

1 **Title:** The urgent need for phased university reopenings to mitigate the spread of COVID-19 and conserve
2 institutional resources: A modeling study

3
4 **Authors:** Lior Rennert^{1*}, PhD, Corey A. Kalbaugh¹, PhD, Christopher McMahan², PhD, Lu Shi¹, PhD,
5 Christopher C. Colenda^{3,4}, MD, MPH

6
7 **Affiliations**

8 ¹ Department of Public Health Sciences, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA

9 ² School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA

10 ³ Principal, C.C. Colenda, LLC

11 ⁴ Section of Gerontology and Geriatrics, Department of Internal Medicine, Wake Forest University, NC, USA

12
13 ***Corresponding author**

14 Lior Rennert, PhD

15 Department of Public Health Sciences, Clemson University

16 529 Edwards Hall

17 Clemson, SC, 29601

18 864-656-7434

19 liorr@clemson.edu

20
21 **Word count:** 2185

22 **Abstract**

23 **Introduction:** Recent outbreaks of COVID-19 in universities across the United States highlight the difficulties in
24 containing the spread of COVID-19 on college campuses. While research has shown that mitigation strategies
25 such as frequent student testing, contact tracing, and isolation of confirmed and suspected cases can detect early
26 outbreaks, such mitigation strategies may have limited effectiveness if large outbreaks occur. A phased reopening
27 is a practical intervention to limit early outbreaks, conserve institutional resources, and ensure proper safety
28 protocols are in place before the return of additional students to campus.

29 **Methods:** We develop dynamic compartmental transmission models of SARS-CoV-2 to assess the impact of a
30 phased reopening and pre-arrival testing on minimizing outbreaks (measured by daily infections) and conserving
31 university resources (measured by isolation bed capacity). We assume that one-third of the student population
32 returns to campus each month as part of the phased reopening, and that pre-arrival testing removes 90% of
33 infections at the semester start. We assume an on-campus population of $N = 7500$, an active COVID-19
34 prevalence of 2% at baseline, and that 60% of infected students require isolation for an average period of 11 days.
35 We vary the reproductive number (R_t) between 1.25 and 4 to represent the effectiveness of alternative mitigation
36 strategies throughout the semester, where R_t is constant or improving throughout the semester (ranging from 4 to
37 1.25).

38 **Results:** Compared to pre-arrival testing only or neither intervention, phased reopening with pre-arrival testing
39 reduced peak daily infections by 6% and 18% ($R_t=1.25$), 44% and 48% ($R_t=2.5$), 63% and 64% ($R_t=4$), and 72%
40 and 74% (improving R_t), respectively, and reduced the proportion of on-campus beds needed for isolation from
41 10%-25% to 5%-9% across different values of R_t .

42 **Conclusion:** Phased reopening with pre-arrival testing substantially reduces the peak number of daily infections
43 throughout the semester and conserves university resources compared to strategies involving the simultaneous
44 return of all students to campus. Phased reopenings allow institutions to improve safety protocols, adjust for
45 factors that drive outbreaks, and if needed, preemptively move online before the return of additional students to
46 campus, thus preventing unnecessary harm to students, institutional faculty and staff, and local communities.

47

48 **Introduction**

49 Higher education institutions are struggling to reopen their campuses in a safe and judicious manner during the
50 COVID-19 pandemic. The reopening strategies for Fall 2020 implemented by several universities in the United
51 States have largely failed.^{1,2} Other institutions have elected to delay reopening, partially reopen, or remain closed,
52 preferring instead to continue with online instruction.³⁻⁵ Those planning to continue with reopening are exploring
53 several preventative strategies to mitigate the spread of COVID-19, including frequent SARS-CoV-2 testing,
54 contact tracing, and isolation of confirmed and suspected cases.^{3,4}

