

1 **Title:** Optimizing COVID-19 testing strategies on college campuses: evaluation of the health  
2 and economic costs

3 **Short Title:** Health and economic cost-optimal testing strategies at universities

4 **Authors:** Kaitlyn E. Johnson<sup>1,2</sup>, PhD; Remy Pasco<sup>1</sup>, PhD; Spencer Woody<sup>1</sup>, PhD; Michael  
5 Lachmann<sup>3</sup>, PhD; Maureen Johnson-Leon<sup>1</sup>, MS; Darlene Bhavnani<sup>4</sup>, PhD, MPH; Jessica Klima<sup>5</sup>,  
6 A. David Paltiel<sup>6</sup>, PhD; Spencer J. Fox<sup>1,7</sup>, PhD; Lauren Ancel Meyers<sup>\*1,3</sup>, PhD

7 **Affiliations:**

8 <sup>1</sup>Department of Integrative Biology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, United  
9 States of America

10 <sup>2</sup>The Pandemic Prevention Institute, The Rockefeller Foundation, New York, New York

11 <sup>3</sup>Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, New Mexico, United States of America

12 <sup>4</sup>Department of Population Health, Dell Medical School, The University of Texas at Austin,  
13 Austin, Texas

14 <sup>5</sup>Office of the Vice President for Research, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas

15 <sup>6</sup>Public Health Modeling Unit, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut

16 <sup>7</sup>Department of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

17 \*Corresponding author: Lauren Ancel Meyers

18 The University of Texas at Austin

19 Department of Integrative Biology

20 1 University Station C0930

21 Austin, TX 78712, USA

22 +1 (512) 699-2525

23 [laurenmeyers@austin.utexas.edu](mailto:laurenmeyers@austin.utexas.edu)

## 24 **Abstract**

25 Colleges and universities in the US struggled to provide safe in-person education  
26 throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. Testing coupled with isolation is a nimble  
27 intervention strategy that can be tailored to mitigate health and economic costs, as the  
28 virus and our arsenal of medical countermeasures continue to evolve. We developed a  
29 decision-support tool to aid in the design of university-based testing strategies using a  
30 mathematical model of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Applying this framework to a large  
31 public university reopening in the fall of 2021 with a 60% student vaccination rate, we  
32 find that the optimal strategy, in terms of health and economic costs, is twice weekly  
33 antigen testing of all students. This strategy provides a 95% guarantee that, throughout  
34 the fall semester, case counts would not exceed the CDC's original high transmission  
35 threshold of 100 cases per 100k persons over 7 days. As the virus and our medical  
36 armament continue to evolve, testing will remain a flexible tool for managing risks and  
37 keeping campuses open. We have implemented this model as an [online tool](#) to facilitate  
38 the design of testing strategies that adjust for COVID-19 conditions, university-specific  
39 parameters, and institutional goals.

## 40 **Author Summary**

41 As a part of the COVID-19 response team at a large public university in the US, we  
42 performed an analysis that considered together, the potential health and economic  
43 costs of different testing policies for the student body. University administrators had to  
44 weigh the up-front effort needed to implement wide scale testing against the potential  
45 costs of responding to high levels of disease on campus in the Fall of 2021, after  
46 vaccines were widely available but vaccination rates among college students were

47 uncertain. The results presented here are applied to this specific instance, but the [online](#)  
48 [tool](#) provided can be tailored to university specific parameters, the epidemiological  
49 conditions, and the goals of the university. As we confront newly emerging variants of  
50 COVID-19 or novel pathogens, consideration of both the health and economic costs of  
51 proactive testing may serve as a politically tractable and cost-effective disease  
52 mitigation strategy.

53

## 54 **Introduction**

55 During the first two years of the COVID-19 pandemic, universities throughout the US  
56 struggled to provide in-person education while mitigating the health and economic risks  
57 of COVID-19. The 2020-2021 academic year was particularly challenging, with many  
58 universities severely restricting in-person activities (1,2). Although the roll-out of  
59 vaccines to college-aged students in 2021 (3) ultimately allowed universities to restore  
60 many of the key elements of the residential campus experience, many spent the  
61 summer of 2021 planning for an uncertain future, as new variants emerged and vaccine  
62 uptake slowed.

