e.g local schools, community groups, etc.) than the students(12, 13).

57 Public health officials in Whitman County and Washington State University were able to track
58 and count COVID-19 cases during the Fall 2020 semester, when classes were virtual, but a
59 majority returning students came back to Pullman, giving it one of the highest cases per
60 population(14, 15). There were two metapopulations noted within Whitman County, the
61 students had a high peak and then a slight lull in August, where the non-student population
62 then had a small outbreak in November(15). We were interested in trying to ascertain if faculty
63 and staff were the link between the two outbreaks in Whitman County, and if Washington
64 State's COVID-19 policies affected contact rates of their employees across all its campuses. To
65 answer these questions, we modified the FluScape survey used for the H1N1 influenza outbreak
66 in China and Hong Kong for COVID-19 and asked university employees about their contacts
67 during virtual learning period, and then in-person masking (16–18).

68 **Methods**

69 The study protocol was approved by the Washington State University's Institutional Review
70 Board. The survey was modified from the FluScape Survey and administered through REDCap
71 an electronic data capture tool hosted at Washington State University(19, 20).

72 Faculty and staff from all campuses of Washington State University were invited to participate
73 in a contact tracing survey during two different survey periods. The first survey period was from
74 January to March 2021, when the university had virtual learning and most employees were
75 allowed to work from home. The second survey period was from November 2021 to March
76 2022, when the university was teaching in-person with a mask mandate and employees were
77 being asked to go back into the office. Recruitment involved sending out listserv emails from
78 the Office of Research, Deans of Colleges, and Department Heads with a link to the survey along
79 with follow-up emails reminder emails. The respondents were kept anonymous and no
80 personal demographic information was collected.

81 Both surveys sent out had three sections. The first section determined eligibility, defined as
82 anyone over the age of 18, who was not a student, and was currently working for the
83 university. In the second section, participants were asked to fill out a contact questionnaire,
84 which aimed to record their physical contacts as they remembered them for the previous day.
85 Physical contacts were defined as having a face-to-face conversation, skin-to-skin contact,
86 indoor in a room for 10+ minutes, or non-socially distanced indoors or outdoors, for 10+
87 minutes. The encounter patterns of this study were in qualitative agreement with other contact
88 studies, as well as initial evidence regarding COVID-19 aerosolization(17, 21–23). Respondents
89 were asked to give a general label of a contact (e.g. colleague, barista, spouse), age range of

90 contact, where they met with the contact (general location they wrote down and one of six
91 general location types), how long they interacted, and if they touched or wore masks.

92 The third section asked general questions regarding the campus they worked at, their job title,
93 if their job was classified as essential, and if they had had COVID-19 testing or symptoms since
94 the beginning of the pandemic. Data was cleaned for general labels for contacts and specific
95 locations. Cleaning and analysis was done with RStudio 4.2.2(24). The relationship between
96 total contacts (degree) and potential variables that affected total contacts was evaluated using
97 negative binomial regression. We express the output of these regression models as a degree
98 ratio (DR), the ratio of counts compared to the referent group. Survey questions from both
99 survey periods can be found in Supplemental Appendix A .

100 **Results**

101 *Study Demographics Information*

102 For the first period study, 413 respondents started the REDCap survey. 406 met eligibility
103 requirements, and 271 respondents completed the contact questionnaire part of the survey.

104 For the second study period, 323 respondents started the survey, 310 met eligibility
105 requirements and 124 respondents completed the contact questionnaire (Figure 1).

106 We break down the study period into Virtual Learning (VL) for January to March 2021, and In-
107 Person Masking (IPM), for November 2021 to March 2022. We had 271 VL respondents with
108 872 contacts and 124 IPM respondents with 5024 contacts. Density histogram for the two study
109 periods are shown in Figure2. The median contacts per respondent were 3 for VL and 7 for IPM
110 ($p < 0.001$)(Table 1). Most respondents during the VL period lived or worked on the main

111 campus in Pullman WA (61%), while only 49% of respondents worked on that campus for IPM
112 (49%) ($\chi^2=27.12$, $p < 0.001$). Further breakdown of occupation and essential workers between
113 the two different learning periods are shown in Table 1.