55
56 Previous modeling studies have demonstrated that high numbers of active infections at the beginning of the
57 semester lead to early and large outbreaks and drain institutional resources.⁵ This has been further evidenced by
58 recent COVID-19 outbreaks in universities, which have been forced to send students home and shift to online
59 learning within one week of reopening.^{1,2} With such early outbreaks and closures, implementation of preventative
60 strategies throughout the semester may no longer be relevant, as these strategies are intended to prevent outbreaks
61 rather than contain them. Indeed, the initial number of active infections assumed by modeling studies that support
62 these strategies^{3,6,7} may be far lower than suggested by current estimates of SARS-CoV-2 prevalence^{5,8} and recent
63 university reopenings.^{1,2} Colleges and universities intending to reopen campuses in Fall 2020 or in future
64 semesters must therefore place a greater emphasis on reducing active infections and limiting outbreaks at the
65 semester start. However, given the number of high-density social gatherings that occur early in the semester and
66 beyond,^{1,9,10} such outbreaks may be difficult to contain with the simultaneous return of all students to campus.¹¹


67
68 A phased return of students to campus is a practical intervention to limit early outbreaks, ensure proper protocols
69 are in place, and conserve university resources. This is accomplished through minimizing the susceptible
70 population size and density early in the semester, which can delay large outbreaks and reduce outbreak size,
71 ensure the availability of sufficient resources by vacating a large portion of isolation beds for confirmed or
72 suspected cases, and increase testing and support service capacity per student. Furthermore, a phased reopening
73 provides institutions time to improve strategies to mitigate the spread of COVID-19 and adjust for factors that
74 drive outbreaks (e.g., fraternity gatherings^{1,9,10}) before the return of additional students to campus. If outbreaks
75 cannot be contained, a phased reopening allows higher education institutions to pre-emptively transition to remote
76 learning before the arrival of all students and thus prevent unnecessary harm.

77
78 Our team was tasked with recommending strategies to limit outbreaks and ensure adequate resources for
79 confirmed on-campus COVID-19 cases in a large university in the Southeastern United States. To guide and
80 inform our recommendations, we developed dynamic compartmental transmission models to assess the impact of
81 a phased reopening, along with exclusion of COVID-19 positive students through testing prior to campus arrival,
82 on minimizing outbreak size and conserving university resources throughout the semester.

83 Methods

84 To capture the essential features of COVID-19 spread on campus, we developed dynamic compartmental
85 transmission models of SARS-COV-2¹² with the following compartments: susceptible, exposed, infectious
86 (asymptomatic), infectious (symptomatic), isolated, and recovered (**Figure 1**). We assumed a large on-campus
87 population ($N = 7,500$), an active infection rate of 2% at the semester start,¹³ and that 60% of active infections
88 would be detected and require isolation¹⁴ for an average period of 11 days.¹⁵ We considered four settings for the
89 reproductive number (R_t) to represent the effectiveness of various mitigation strategies throughout the semester:
90 highly effective ($R_t = 1.25$), moderately effective ($R_t = 2.5$), and ineffective ($R_t = 4$), along with a time-varying R_t
91 that improved throughout the semester ($R_0 = 4$, $R_t = 2.5$, and $R_t = 1.25$ for months $t \geq 2$). The latter setting was
92 intended to capture improvement in mitigation efforts over time. Additional assumptions were compiled from
93 published sources and are provided in **Table 1**. Because this study used only a theoretical model with no actual
94 data, the Institutional Review Board of Clemson University determined that this research did not involve human
95 participants and did not require their approval.

96 **Figure 1: Model structure**



97

98 The population is divided into the following six compartments: susceptible, exposed (not infectious or detectable),
99 asymptomatic (infectious and not detectable), symptomatic (infectious and detectable), isolated (infectious but no contact
100 with other individuals), and recovered. Exposed individuals transition into the symptomatic compartment with probability α
101 and asymptomatic compartment with probability $1-\alpha$. It is assumed all symptomatic individuals are detected (after an average
102 period of 2 days) and isolated for the remaining duration of their infection.

103

104 We considered three interventions: Phased reopening with pre-arrival testing, pre-arrival testing only, and neither
105 intervention. We assumed that infectious students enter campus through the asymptomatic compartment, and that
106 pre-arrival testing reduced the number incoming infections by 90%. We assumed a phased re-opening over a 2-
107 month period, in which one-third of the population ($N^* = 2500$) returns to campus at the semester start, 30 days
108 after the semester start, and 60 days after the semester start. We further assumed that the reproductive rate is
109 reduced by 20% during the first phase and 10% during the second phase due to a decrease in student population
110 density, and that any unoccupied beds during these phases are available for isolation of detected COVID-19 cases.
111 The equations and initial values for each compartment are provided in **Supplementary Table 1**.