63

64 Initial data on vaccine effectiveness indicated that vaccines available in the US  
65 significantly reduced the incidence of symptomatic disease (4), susceptibility to infection  
66 (5), and transmissibility if rare breakthrough infections did occur (6). Under this  
67 scenario, universities with high levels of vaccine coverage could tentatively relax face  
68 mask requirements and other precautionary measures (3,7). However, vaccine efficacy  
69 rapidly dropped with immunological waning and the emergence of new variants (8–10).  
70 Universities without vaccine mandates had to rely on estimates from vaccination data

71 and surveys, for example in May of 2021, national polls suggested that 49% of 18-24  
72 year olds had been vaccinated or planned to get vaccinated, but uptake varied  
73 considerably throughout the country (11), with 29% of college-aged students expressing  
74 strong hesitancy (12). Thus, many universities looked to face masks and proactive  
75 testing as low cost strategies for managing risks while reopening campus.

76

77 While college students, especially those vaccinated, are at a low risk of severe health  
78 outcomes, transmission may spillover into the surrounding community leading to surges  
79 in cases, hospitalizations and deaths. While we do not explicitly model such indirect  
80 effects, mitigating risks to vulnerable populations remains a motivating factor for  
81 preventing viral transmission on college campuses.

82

83 Several universities deployed large-scale proactive testing programs to monitor and  
84 mitigate SARS-CoV-2 activity during the 2020-2021 academic year (13–15).

85 Retrospective analysis suggests that these programs reduced transmission at  
86 universities (16,17) and in the surrounding communities (18). With the increasing  
87 availability and decreasing costs of SARS-CoV-2 tests, large-scale proactive testing  
88 leading to early detection and isolation of infections has become a viable but  
89 underutilized strategy for mitigating surges (17,19,20).

90

91 Here, we introduce a framework for designing cost effective testing strategies on a  
92 college campus that consider the transmission dynamics of a well-mixed, partially-  
93 vaccinated student population following a particular testing policy. A positive test drives


94 students into isolation, where they are unable to transmit to others. The overall  
95 effectiveness of the testing policy depends on the vaccination rate, immunity from prior  
96 infection, transmissibility of the virus, vaccine effectiveness, and compliance with testing  
97 and isolation. The economic factors considered include the cost of both the proactive  
98 testing and the response and mitigation required for each positive case. These factors  
99 include the cost of a confirmatory PCR test, isolation facilities, sequencing, contact-  
100 tracing, and the cost incurred to the university of needing to move classes online.  
101 Building on prior cost effectiveness analyses of COVID-19 screening policies (21–23)  
102 and university COVID-19 policies (7,13,24), we developed this approach to support  
103 planning efforts at one of the largest public universities in the US during the summer of  
104 2021. Using the University of Texas at Austin as a case study, we derive cost-effective  
105 testing strategies to prevent campus closures in a partially-vaccinated community of  
106 50,000 students during the emergence of a novel variant (Delta). The model is available  
107 as an [online tool](#) to support universities throughout the US in tailoring COVID-19  
108 screening programs as novel variants continue to drive waves of infection.

109

## 110 **Results**

111 In the summer of 2021, we derived an optimal proactive testing strategy for the  
112 University of Texas at Austin, an urban public university with 50,000 students, for the  
113 upcoming fall semester. Given the uncertainty in vaccination rates that some  
114 universities faced, we considered a range of vaccination rates (Figure 1 and Table 1). If  
115 60% of students arrive vaccinated, we project that cases could far surpass the CDC's  
116 threshold for high COVID-19 activity, potentially triggering a campus closure. With

117 passive testing (only symptom-based care seeking), we estimate that symptomatic case  
118 counts would peak between 550 and 830 (median: 700) in mid-October. If 75% of all  
119 students test two times per week the expected peak reduces to 40-100 (median: 70),  
120 with a 95% guarantee of remaining below the closure threshold. This optimal strategy  
121 would require approximately 75,000 tests per week. If 90% of students are vaccinated,  
122 however, weekly testing would be sufficient to prevent an overwhelming surge.