114 Respondents were asked if they had ever been tested for COVID, and how many had been
115 positive. 48 VL respondents had been tested in the last 30 days with no positives and IPM had
116 28 respondents tested in the last 30 days with 1 positive ($\chi^2=1.00$, $p=0.32$). For total positives,
117 VL had 10 respondents answer that they ever tested positive and IPM had 13 answer that they
118 had ever tested positive for COVID ($\chi^2=5.98$, $p=0.015$).

119 *Types of Contacts and Locations*

120 When contacts were assessed, there was a different makeup for VL compared to IPM contacts.
121 Most contacts in VL were family contacts, such as Partner (209) and Children (166), followed by
122 Laborers (142). IPM had Strangers as the largest number of contacts (2639), followed by
123 Students (1420), and then Colleagues (339) ($\chi^2=2183.3$ $p < 0.001$). (Figure 3a)

124 Respondents were able to choose one of six different places when asked where they had
125 contact with people: My Home, Work, Leisure, Travel, Shopping and Other. This noted where
126 contact happened, not how many people a respondent had contact with at each place. For VL,
127 My Home was over 50% of responses, followed by Work (18%). IPM was a slightly more even
128 split, with 40% of contacts happening at Work, and 35% at My Home. ($\chi^2=81.66$, $p < 0.001$)
129 (Figure 3b)

130 *Masking*

131 Respondents were asked about masking, as part of an awareness of how often they were
132 masking. There were 44(5%) discordant pairs in VL and 47(10%) in IPM, where the respondent
133 did the opposite masking as the contact. Neither party masked in 467 (53%) of VL encounters,
134 and 227 (45%) of IPM encounters. Both parties masked 42% and 46% of the time for VL and
135 IPM respectively ($\chi^2=13.6$, $p<0.01$). The majority of masking was done with contacts they met
136 outside of the house.

137 *Close Contacts*

138 Close contact was defined as someone the respondent marked as having physical contact with.
139 The top three types of close contacts were family members, specifically Partners/Spouses,
140 Children, then other Family Members (e.g. grandparents, cousin, aunt). When analyzing close
141 contacts by duration of interaction, it was noted that as duration of contact increased, so did
142 the chance of the contact being a close contact. Contacts in VL were the ones most likely to be
143 close contacts at shorter periods of time ($\chi^2=380.37$, $p<0.001$). 30% of 30-60 minute
144 interactions involved close contacts, compared to less than 20% for IPM. Approximately 20% of
145 VL contacts were defined as close contacts, and about 13% were defined as such for IPM (χ^2
146 $=19.7$, $p<0.001$). 75% of all My Home interactions were determined to be close contacts for
147 both periods followed by Other (20%), and Leisure (10%).

148 The majority of close contact encounters for both periods were unmasked (94% and 92%).
149 When looking at non-close contacts, 73% of VL encounters were masked ($\chi^2=470.82$, $p<0.001$)
150 and 63% of IPM encounters were masked ($\chi^2=182.13$, $p<0.001$)

151 *Negative Binomial Regression*

152 Negative Binomial was used in multiple univariate models to determine if there were any
153 variables that would affect the number of contacts a respondent would have for both survey
154 periods. During the VL period having received flu shot significantly associated with having more
155 contacts (DR 1.37 (95% Confidence Interval: 1.10-1.72)), and being an essential worker (DR 0.74
156 (95% CI: 0.6-0.91)) or having a typical day (DR 0.78 (95% CI: 0.61-0.99)) was associated with
157 less contacts. For IPM, being an essential worker (DR 3.22 (95% CI: 1.88-5.54)), having a COVID-
158 19 vaccination (DR 5.12 (95% CI: 1.73-12.03)), and teaching (DR 5.53(95% CI: 3.19-9.39)) was
159 correlated with an increase in contacts. All results can be found in Table 2.