112 **Table 1: Model input parameters, assumptions, and references**

Model parameter	Input
On-campus population (N)	7,500 (assumption)
...Other compartments	0 (assumption)
Time horizon (months)	3 months ⁷
Disease dynamics ^a	
...Mean incubation time, $1/\sigma$	3 days ¹⁷
...Mean asymptomatic infectious time (days), $1/\phi$	14 days ¹⁷
...Mean symptomatic infection time before detection and isolation (days), $1/\gamma$	2 days ¹⁷
...Isolation time, $1/\rho$ (days)	11 days: Time between symptom onset and negative NAT test ¹⁵
...Proportion of infections that are symptomatic, α	0.6 ¹⁴
Transmission rate, β	Dependent on R_t
Baseline infectious rate (%) ^b	2% ¹³
Baseline recovered rate (%)	10% ^{5,7,8}
Mitigation strategies throughout semester (R_t) ^c	
...Highly effective (best case)	1.25 ¹⁸
...Moderately effective (base case)	2.5 ^{3,14}
...Ineffective (worst case)	4 ¹⁴
...Time-varying	Month 0: 4; Month 1: 2.5; Month 2+: 1.25 (assumption)
Interventions	
Test characteristics	
...Sensitivity (%)	90% ^{3,19}
...Specificity (%)	100% (assumption)
Phased re-opening	
...Phase 1: Calendar time (months)/sub-population returning to campus	0 months/2,500 students (assumption)
...Phase 2: Calendar time (months)/sub-population returning to campus/cumulative population	1 months/2,500 students/5,000 students (assumption)
...Phase 3: Calendar time (months)/sub-population returning to campus/cumulative population	2 months/2,500 students/7,500 students (assumption)

113 ^a We assume a closed system (i.e., no exogenous infections or deaths)

114 ^b Under pre-arrival testing, baseline infections are reduced by 90%

115 ^c Under phased reopening, we assume this number is reduced by 20% during the first phase and 10% during the second phase

116

117 We evaluated the relative impact of each intervention on the number of new active infections throughout the
 118 semester and isolation bed capacity. At each timepoint t , new active infections were defined as entries into the
 119 asymptomatic infectious and symptomatic infectious compartments. Isolation bed capacity was measured as the
 120 number (n_{beds}) and proportion (n_{beds}/N) of on-campus beds needed for isolation throughout the semester. We also
 121 evaluated the impact of each strategy on the time until 5% of on-campus beds were occupied for isolation of
 122 confirmed cases. The latter metric is based on recommendations to reserve enough isolation beds for 5% of the
 123 on-campus student population,²⁰ which is currently higher than the isolation bed capacity of at least several large
 124 US universities.^{21,22} With an on-campus population of 7,500, a threshold of 5% would require reservation of 375
 125 beds for isolation.

126

127 **Results**

128 The number of new (active) infections throughout the semester based on the model projections are displayed in
 129 **Figure 2**. In all scenarios, both pre-arrival testing alone and in conjunction with phased reopening reduced the
 130 rate of new daily infections early in the semester and delayed the timing of the peak outbreak size. A phased
 131 reopening in conjunction with pre-arrival testing reduced the size of the peak outbreak across all scenarios. Under
 132 highly effective mitigation strategies throughout the semester ($R_t = 1.25$), a phased reopening reduced the peak by
 133 6% and 18% compared to pre-arrival testing only and no interventions, respectively. For moderate to ineffective
 134 mitigation strategies throughout the semester, this decrease was substantial. Compared to the simultaneous return
 135 of all students, a phased reopening (with pre-arrival testing) decreased the peak number of new infections between
 136 44% to 48% ($R_t = 2.5$) and 63% to 64% ($R_t = 4$). Under improving mitigation strategies throughout the semester
 137 ($R_0 = 4$, $R_t = 2.5$, and $R_t = 1.25$ for $t \geq 2$ months), phased reopening with pre-arrival testing decreased the peak
 138 number of new infections between 72% to 74%. Meanwhile, improvement in mitigation efforts throughout the
 139 semester had little impact on reducing the rate of new infections for strategies involving the simultaneous return
 140 of students to campus. Compared to no interventions, pre-arrival testing alone reduced the peak number of new
 141 infections between 6% and 12% across all scenarios.