123  
124 **Figure 1. Projected COVID-19 cases among students under different levels of proactive**  
125 **testing, assuming 60% (left) or 90% (right) of students are fully vaccinated.** Graphs project  
126 the seven-day total of detected symptomatic cases. Colors indicate testing frequency assuming  
127 75% compliance. Shading indicates 90% prediction intervals. Horizontal lines represent the  
128 assumed campus closure threshold (twice the CDC's high transmission threshold).

129 **Table 1. Recommended testing levels under three different policy options.** Testing  
130 recommendations are based on the minimum amount of testing needed to provide 95%  
131 certainty that symptomatic infections will not exceed the campus closure threshold across a  
132 range of vaccination rates.

Population of students tested	Percent of students fully vaccinated				
	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
<b>Number of tests per week</b>					
<b>All</b>	3	2	2	2	1
<b>Unvaccinated at twice the rate of vaccinated</b>	3	3	2	2	2
<b>Only unvaccinated</b>	7	daily	daily	daily	Not possible*
<b>Total number of tests per week</b>					
<b>All</b>	112,500	75,000	75,000	75,000	37,500
<b>Unvaccinated at twice the rate of vaccinated</b>	84,375	78,750	48,750	45,000	41,250
<b>Only unvaccinated</b>	13,1250	105,000	78,750	52,500	Not possible*


133 \* Due to the very small size of the population being tested, if vaccination rates are very high and testing only is  
 134 occurring in the unvaccinated, it is not possible to ensure that the campus closure threshold won't be exceeded

135

136

137 The optimal testing frequency depends on both vaccine coverage and whether  
138 vaccinated students are exempt from testing (Table 1, Figure S4). At 90% vaccine  
139 coverage, testing only the unvaccinated would be insufficient, given our assumption that  
140 vaccines reduce risks of infection by only 47%. Across vaccination rates, exempting  
141 vaccinated students from testing requires frequent (daily) testing of unvaccinated  
142 students to prevent a surge, costing more testing resources than if all students  
143 regardless of vaccination status were tested. Testing vaccinated students at half the  
144 rate as unvaccinated students remains a viable option, as total testing resources are, at  
145 most vaccination rates, lower than if all students were tested. At 70% vaccine coverage,  
146 testing the unvaccinated 2 times per week and the vaccinated weekly requires 48,750  
147 tests per week compared to 75,000 if vaccinated and unvaccinated test at equal rates.  
148 Across testing frequencies, the costs and infections associated with either prevention  
149 (proactive tests) or outbreak response (contact-tracing, isolation, sequencing,  
150 confirmatory PCR) are expected to be significantly higher under 60% vaccine coverage  
151 than 90% vaccine coverage (Figure 2, Figure S3).





152

153 **Figure 2. Projected health and economic costs over one semester under different levels**  
154 **of proactive testing, assuming 60% (left) or 90% (right) of students are fully vaccinated.**

155 Upper graphs indicate the median and 90% predictive interval of projected cumulative  
156 infections. Lower graphs indicate the projected costs, broken down by the source (colors). The  
157 green shading indicates testing frequencies that ensure the university would not exceed its  
158 closure threshold.

159

160 At 60% vaccine coverage, proactive testing of all students two times per week is

161 sufficient to avoid exceeding the campus closure threshold at an estimated cost of

162 around \$9.1 million (Table 2). At 90% vaccine coverage, proactive testing of all students  
 163 weekly is sufficient to avoid closure at a cost of \$4.7 million (Table 2). We note that it  
 164 costs nearly twice as much (\$9.1 million vs \$4.7 million, Figure 2, Table 2) to avoid  
 165 campus closure at 60% vaccine coverage than at 90% vaccine coverage.

166 **Table 2. Estimated level of proactive testing required to provide a 95% guarantee that**  
 167 **detected symptomatic cases will remain below the campus closure threshold.** The total  
 168 cost includes the cost of the minimum proactive testing needed to stay under the threshold, plus  
 169 the cost of pandemic related expenses (i.e., confirmatory testing, isolation, contact-tracing,  
 170 sequencing).