160 **Discussion**

161 For the first survey period, most of the respondents were on the main campus, and had very
162 few contacts during VL. This corresponds with the lockdown that Washington State
163 implemented as most employees or staff were accommodated with social distancing and work
164 from home was encouraged or required. Bench lab work was performed in shifts, and those in
165 teaching roles were mostly virtual (some health science classes were still in-person). VL also had
166 the highest number of respondents marking their location with people as Other. When looking
167 at the location that they wrote in, most of those were outdoor places- eg. parks, backyards, out
168 on walks- showing that people were taking social distancing potentially more seriously in 2021,
169 before vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 were introduced.

170 If a survey respondent indicated that they held an essential job during the VL period, they had a
171 median of twice the number of daily contacts compared to non-essential respondents, which
172 was not what the negative binomial analysis showed. When examining the essential worker

173 contact distribution closer, a long tail of contacts appeared, from some faculty that still had to
174 teach classes. This pattern persisted during the second survey period, where essential
175 respondents experienced a more significant increase in contacts compared to non-essential
176 respondents. We attribute this finding to essential people having more reasons for potential
177 exposure, such as teaching large classes or participating in on-campus events. Additionally, the
178 loosening of social distancing and mask-wearing practices over time during the ongoing
179 pandemic played a role in this trend. This explanation is consistent with the observation that
180 receiving a COVID vaccine during the second survey period was significantly associated with an
181 increase in contacts. People likely felt safer with vaccination and began venturing out into
182 public spaces more frequently. One of the essential workers for IPM mentioned going to a
183 concert for the first time in two years. Results show how loosening policies and people going
184 out in public had an impact using IPM's highest contact category- Strangers. While VL had more
185 people put down Shopping than IPM, IPM recorded a higher number of contacts at each
186 location recorded.

187 When examining the incidence of close contacts across the two instructional policies, one can
188 observe comparable levels of close contacts between VL and IPM. This similarity may be
189 attributed to the consistency of contacts in close contact areas, suggesting that neither the
190 easing of social distancing measures nor the increased presence of contacts elevated a
191 respondent's likelihood of close contact interactions with others. One's home is still the place
192 one will likely have the most amounts of close contacts, no matter the policies set forth by an
193 institution or state. What was intriguing was the difference between close contacts and time
194 spent between VL and IPM. The increased number of close contacts at shorter duration for VL

195 might potentially speak of need for connection, or fewer number of people meeting in general,
196 meant more of them were close contacts. With the sharp increase of total number of people
197 IPM respondents have, they are more likely to touch those they are already close to and avoid
198 touching others even if they are masked due to cultural norms and potential social distance
199 guidelines.

200 There are caveats to this study. While the original survey period had a higher response rate, it
201 was still less than 25% of employees across all the campuses, and samples heavily from faculty,
202 rather than staff, who has 500 fewer appointees than faculty(25). Due to institutional concerns
203 regarding confidentiality this study was unable to collect demographic information, negating
204 opportunity to analyze contacts by age, gender, or ethnicity. This was also sent out via email,
205 with many employees experiencing burnout or not having time to do a long study, as evidenced
206 by the reduction of people who completed eligibility but not the contact diary. The study is
207 susceptible to recall bias, as asking individuals to remember the details of a day within a 24-
208 hour period is inherently challenging. These numbers are considered a conservative baseline,
209 with the actual number of contacts, both close and otherwise, expected to exceed those
210 reported here.

211 **Conclusion**

212 This study is one of the few looking at university employees exclusively during two different
213 policy periods that affected teaching, working, and learning for all campuses. Respondents
214 were self-selecting and were able to offer an idea of what habits changed due to these

215 institutional policies. We also must place results in context of what was going on during the
216 time, not just policies but public opinion and other mandated health measures.