142
 143 Pre-arrival testing alone had minimal impact on maximum isolation bed capacity, while implementation in
 144 conjunction with a phased reopening substantially reduced the number of isolation beds needed for values of $R_t \geq$
 145 2.5 (**Table 2**). In these scenarios, phased reopening with pre-arrival testing required reservation of 7% of on-
 146 campus beds for isolation, compared to 20% ($R_t = 2.5$) and 25% ($R_t = 4$) for the other interventions. Under
 147 improving R_t , phased reopening in conjunction with pre-arrival testing required 5% of on-campus beds for
 148 isolation. With highly effective mitigation strategies throughout the semester ($R_t = 1.25$), there was little
 149 difference in the maximum number of isolation beds needed (range: 9% to 11%).

150
 151 **Table 2.** Modeling results for occupied isolation beds for each strategy across varying disease reproductive numbers

Phased reopening	Pre-arrival testing	Beds needed: n_{beds} (%) ^a			
		$R_t = 1.25$	$R_t = 2.5$	$R_t = 4$	$R_t = 4, 2.5, 1.25^b$
No	No	822 (11%)	1534 (20%)	1869 (25%)	1869 (25%)
No	Yes	739 (10%)	1490 (20%)	1854 (25%)	1854 (25%)
Yes	Yes	702 (9%)	542 (7%)	520 (7%)	354 (5%)
		Time until 375 beds (5%) are occupied for isolation: days			
		$R_t = 1.25$	$R_t = 2.5$	$R_t = 4$	$R_t = 4, 2.5, 1.25^b$
No	No	18 days	10 days	8 days	8 days
No	Yes	43 days	20 days	14 days	14 days
Yes	Yes	71 days	61 days	69 days	NA ^c

152 Maximum number of isolation beds needed throughout the semester and time until 375 beds (5% of student population) are
 153 occupied, under three interventions: No phased reopening or pre-arrival testing, pre-arrival testing only, phased re-opening
 154 with pre-arrival testing. The size of the on-campus student population is $N = 7,500$.

155 ^a Proportion of isolation beds needed (n_{beds}) relative to on-campus student population (N)

156 ^b Improving R_t : $R_0 = 4$, $R_t = 2.5$, and $R_t = 1.25$ for months $t \geq 2$


157 ^c Maximum capacity not reached during semester

158

159 Reservation of 375 beds for isolation (5% of on-campus student population) was not sufficient without a phased
 160 reopening. Under no interventions or pre-arrival testing only, this threshold was reached in 18 and 43 days for R_t
 161 = 1.25, 10 and 20 days for $R_t = 2.5$, and 8 and 14 days for $R_t = 4$, respectively. A phased reopening substantially
 162 increased the time until this threshold was reached under these scenarios (range: 61 to 71 days). This intervention
 163 under improving mitigation efforts throughout the semester (improving R_t) was the only scenario in which
 164 isolation bed occupancy did not exceed the 5% threshold.

165

166 **Figure 2:** Projected new infections (daily) throughout the semester for each intervention



167

168 Expected number of new active infections throughout the semester under three interventions: No phased reopening or pre-
 169 arrival testing (solid red line), no phased reopening with pre-arrival testing (dashed blue line), phased reopening with pre-
 170 arrival testing (dotted green line). Top left panel: effective mitigation strategies throughout semester ($R_t = 1.25$). Top right
 171 panel: moderately effective mitigation strategies throughout the semester ($R_t = 2.5$). Bottom left panel: ineffective mitigation
 172 strategies throughout the semester ($R_t = 4$). Bottom right panel: improving mitigation strategies throughout the semester (R_0
 173 = 4, $R_t = 2.5$, and $R_t = 1.25$ for months $t \geq 2$). New active infections are defined as new entries into the asymptomatic
 174 and symptomatic infectious compartments.

