

1 Resources Required for Implementation of SARS-CoV-2 Screening in  
2 Massachusetts K-12 Public Schools in Winter/Spring 2021

3  
4 Stephanie S. Lee

5 Michelle Weitz

6 Kristin Ardlie, PhD

7 Amy Bantham, DrPH, MS, MPP

8 Michele Fronk Schuckel, MBA, BSN, RN

9 Katey Goehringer

10 Caitlin Hogue, Ed.M.

11 Rosy Hosking, PhD

12 Kathleen Mortimer, ScD, MPH

13 Alham Saadat, MSc

14 Jill Seaman-Chandler, MEd, BSN, RN

15 Benjamin P. Linas, MD, MPH

16 Andrea Ciaranello, MD, MPH

17  
18 Affiliations:

19 SL: Medical Practice Evaluation Center, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

20 MW: Section of Infectious Diseases, Boston Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA

21 KA: Broad Institute of MIT & Harvard, Cambridge MA 02142, [kardlie@broadinstitute.org](mailto:kardlie@broadinstitute.org)

22 AB: Move to Live More, LLC, Somerville, MA 02144, [abantham@movetolivemore.com](mailto:abantham@movetolivemore.com)

23 MFS: Town of Weston Public Health, Weston MA 02493, [schuckel.m@WestonMA.gov](mailto:schuckel.m@WestonMA.gov)

- 24 KG: Wellesley Education Foundation and Safer Teachers, Safer Students Collaborative, Wellesley, MA
- 25 02482 [kateygoehringer@yahoo.com](mailto:kateygoehringer@yahoo.com)
- 26 CH: email [hoguec@newton.k12.ma.us](mailto:hoguec@newton.k12.ma.us)
- 27 RH: Broad Institute of MIT & Harvard; email [crhosking@gmail.com](mailto:crhosking@gmail.com)
- 28 KMM: email: [Mortimer.kathleen@gmail.com](mailto:Mortimer.kathleen@gmail.com)
- 29 AS: email [alhams999@gmail.com](mailto:alhams999@gmail.com)
- 30 JSC: Public Schools of Brookline; email [jill\\_seaman-chandler@psbma.org](mailto:jill_seaman-chandler@psbma.org)
- 31 BPL: Boston University Schools of Medicine and Public Health and Section of Infectious Diseases, Boston
- 32 Medical Center
- 33 ALC: Division of Infectious Disease and Medical Practice Evaluation Center, Massachusetts General
- 34 Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
- 35
- 36
- 37 Communicating author:
- 38 Andrea Ciaranello, MD, MPH
- 39 [aciaranello@partners.org](mailto:aciaranello@partners.org)
- 40
- 41 **Word Count:** Abstract 353, Manuscript 3,347

42 **ABSTRACT**

43 **Importance** CDC guidance emphasizes the importance of in-person education for students in grades  
44 kindergarten to 12 (K-12) during the COVID-19 pandemic. CDC encourage weekly SARS-CoV-2 testing of  
45 asymptomatic, unvaccinated students and staff ("screening") to reduce infection risk and provide data  
46 about in-school SARS-CoV-2 prevalence where community incidence is high. The financial costs of  
47 screening assays have been described, but the human resource requirements at the school and district  
48 level to implement a SARS-CoV-2 screening program are not well known.

49

50 **Objective** To quantify the resources required to implement a screening program in K-12 schools.

51

52 **Design, Setting, and Participants** A consortium of Massachusetts public K-12 schools was formed to  
53 implement and evaluate a range of SARS-CoV-2 screening approaches. Participating districts were  
54 surveyed weekly about their programs, including: type of assay used, individual vs. pooled screening,  
55 approaches to return of results and deconvolution (identification of positive individual specimens) of  
56 positive pools, number and type of personnel implementing the screening program, and hours spent on  
57 program implementation.

58

59 **Main Outcomes and Measures** Costs, resource utilization

60

61 **Results** In 21 participating districts, over 21 weeks from January to June 2021, the positivity rate was  
62 0.0%-0.21% among students and 0.0%-0.13% among educators/staff, and 4 out of 21 (19%) districts had  
63 at least one classroom transition to remote learning at any point due to a positive case. The average  
64 weekly cost to implement a screening program, including assay and personnel costs, was \$17.00 per  
65 person tested; this was \$46.68 for individual screenings and \$15.61 for pooled screenings. The total

66 weekly costs by district ranged from \$1,644-\$93,486, and districts screened between 58 and 3,675  
67 people per week. The reported number of personnel working per week ranged from 1-5 to >50, and the  
68 total number of hours worked by all personnel ranged from 5-10 to >50.