	Percent of students fully vaccinated				
	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%
<b>Minimum frequency (in all students)</b>	3 times per week	2 times per week	2 times per week	2 times per week	weekly
<b>Total proactive tests per week</b>	112,500	75,000	75,000	75,000	37,500
<b>Total cost to university (\$ if testing implemented)</b>	\$12.5 million	\$9.1 million	\$8.7 million	\$8.4 million	\$4.7 million
<b>Cost of testing per student</b>	\$218	\$145	\$145	\$145	\$73
<b>Number of infections expected if only symptomatic testing is</b>	25,600	23,600	20,400	17,000	10,800

offered					
---------	--	--	--	--	--

171

172 At both the 60% and 90% vaccination rates, providing the optimal amount of testing  
173 would be cost saving or nearly equivalent to the cost of the resources needed for  
174 outbreak response. At insufficient testing levels, the cost of outbreak response (i.e.,  
175 contact-tracing, isolation, confirmatory PCR, and sequencing) match if not exceed the  
176 cost of proactive testing. If we assume that crossing the campus closure threshold  
177 triggers a costly move to online instruction, then proactive testing at the necessary  
178 levels is always cost-saving. When considering health costs, failing to provide sufficient  
179 testing results in significantly higher infection rates, for example, at 60% vaccination  
180 sufficient testing of 2 times per week results in 2,280 infections compared to 23,700  
181 infections if only symptomatic testing is offered (Table 2).

## 182 Discussion

183 At large US universities, large-scale proactive testing can help to suppress transmission  
184 and be cost saving overall. Although the upfront costs of proactive testing and  
185 personnel may be large, it may ultimately avert the higher costs of outbreak response  
186 and campus closure. In the fall 2021 scenarios analyzed, the costs of an effective  
187 proactive testing program per student per semester are relatively low, ranging from \$73-  
188 218\$ per student, depending on the vaccination rate. As we confront newly emerging  
189 variants of COVID-19 or novel pathogens, proactive testing may serve as a politically  
190 tractable and cost-effective mitigation strategy in college communities with low levels of  
191 population immunity.

192 Our projections suggest that, even at high vaccination rates, testing only unvaccinated  
193 students is insufficient to avoid a surge. The two other policies considered—testing all  
194 students equally and testing unvaccinated students at twice the rate of vaccinated  
195 students—are expected to exact similar overall costs and require comparable testing  
196 resources.

197 Large-scale asymptomatic testing is a nimble mitigation tool for universities facing novel  
198 variants, changing levels of immunity, and shifting attitudes towards face masks and  
199 intrusive social distancing measures. Testing levels can be tuned to match the changing  
200 risks and achieve university goals. When community-wide immunity is high and  
201 transmission is low, universities can reduce testing levels. As immune-evasive variants  
202 emerge and immunity wanes, universities can scale up testing to safeguard in-person  
203 activities.

204 Although the quantitative results of this study pertain to a specific university in the fall of  
205 2021, the qualitative findings and modeling framework can broadly inform COVID-19  
206 planning at US colleges and universities. We acknowledge the limitation that the cost  
207 parameters used in this analysis are based on the situation at this specific university,  
208 rather than from nationally representative cost estimates. Because these costs, as well  
209 as the epidemiological and university specific parameters, will vary widely over time and  
210 space, we have developed an interactive online tool (28) to facilitate generalizability of  
211 the analysis. The spread and costs of COVID-19 will depend not only on the factors  
212 considered here, but also on university policies, student behavior, vaccine uptake  
213 throughout the semester, and the emergence of variants with different levels of  
214 transmission, immune evasiveness, and severity.

215 We note that our projections assume a high and constant transmission rate throughout  
216 the simulation period, and thus do not account for changes in face mask usage, social  
217 distancing, and contact tracing efforts. The model assumes that 75% of students would  
218 participate in proactive testing, which would require aggressive health communication  
219 and outreach. The model also assumes that individuals fully isolate following a positive  
220 test, which may require the provision of additional isolation rooms, paid sick-leave, and  
221 removal of academic penalties for missed classes. Additionally, the model does not  
222 explicitly consider the effects of waning immunity (from vaccination or prior infections),  
223 though we address this in the shiny app by allowing the user to input the percent of  
224 students optimally immunized (i.e. up to date on their booster shots). We have not  
225 considered the health or economic costs of severe disease, long COVID, or death within  
226 the university community nor how these risks may differ between students, faculty, and  
227 staff, nor do we consider the cost to the individual of missing class due to isolation  
228 resulting from a positive test.