175 **Discussion**

176 Minimizing the number of active infections at the start of the semester is essential to limiting rapid outbreaks and
177 ensuring available resources for support services such as testing, contact tracing, and case isolation. We found that
178 unless highly effective mitigation strategies are implemented throughout the semester, which may be optimistic
179 given recent events,^{1,2} the simultaneous arrival of all students to campus leads to early and large outbreaks.
180 Furthermore, the timing of these outbreaks occur early in the semester and are therefore not impacted by
181 improvements in mitigation efforts over time. Alternatively, a phased return of students to campus in conjunction
182 with testing prior to arrival substantially delays the peak outbreak timing and reduces the outbreak size by up to
183 74%.

184
185 Rapid outbreaks drain university resources and will inevitably lead to institutions shutting down on-campus
186 activities and shifting fully online. Our models demonstrate that the simultaneous return of all students to campus
187 may require 10% to 25% of on-campus beds for isolation of confirmed COVID-19 cases, far exceeding the
188 current capacity of several large institutions.^{21,22} In fact, we found that the recommended 5% of isolation beds for
189 confirmed COVID-19 cases²⁰ may lead to institutions reaching capacity in less than 10 days. Under a phased
190 reopening with pre-arrival testing, the number of isolation beds needed ranged from 5% to 9% of total capacity.

191
192 While previous studies have concluded that frequent SARS-CoV-2 testing and contract tracing can significantly
193 reduce disease spread, they have limitations in college and university settings. First, the models that support these
194 conclusions assume a low number of initial active infections. Contact tracing, for example, has shown to be
195 ineffective when the number of initial infections is greater than 40.⁶ Other modeling studies demonstrating the
196 effectiveness of frequent testing for SARS-CoV-2 assume that initial infections range between 1 and 10
197 individuals.^{3,7} These are much lower than the number of early infections from recent university outbreaks^{1,2} and
198 current prevalence estimates of SARS-CoV-2.^{5,8} Second, the logistical constraints and high costs may challenge
199 the ability of institutions to impelement these strategies effectively. This may be especially difficult at the
200 semester start, where larger outbreaks are more likely to occur due to the number of high-density social events in
201 these settings.^{1,9,10} Such gatherings have been the driving factor behind several university closings.^{1,2}

202

203 **Limitations**

204 Our study has several limitations. First, we omit an in-depth discussion of the logistics behind a phased reopening.
205 Difficulties in implementation include the careful coordination of the return of students back to campus and may
206 require institutions to shift between on-campus and remote learning throughout the phased reopening. The costs
207 of unutilized institutional facilities are also not considered here. In addition, our study does not consider the
208 contribution of off-campus students to disease spread, nor does it consider their impact on institutional resources.

209 While we used current evidence to inform plausible biological parameters for SARS-CoV-2, these values may
210 need refinement as more data become available. However, we performed sensitivity analyses under several
211 disease transmission parameters ranging from best-case to worst-case scenarios in order to provide a range of
212 plausible estimates. Finally, while the effects of mitigation strategies throughout the semester, such as frequent
213 testing, successful contact tracing, and quarantine of suspected cases are implicitly incorporated into our model
214 through the reproductive number (R_t), we do not consider the impact of these strategies on the occupation of
215 reserved beds. Therefore the number of beds needed for reservation may far exceed estimates provided here.

216

217 **Conclusions**

218 Based on our findings, we encourage institutions to immediately increase the number of isolation beds and support
219 service capacity. In addition, all students should be tested prior to campus arrival to avoid the return of infectious
220 students to campus. A phased reopening offers several additional benefits. Limiting the number of students on-
221 campus at the start of the semester can substantially reduce the number of initial infections and delay the timing
222 and size of outbreaks, while providing opportunities to improve safety protocols and adjust for factors that drive
223 these outbreaks before returning additional students to campus. Furthermore, minimizing the size of the
224 susceptible population will help ensure that institutions have sufficient resources at their disposal to handle early
225 outbreaks. While mitigation strategies are promising tools to prevent rapid disease spread,^{3,6,7} the logistics of
226 implementation during large outbreaks and their effectiveness in containing them have yet to be tested. A phased
227 reopening provides opportunities to trial such strategies on a smaller population before they are implemented in
228 larger scales. Most importantly, if COVID-19 outbreaks cannot be kept under control with a limited student
229 population, a phased reopening provides the ability to halt the return of additional students to campus and will
230 undoubtedly prevent hundreds to thousands of additional infections, thus preventing unnecessary harm to
231 students, institutional faculty and staff, and local communities.