217 Notably, the interaction of respondents with students for the IPM survey response did not
218 escape our attention. These were months where students were living on campus in large
219 numbers, and classes were being taught in-person, with some potential disease mitigation
220 measures(26, 27). University employees serving as a vital bridge between students and outside
221 communities is a potential idea, especially in rural areas. In these regions there is more of a
222 closed population and less chance for students to interact with strangers in large populations
223 via public transit or population density(13, 28, 29). University employees have a unique position
224 on college campuses, going back and forth as a liaison for students and the community. While
225 employees might be teaching, advising, caring for, or helping students, they leave the campus
226 and go out into the community and their own homes. They don't live with the students in a
227 mostly self-contained university-based social group but participate in both university and town
228 ones.

229 For future pandemics, it would be wise to take employees into account when trying to plan for
230 the safety of university students, employees, and surrounding communities. Employees tend to
231 have a wide variety of contacts in multiple locations. The main places to be aware of and
232 potentially push infectious disease precautions would be on campus, especially confined spaces
233 like offices or small classrooms, and the home, as these tend to be the largest areas of non-
234 masked close contact. The estimates from this study may assist in the planning of future
235 campus-based interventions, predicting the shifts in social contacts that may be expected from
236 a move toward virtual learning.

237 **Acknowledgements:**

238 Funding: This work was supported by the Advancing Science in America Fellowship (Leo Barrier)
239 and NIH R35GM147013. The authors would also like to acknowledge all the respondents who
240 participated in these surveys.

241

242 **Conflict of Interest Statements**

243 The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest.

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263 **References**

- 264 1. COVID-19 United States Cases by County. Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resour Cent.
265 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/us-map>. Retrieved 3 August 2021.
- 266 2. Important updates on finals, commencements, flexible work arrangements and additional COVID-
267 19 announcements | Office of the President. <https://president.umich.edu/news-communications/letters-to-the-community/important-updates-on-finals-commencements-flexible-work-arrangements-and-additional-covid-19-announcements/>. Retrieved 28 February
269 2022.
- 270
- 271 3. 2020. Message from campus leaders on the return to academics | UNC-Chapel Hill. Univ N C Chap
272 Hill. <https://www.unc.edu/posts/2020/03/22/message-return-to-academics/>. Retrieved 28
273 February 2022.
- 274 4. Coming together in an extraordinary time | President’s Office | Washington State University |
275 Washington State University. <https://president.wsu.edu/2020/03/27/coming-together-in-an-extraordinary-time/>. Retrieved 28 February 2022.
- 276
- 277 5. Mervosh S, Lu D, Swales V. 2020. See Which States and Cities Have Told Residents to Stay at Home.
278 N Y Times.
- 279 6. Kohn S, Barnett DJ, Galastri C, Semon NL, Links JM. 2010. Public Health-Specific National Incident
280 Management System Trainings: Building a System for Preparedness. Suppl 5. Public Health Rep
281 125:43–50.
- 282 7. Guy GP. 2021. Association of State-Issued Mask Mandates and Allowing On-Premises Restaurant
283 Dining with County-Level COVID-19 Case and Death Growth Rates — United States, March 1–
284 December 31, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 70.
- 285 8. Lyu W, Wehby GL. 2020. Community Use Of Face Masks And COVID-19: Evidence From A Natural
286 Experiment Of State Mandates In The US: Study examines impact on COVID-19 growth rates