229 Prior studies have demonstrated that frequent rapid testing can reduce transmission  
230 (7,13,17,20) and is cost-effective (21–23). A similar decision-support tool helps  
231 universities optimize testing while keeping cumulative cases below 5% of the population  
232 (7). The CDC (29) and ACHA (3) have continually released guidance to help universities  
233 navigate the rapidly changing COVID-19 situation. Building on these contributions, our  
234 study offers a tool that incorporates the health effects, and also the economic effects,  
235 not just of the cost of the testing program but also the costs of responding to positive  
236 COVID-19 cases in a university setting.

237

## 238 **Materials & Methods**

239

### 240 **Transmission model**

241 We analyzed a compartmental model of SARS-CoV-2 transmission that incorporates  
242 vaccination and isolation following a positive test. A full description of the model  
243 structure and parameters are provided in the Supplement (Section S1). In our case  
244 study, we modeled COVID-19 during the summer of 2021, immediately after the Delta  
245 variant rose to dominance. We assumed that vaccines reduce the risks of infection by  
246 47% [95% CI: 37-50%] (8,25), reduce the likelihood of developing symptoms by 64%  
247 [95% CI: 63-73%] (25), and reduce transmission to others by 20% (10). We assumed a  
248 reproduction number ( $R_0$ ) of 5, without interventions, that 75% of students comply with  
249 testing policies, and that students who test positive isolate for 7 days. We did not  
250 explicitly model the effect of quarantining close contacts on reducing transmission.  
251 Finally, we assumed that 25% of symptomatic individuals infected with SARS-COV-2  
252 would seek testing. We tracked the rolling seven-day total detected symptomatic cases,  
253 where cases are detected through both proactive (antigen) testing and symptom-based  
254 care seeking.

255

### 256 **Economic model**

257 To estimate the costs of testing, we considered both testing supplies and the personnel  
258 needed to administer tests, collect data, and process results. All proactive testing was  
259 assumed to be performed via antigen testing, at a significantly reduced cost than PCR  
260 tests. We assumed that all positive proactive tests received a PCR confirmatory test.

261 Symptom-based care seekers received only a PCR test. PCR confirmation was then  
262 followed by contact tracing, molecular sequencing of the test specimen, and a seven-  
263 day isolation period. At the time of the case study, contact-tracing was being performed  
264 to encourage students who were close contacts of positive cases to get tested. We  
265 assumed that 20% of positive cases require a campus-provided isolation room, based  
266 on internal data from the university. Finally, we considered the costs of campus closures  
267 triggered by large surges. Based on conversations with university leadership, we  
268 assumed that on-line instruction incurs additional costs totalling \$100,000 per day. We  
269 do not explicitly consider educational losses (i.e. missed class) or administrative costs  
270 of coordinating COVID-19 responses, nor do we directly consider the healthcare costs  
271 associated with student illness

272

### 273 **Campus closure thresholds**

274 We assumed that universities would revert to hybrid or online instruction when case  
275 counts surpassed the following public health thresholds (26).

- 276 ● High risk: 100 detected symptomatic cases per 100,000 people in a seven-day  
277 period, corresponding to the original CDC red (high) alert level.
- 278 ● Higher risk: 150 detected symptomatic cases per 100,000 people in a seven-day  
279 period, corresponding to the 1.5 times the original CDC red (high) alert level.
- 280 ● Very high risk: 200 symptomatic detected cases per 100,000 people in a seven-  
281 day period, corresponding to double the original CDC red (high) alert level.

282 Our case study assumed that the university would close when the seven-day new  
283 symptomatic case count exceeded the very high risk threshold. In our online tool, we  
284 provide even higher thresholds to support universities in mitigating highly transmissible  
285 variants with lower severity, like Omicron (27) .