232 References

- 233 1. Nierenberg A, Pasick A. Colleges Closing: University Outbreaks and Parental Angst. *The New York Times*.
234 <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/19/us/colleges-closing-covid.html>. Published August 19, 2020. Accessed
235 August 22, 2020.
- 236 2. Svrluga S. UNC-Chapel Hill begins testing as coronavirus cases spike, while N.C. State switches to virtual
237 classes. *Washington Post*. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2020/08/20/nc-state-switches-virtual-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2020/08/20/nc-state-switches-virtual-classes-amid-covid-clusters-adding-scramble-students-moving/)
238 [classes-amid-covid-clusters-adding-scramble-students-moving/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2020/08/20/nc-state-switches-virtual-classes-amid-covid-clusters-adding-scramble-students-moving/). Accessed August 22, 2020.
- 239 3. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to Permit the Safe
240 Reopening of College Campuses in the United States. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(7):e2016818.
241 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.16818
- 242 4. Redden E. COVID-19 testing strategies vary widely across institutions. *Inside Higher Ed*.
243 [https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/08/21/covid-19-testing-strategies-vary-widely-across-](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/08/21/covid-19-testing-strategies-vary-widely-across-institutions)
244 [institutions](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/08/21/covid-19-testing-strategies-vary-widely-across-institutions). Published August 21, 2020. Accessed August 22, 2020.
- 245 5. Rennert L, Kalbaugh CA, Shi L, McMahan C. Reopening universities during the COVID-19 pandemic: A
246 testing strategy to minimize active cases and delay outbreaks. *medRxiv*. Published online July 7,
247 2020:2020.07.06.20147272. doi:10.1101/2020.07.06.20147272
- 248 6. Hellewell J, Abbott S, Gimma A, et al. Feasibility of controlling COVID-19 outbreaks by isolation of cases
249 and contacts. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2020;8(4):e488-e496. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30074-7
- 250 7. Martin N, Schooley RT, De Gruttola V. *Modelling Testing Frequencies Required for Early Detection of a*
251 *SARS-CoV-2 Outbreak on a University Campus*. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*; 2020.
252 doi:10.1101/2020.06.01.20118885
- 253 8. Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, et al. Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10 Sites in the United
254 States, March 23-May 12, 2020. *JAMA Intern Med*. Published online July 21, 2020.
255 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.4130
- 256 9. St. Amour M. Colleges point fingers at students for partying, spreading COVID-19. *Inside Higher Ed*.
257 [https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/08/21/colleges-point-fingers-students-partying-spreading-covid-](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/08/21/colleges-point-fingers-students-partying-spreading-covid-19)
258 [19](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/08/21/colleges-point-fingers-students-partying-spreading-covid-19). Published August 21, 2020. Accessed August 22, 2020.
- 259 10. College Officials Clamp Down on Student Behavior Over Covid-19 Fears. *The New York Times*.
260 <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/20/world/coronavirus-covid.html>. Published August 20, 2020. Accessed
261 August 23, 2020.
- 262 11. Hubler S, Hartocollis A. Stop Campus Partying to Slow the Virus? Colleges Try but Often Fail. *The New*
263 *York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/22/us/college-campus-covid.html>. Published August 22,
264 2020. Accessed August 25, 2020.
- 265 12. Bjørnstad ON. *Epidemics: Models and Data Using R*. Springer International Publishing; 2018.
266 doi:10.1007/978-3-319-97487-3
- 267 13. Clemson releases employee COVID-19 test results from July 20-22 and July 27-28. Newsstand | Clemson
268 University News and Stories, South Carolina. Accessed August 21, 2020.