- 287 associated with state government mandates requiring face mask use in public. *Health Aff*
288 (Millwood) 39:1419–1425.
- 289 9. Johnson SS, Jackson KC, Mietchen MS, Sbai S, Schwartz EJ, Lofgren ET. 2021. Excess Risk of COVID-
290 19 to University Populations Resulting from In-Person Sporting Events. *16. Int J Environ Res Public*
291 *Health* 18:8260.
- 292 10. Baker T, Edelman M, Holden JT. 2020. College Football in the Time of COVID-19. 3631528. SSRN
293 Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3631528>.
- 294 11. Losina E, Leifer V, Millham L, Panella C, Hyle EP, Mohareb AM, Neilan AM, Ciaranello AL, Kazemian
295 P, Freedberg KA. 2021. College Campuses and COVID-19 Mitigation: Clinical and Economic Value.
296 *Ann Intern Med* 174:472–483.
- 297 12. Weeden K, Cornwell B. 2020. The Small-World Network of College Classes: Implications for
298 Epidemic Spread on a University Campus. *Sociol Sci* 7:222–241.
- 299 13. VAIDYA NK, MORGAN M, JONES T, MILLER L, LAPIN S, SCHWARTZ EJ. 2015. Modelling the epidemic
300 spread of an H1N1 influenza outbreak in a rural university town. *Epidemiol Infect* 143:1610–1620.
- 301 14. Leadingham S. 2020. Pullman COVID-19 Cases Continue Rapid Climb. WSU President And Governor
302 Very Concerned. Northwest Public Broadcast. [https://www.nwpb.org/2020/09/13/pullman-covid-](https://www.nwpb.org/2020/09/13/pullman-covid-19-cases-continue-rapid-climb-wsu-president-and-governor-very-concerned/)
303 [19-cases-continue-rapid-climb-wsu-president-and-governor-very-concerned/](https://www.nwpb.org/2020/09/13/pullman-covid-19-cases-continue-rapid-climb-wsu-president-and-governor-very-concerned/). Retrieved 7 March
304 2023.
- 305 15. Mietchen MS, Clancey E, McMichael C, Lofgren ET. 2024. Estimating SARS-CoV-2 transmission
306 parameters between coinciding outbreaks in a university population and the surrounding
307 community. medRxiv <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.10.24301116>.
- 308 16. Read JM, Lessler J, Riley S, Wang S, Tan LJ, Kwok KO, Guan Y, Jiang CQ, Cummings DAT. 2014. Social
309 mixing patterns in rural and urban areas of southern China. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 281:20140268.

- 310 17. Social contacts and the locations in which they occur as risk factors for influenza infection |
311 Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences.
312 <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2014.0709>. Retrieved 7 March 2023.
- 313 18. Lessler J, Cummings DAT, Read JM, Wang S, Zhu H, Smith GJD, Guan Y, Jiang CQ, Riley S. 2011.
314 Location-specific patterns of exposure to recent pre-pandemic strains of influenza A in southern
315 China. 1. Nat Commun 2:423.
- 316 19. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. 2009. Research Electronic Data
317 Capture (REDCap) - A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing
318 translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform 42:377–381.
- 319 20. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O’Neal L, McLeod L, Delacqua G, Delacqua F,
320 Kirby J, Duda SN. 2019. The REDCap Consortium: Building an International Community of Software
321 Platform Partners. J Biomed Inform 95:103208.
- 322 21. Feehan DM, Mahmud AS. 2021. Quantifying population contact patterns in the United States
323 during the COVID-19 pandemic. 1. Nat Commun 12:893.
- 324 22. Rebmann T, Loux TM, Arnold LD, Charney R, Horton D, Gomel A. 2021. SARS-CoV-2 Transmission to
325 Masked and Unmasked Close Contacts of University Students with COVID-19 — St. Louis, Missouri,
326 January–May 2021. Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 70:1245–1248.
- 327 23. Keeling MJ, Hollingsworth TD, Read JM. 2020. Efficacy of contact tracing for the containment of
328 the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). J Epidemiol Community Health 74:861–866.
- 329 24. Posit. Posit. <https://www.posit.co/>. Retrieved 7 March 2023.
- 330 25. Employee Headcount | Institutional Research | Washington State University.
331 <https://ir.wsu.edu/employee-headcount/>. Retrieved 7 March 2023.
- 332 26. Betancourt WQ, Schmitz BW, Innes GK, Prasek SM, Pogreba Brown KM, Stark ER, Foster AR,
333 Sprissler RS, Harris DT, Sherchan SP, Gerba CP, Pepper IL. 2021. COVID-19 containment on a

334 college campus via wastewater-based epidemiology, targeted clinical testing and an intervention.