## 286 **Identification of optimal testing levels**

287 We considered a range of vaccination rates, from 50% to 90% vaccinated in 10%  
288 increments. For a given level of vaccination, we identified the minimum amount of  
289 proactive testing required to ensure that the university does not exceed its closure  
290 threshold, with a 95% guarantee. For each candidate policy, we ran 100 deterministic  
291 simulations, each with parameters randomly selected from their specified distributions  
292 (Table S2), and identified the policy with the least amount of testing in which 95% of  
293 simulations remain under the closure threshold. We note that we identified the optimal  
294 policy conditioned on the vaccination rate; across vaccination rates, the costs  
295 associated with either proactive testing or outbreak response generally increase as the  
296 vaccination rate decreases.

297

## 298 **Sensitivity analyses**

299 Beyond vaccination rates, testing frequencies, and risk tolerances, several other factors  
300 influence the projections. To elucidate their impact, we conducted a sensitivity analysis  
301 with respect to vaccine effectiveness against infection (ranging from 40%-90%, base  
302 case at 47%), vaccine effectiveness against onwards transmission if infected (ranging  
303 from 50% to 0% effective, base case at 20%), and the testing policy (only unvaccinated,



304 unvaccinated at double the rate of vaccinated, and all students equally). The results are  
305 provided in the Supplement (Figure S5).

## 306 **Data availability statement**

307 All code and data used to make the manuscript figures are available at this [Github repo](#).  
308 A separate [Github repo](#) is available here to deploy the latest version of the Rshiny app.

## 309 **Acknowledgments**

310 We acknowledge the financial support from NIH Grant R01 AI151176, CDC Grant  
311 U01IP001136, and funding from Tito's Handmade Vodka. All authors declare no  
312 conflicts of interest. We would like to thank all of the individuals involved in the Proactive  
313 Community Testing team at the University of Texas at Austin.

## 314 **References**

- 315 1. Andersen MS, Bento AI, Basu A, Marsicano C, Simon K. College openings in the United  
316 States increased mobility and COVID-19 incidence [Internet]. bioRxiv. medRxiv; 2020.  
317 Available from: <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2020.09.22.20196048>
- 318 2. Casey Smith IH. Infection rates soar in college towns as students return [Internet].  
319 Associated Press. 2021 [cited 2021 Sep 27]. Available from:  
320 [https://apnews.com/article/virus-outbreak-indiana-muncie-](https://apnews.com/article/virus-outbreak-indiana-muncie-b62eacec9bd3fff89eeab1a8de72f819)  
321 [b62eacec9bd3fff89eeab1a8de72f819](https://apnews.com/article/virus-outbreak-indiana-muncie-b62eacec9bd3fff89eeab1a8de72f819)
- 322 3. American College Health Association. Considerations for reopening institutions of higher  
323 education for the fall semester 2021. 2021 May.
- 324 4. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, Lockhart S, et al. Safety and  
325 Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Dec  
326 31;383(27):2603–15.
- 327 5. Thompson MG, Burgess JL, Naleway AL, Tyner HL, Yoon SK, Meece J, et al. Interim  
328 Estimates of Vaccine Effectiveness of BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 Vaccines in  
329 Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Health Care Personnel, First Responders, and  
330 Other Essential and Frontline Workers - Eight U.S. Locations, December 2020-March 2021.  
331 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021 Apr 2;70(13):495–500.
- 332 6. Layan M, Gilboa M, Gonen T, Goldenfeld M, Meltzer L, Andronico A, et al. Impact of  
333 BNT162b2 vaccination and isolation on SARS-CoV-2 transmission in Israeli households: an