- 269 [https://newsstand.clemson.edu/mediarelations/clemson-releases-employee-covid-19-test-results-from-july-](https://newsstand.clemson.edu/mediarelations/clemson-releases-employee-covid-19-test-results-from-july-20-22-and-july-27-28/)
270 [20-22-and-july-27-28/](https://newsstand.clemson.edu/mediarelations/clemson-releases-employee-covid-19-test-results-from-july-20-22-and-july-27-28/)
- 271 14. CDC. COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published
272 February 11, 2020. Accessed June 30, 2020. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html)
273 [scenarios.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html)
- 274 15. Chen J, Qi T, Liu L, et al. Clinical progression of patients with COVID-19 in Shanghai, China. *Journal of*
275 *Infection*. 2020;80(5):e1-e6. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.03.004
- 276 16. Hubler S. College Calendars in the Pandemic: No Fall Break and Home by Thanksgiving. *The New York*
277 *Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/19/us/coronavirus-college-fall-semester.html>. Published May 19,
278 2020. Accessed August 13, 2020.
- 279 17. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19.
280 *Nature Medicine*. 2020;26(5):672-675. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0869-5
- 281 18. Bradley EH, An M-W, Fox E. Reopening Colleges During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
282 Pandemic—One Size Does Not Fit All. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(7):e2017838.
283 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.17838
- 284 19. Berenger BM, Fonseca K, Schneider AR, Hu J, Zelyas N. Sensitivity of Nasopharyngeal, Nasal and Throat
285 Swab for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv*. Published online May 8, 2020:2020.05.05.20084889.
286 doi:10.1101/2020.05.05.20084889
- 287 20. Minnesota Department of Health. Guidance for Mitigating COVID-19 at Higher Education Institutions.
288 Accessed August 18, 2020. <https://www.health.state.mn.us/diseases/coronavirus/schools/ihe.html>
- 289 21. Schackner B. Pitt, Penn State set aside hundreds of beds for students who might get COVID-19. *Pittsburgh*
290 *Post-Gazette*. [https://www.post-gazette.com/news/education/2020/07/30/University-of-Pittsburgh-Pitt-Penn-](https://www.post-gazette.com/news/education/2020/07/30/University-of-Pittsburgh-Pitt-Penn-State-fall-COVID19-football-testing-Gallagher-online/stories/202007300137)
291 [State-fall-COVID19-football-testing-Gallagher-online/stories/202007300137](https://www.post-gazette.com/news/education/2020/07/30/University-of-Pittsburgh-Pitt-Penn-State-fall-COVID19-football-testing-Gallagher-online/stories/202007300137). Accessed August 18, 2020.
- 292 22. Casagrande M. UA plans for 450 beds to isolate COVID-positive students. *al*.
293 <https://www.al.com/news/2020/08/alabama-plans-for-450-beds-to-isolate-covid-positive-students.html>.
294 Published August 5, 2020. Accessed August 18, 2020.

295

296 **Author contribution statement:** LR: Conceptualization, literature search, figures, methodology, writing, review,
297 and editing; CAK: Project administration, writing, review, and editing; CM: Methodology, review, and editing;
298 LS: Review and editing, literature search; CCC: Conceptualization, literature search, writing, review, and editing.

299
300 **Conflict of Interest Disclosure:** LR, CAK, CM, and LS acknowledge salary support from Clemson University
301 for modeling work pertaining to reopening strategies. CCC is an independent paid advisor to Clemson University
302 on COVID-19 matters. Clemson University did not influence our work or findings.

303
304 **Funding/Support:** LR, CAK, CM, and LS acknowledge salary support from Clemson University for modeling
305 work pertaining to reopening strategies. CCC is an independent paid advisor to Clemson University on COVID-
306 19 matters. CAK was funded for this work by Career Development Awards from the American Heart Association
307 (19CDA34760135) and National Institute of Health/National Heart Lung and Blood Institute (K01HL146900).

308
309 **Role of the Funder/Sponsor:** The funders of this study had no role in the study design or data collection,
310 including model assumptions and choice of model parameters, or interpretation of results and writing of the
311 report. The corresponding author had full access to all data used in this study and had final responsibility for all
312 aspects of this study, including the decision to submit for publication.

313
314 **Supplement: Equations and initial values for dynamic compartmental transmission models**

315
316 **Data sharing:** No data was collected for this study. R code for dynamic compartmental transmission models will
317 be posted on github, or can be accessed by emailing corresponding author (liorr@clemson.edu).