335 Sci Total Environ 779:146408.

336 27. Borowiak M, Ning F, Pei J, Zhao S, Tung H-R, Durrett R, Borowiak M, Ning F, Pei J, Zhao S, Tung H-R,

337 Durrett R. 2021. Controlling the spread of COVID-19 on college campuses. mbe-18-01-030. Math

338 Biosci Eng 18:551–563.

339 28. Lakhani HV, Pillai SS, Zehra M, Sharma I, Sodhi K. 2020. Systematic Review of Clinical Insights into

340 Novel Coronavirus (CoVID-19) Pandemic: Persisting Challenges in U.S. Rural Population. 12. Int J

341 Environ Res Public Health 17:4279.

342 29. Mueller JT, McConnell K, Burow PB, Pofahl K, Merdjanoff AA, Farrell J. 2021. Impacts of the COVID-

343 19 pandemic on rural America. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 118:2019378118.

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359 Table 1. Median (IQR) Number of Recorded Contacts per Respondent per Day by Different
360 Characteristics and Two Teaching Styles, Virtual Learning (VL), and In-Person Masking (IPM)

Category	Covariate	VL Participants	Median (IQR) of Reported Contacts	IPM Participants	Median (IQR) of Reported Contacts
Total	---	271	3(3)	124	7 (26.5)
Pullman (Live/Work)	Yes	166	3(4)	61	9 (27)
	No	56	2(3.25)	55	3 (29.5)
	NA	49	2(2)	8	2 (3.5)
Occupation	Faculty	162	3(4)	84	8 (32)
	Staff	96	2(3)	27	7 (16)
	NA	13	2(3)	13	5 (6)
Essential Worker	Yes	61	4(5)	56	12 (31.2)
	No	200	2(3)	57	6 (13)
	NA	10	1.5(1.75)	11	4 (5.5)

361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378

379 Table 2. Univariate Negative Binomial Degree Ratios for both VL and IPM

Univariate Models (Reference Category)	VL Degree Ratio (95% CI)	IPM Degree Ratio (95% CI)
Essential Job ^a		
Yes	0.74 (0.6-0.91)	3.22 (1.88-5.54)
Position (Faculty)		
Staff	0.88 (0.73-1.07)	1.02 (0.54 – 2.07)
Occupation (Clinician)		
Faculty	0.54 (0.37-0.79)	0.38 (0.10-1.02)
Staff	0.49 (0.33-0.72)	0.11 (0.03-0.35)
Upper Admin	0.59 (0.34-1.03)	0.16 (0.03-0.88)
Received a Flu Shot		
Yes	1.37 (1.10-1.72)	0.62 (0.35-1.08)
Received a COVID-19 Vaccine		
Yes	1.08 (0.83-1.40)	5.12 (1.73-12.03)
Lived or Worked in Pullman		
Yes	1.02 (0.81-1.29)	0.36 (0.21-0.61)
Typical Day		
Yes	0.78 (0.61-0.99)	1.01 (0.51-1.86)
Currently Teaching a Class ^b		
Yes	NA	5.53 (3.18-9.39)

380 Degree ratios of total contacts for respondents with the given attributes estimated by univariate
 381 negative binominals. Significant results are shown in bold. ^aWas this job essential either by being told or
 382 respondent thinking so ^b was only asked for the second survey period.

383

384

385

386

387

388

389




Figure 1. Flowchart for the study enrollment process for non-student university employees over eighteen years of age, and the resulting sample size for the virtual learning (Study Period 1) and in-person, masked instruction (Study Period 2) periods.




Figure 2. Degree distributions and proportion of surveyed respondents reporting zero contacts among university employees during virtual learning and in-person masked study periods respectively.




Figure 3. Distribution of type of contact by type of individual and location among university employees during virtual learning and in-person masked study periods respectively.