- 334 observational study [Internet]. bioRxiv. medRxiv; 2021. Available from:  
335 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.07.12.21260377>
- 336 7. Paltiel AD, Schwartz JL. Assessing COVID-19 Prevention Strategies to Permit the Safe  
337 Opening of Residential Colleges in Fall 2021. *Ann Intern Med* [Internet]. 2021 Aug 31;  
338 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7326/M21-2965>
- 339 8. Nanduri S, Pilishvili T, Derado G, Soe MM, Dollard P, Wu H, et al. Effectiveness of Pfizer-  
340 BioNTech and Moderna Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Nursing  
341 Home Residents Before and During Widespread Circulation of the SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2  
342 (Delta) Variant - National Healthcare Safety Network, March 1-August 1, 2021. *MMWR*  
343 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021 Aug 27;70(34):1163–6.
- 344 9. “The war has changed”: Internal CDC document urges new messaging, warns delta  
345 infections likely more severe. *The Washington Post* [Internet]. 2021 Jul 29 [cited 2021 Aug  
346 4]; Available from: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2021/07/29/cdc-mask-guidance/>
- 347 10. Chia PY, Xiang Ong SW, Chiew CJ, Ang LW, Chavatte JM, Mak TM, et al. Virological and  
348 serological kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant vaccine-breakthrough infections: a multi-  
349 center cohort study [Internet]. bioRxiv. medRxiv; 2021. Available from:  
350 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.07.28.21261295>
- 351 11. Baack BN, Abad N, Yankey D, Kahn KE, Razzaghi H, Brookmeyer K, et al. COVID-19  
352 Vaccination Coverage and Intent Among Adults Aged 18-39 Years - United States, March-  
353 May 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021 Jun 25;70(25):928–33.
- 354 12. Jaffe AE, Graupensperger S, Blayney JA, Duckworth JC, Stappenbeck CA. The role of  
355 perceived social norms in college student vaccine hesitancy: Implications for COVID-19  
356 prevention strategies. *Vaccine*. 2022 Mar 15;40(12):1888–95.
- 357 13. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Walensky RP. Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Screening Strategies to  
358 Permit the Safe Reopening of College Campuses in the United States. *JAMA Netw Open*.  
359 2020 Jul 1;3(7):e2016818.
- 360 14. Differing views as states consider whether colleges should test all students for COVID-19  
361 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Sep 27]. Available from:  
362 [https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/22/differing-views-states-consider-whether-](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/22/differing-views-states-consider-whether-colleges-should-test-all-students-covid-19)  
363 [colleges-should-test-all-students-covid-19](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/22/differing-views-states-consider-whether-colleges-should-test-all-students-covid-19)
- 364 15. Mukherjee UK, Bose S, Ivanov A, Souyris S, Seshadri S, Sridhar P, et al. Evaluation of  
365 reopening strategies for educational institutions during COVID-19 through agent based  
366 simulation. *Sci Rep*. 2021 Mar 17;11(1):6264.
- 367 16. Schultes O, Clarke V, Paltiel AD, Cartter M, Sosa L, Crawford FW. COVID-19 in  
368 Connecticut institutions of higher education during the 2020-2021 academic year [Internet].  
369 bioRxiv. medRxiv; 2021. Available from:  
370 <http://medrxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.08.11.21261732>
- 371 17. Gillespie DL, Meyers LA, Lachmann M, Redd SC, Zenilman JM. The Experience of 2  
372 Independent Schools With In-Person Learning During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Sch*  
373 *Health*. 2021 May;91(5):347–55.

- 374 18. Brennan Klein, Nicholas Generous, Stefan McCabe, Zarana Bhadracha, Rishab  
375 Guhashekar, Preeti Kori, Bodian Li, Jon Green, Matteo Chinazzi, David Lazer, Christopher  
376 R. Marsicano, Samuel V. Scarpino, Alessandro Vespignani. Higher education responses to  
377 COVID-19 in the United States: Evidence for the impacts of university policy [Internet].  
378 2021. Available from:  
379 <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5adb3656b105981b681ce5ef/t/6154c4587df19f6cdb>  
380 [c0f520/1632946171591/campus-covid](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5adb3656b105981b681ce5ef/t/6154c4587df19f6cdb/c0f520/1632946171591/campus-covid)
- 381 19. CDC. Overview of testing for SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Sep  
382 27]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/testing-overview.html>
- 383 20. Larremore DB, Wilder B, Lester E, Shehata S, Burke JM, Hay JA, et al. Test sensitivity is  
384 secondary to frequency and turnaround time for COVID-19 screening. *Science Advances*.  
385 2021 Jan 1;7(1):eabd5393.
- 386 21. Du Z, Pandey A, Bai Y, Fitzpatrick MC, Chinazzi M, Pastore y Piontti A, et al. Comparative  
387 cost-effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 testing strategies in the USA: a modelling study. *The*  
388 *Lancet Public Health*. 2021 Mar 1;6(3):e184–91.
- 389 22. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Sax PE. Clinical and Economic Effects of Widespread Rapid Testing  
390 to Decrease SARS-CoV-2 Transmission. *Ann Intern Med*. 2021 Jun;174(6):803–10.
- 391 23. Atkeson A, Droste MC, Mina M, Stock JH. Economic Benefits of COVID-19 Screening  
392 Tests [Internet]. National Bureau of Economic Research; 2020. (Working Paper Series).  
393 Available from: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w28031>
- 394 24. Bubar KM, Middleton CE, Bjorkman KK, Parker R, Larremore DB. SARS-CoV-2  
395 transmission and impacts of unvaccinated-only screening in populations of mixed  
396 vaccination status. *Nat Commun*. 2022 May 19;13(1):2777.
- 397 25. Israeli Ministry of Health. Explanation About the Effectiveness of the Vaccine for  
398 Coronavirus in Israel [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Aug 3]. Available from:  
399 <https://www.gov.il/en/departments/news/06072021-04>
- 400 26. CDC. COVID Data Tracker [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Apr 28]. Available from:  
401 <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/>
- 402 27. Bálint G, Vörös-Horváth B, Széchenyi A. Omicron: increased transmissibility and decreased  
403 pathogenicity. *Signal Transduct Target Ther*. 2022 May 7;7(1):151.
- 404 28. Johnson KE. University Testing Strategy Tool [Internet].  
405 <https://kejohnson1900.shinyapps.io/code/>. 2022 [cited 2022 Sep 12]. Available from:  
406 <https://kejohnson1900.shinyapps.io/code/>
- 407 29. CDC. Community, work, and school [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Sep 27]. Available from:  
408 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/colleges-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/colleges-universities/considerations.html)  
409 [universities/considerations.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/colleges-universities/considerations.html)

410

## 411 **Supporting Information Captions**

- 412 S1 Text. COVID-19 Transmission model with vaccination and testing
- 413 S1 Figure. Compartmental model of COVID-19 transmission incorporating testing and  
414 vaccination.
- 415 S1 Table. Initial conditions
- 416 S2 Table. Transmission model parameters
- 417 S3 Table. Cost parameters
- 418 S2 Text. Results for vaccination coverage ranging from 50% to 90% with all students  
419 tested
- 420 S2 Figure. Projected COVID-19 cases among students under different levels of  
421 proactive testing, assuming 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, and 90% vaccination coverage  
422 amongst students.
- 423 S3 Figure. Projected health and economic costs through December 16, 2021 under  
424 different levels of proactive testing, assuming 50%, 60%, 70%, 80% or 90% of students  
425 are fully vaccinated
- 426 S3 Text. Results for vaccine coverage ranging from 50% to 90% and different  
427 populations tested
- 428 S4 Figure. Projected COVID-19 cases among students under different levels of  
429 proactive testing, assuming 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, and 90% vaccination coverage and  
430 in testing policies for all students, testing vaccinated at half the rate, and testing in the  
431 unvaccinated only.
- 432 S4 Table. Estimated level of proactive testing to provide 95% guarantee that  
433 symptomatic cases will remain below the *very high risk threshold* if testing at half the  
434 rate in vaccinated vs unvaccinated.
- 435 S5 Table. Estimated level of proactive testing to provide 95% guarantee that  
436 symptomatic cases will remain below the *very high risk threshold* if only the  
437 unvaccinated are tested.
- 438 S3 Text. Sensitivity analysis: vaccine efficacy against infection and transmission
- 439 S5 Figure. Projected COVID-19 cases among students as a function of the vaccine  
440 efficacy against infection and symptomatic disease assuming 50%, 60%, 70% or 80% of  
441 students are fully vaccinated.

442 S6 Figure. Projected COVID-19 cases among students as a function of the vaccine  
443 efficacy against transmission assuming 50%, 60%, 70% or 80% of students are fully  
444 vaccinated.

445 S4 Text. Modifications to framework/Rshiny app for future variants

446 S6 Table. Rshiny app default settings and suggested adjustments for Omicron.

447

448

449