69

70 **Conclusion and Relevance** The human resources required to implement SARS-CoV-2 screening in  
71 Massachusetts public K-12 schools were substantial. Where screening is recommended for the 2021-22  
72 school year due to high COVID-19 incidence (e.g., where vaccination uptake is low and/or more  
73 infectious variants predominate), understanding the human resources required to implement screening  
74 will assist districts policymakers in planning.

## 75 INTRODUCTION

76 The US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) encourages in-person learning in kindergarten  
77 through grade 12 (K-12) schools for students' educational, physical, and emotional well-being.<sup>1</sup> In 2020-  
78 21, the risks that students or educators/staff would acquire SARS-CoV-2 infection in a school setting  
79 were low when mitigation measures were well implemented;<sup>2-4</sup> including masking, physical distancing,  
80 simple ventilation improvements, handwashing, diagnosis and contact tracing with appropriate isolation  
81 and quarantine, and vaccination once available.<sup>5-7</sup> Some school communities also added weekly SARS-  
82 CoV-2 testing of asymptomatic people ("screening"). Screening may provide several benefits in K-12  
83 schools.<sup>8,9</sup> Where COVID-19 incidence is high, screening serves as an additional mitigation measure by  
84 identifying people with SARS-CoV-2 infection and isolating them before in-school transmission can  
85 occur. At all COVID-19 incidence levels, screening provides local, real-time information about SARS-CoV-  
86 2 prevalence in schools and may be reassuring to students, educators/staff, and their families.<sup>5,10-15</sup>

87  
88 For the 2021-22 school year, CDC recommends screening of unvaccinated students and staff in  
89 communities where COVID-19 incidence is at least 10/100,000 people/week.<sup>5</sup> Many K-12 schools are  
90 using substantially fewer mitigation measures than in 2020-21, including cohorting, universal masking,  
91 and physical distancing; at the same time, vaccination of all K-12 students is now available. Screening  
92 may play a role in monitoring the impact of both reduced mitigation measures and increased  
93 vaccination rates on in-school SARS-CoV-2 prevalence and transmission, especially as new and  
94 potentially more transmissible variants arise.<sup>16,17</sup> Districts will need to weigh these potential benefits  
95 against the costs of screening programs. The costs of available SARS-CoV-2 screening assays vary widely,  
96 from <\$5 to >\$100 per person screened.<sup>18,19</sup> While the cost of testing reagents and kits is well described,  
97 the additional costs associated with implementing a screening program are not well known.<sup>20,21</sup> We  
98 sought to characterize the screening programs implemented in Massachusetts K-12 public schools and

- 99 estimate the resources required for their implementation to inform future plans for funding and staffing
- 100 of screening programs.

101 **METHODS**

102 *Participating public school districts: STSS and DESE program*

103 In August 2020, a consortium of 6 Massachusetts public K-12 schools, Safer Teachers Safer Students  
104 (STSS), was developed to implement and evaluate SARS-CoV-2 screening programs, negotiate lower  
105 assay costs, advocate for access to screening for all public school districts, and develop online  
106 resources.<sup>14,22-25</sup> STSS grew to 33 districts by April 2021. Each STSS district initially contracted individually  
107 with chosen vendors; screening programs thus varied in assay type and cost, location of specimen  
108 collection, population screened, and screening frequency and schedule.

109

110 In January 2021, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and  
111 Department of Public Health (DPH) offered pooled polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-based SARS-CoV-2  
112 screening to all Massachusetts K-12 public schools providing in-person learning.<sup>26</sup> The state provided  
113 test kits, support from testing service providers, and testing software. The program matched each  
114 participating district with a vendor from a state-approved list; assay type varied by vendor (PCR or next-  
115 generation sequencing [NGS]). Initially, all state-supported program vendors offered at-school pooling:  
116 students or staff collected anterior nares (AN) swabs and placed up to 10 swabs in a single collection  
117 tube. With at-school pooling, any pool reported as positive then required a second sample collection for  
118 "deconvolution" to identify the individual(s) from the original pool with SARS-CoV-2 infection. Most  
119 schools requested that members of a positive pool return to school for rapid antigen testing with a  
120 moderate-sensitivity and high-specificity assay provided by the state,<sup>23</sup> or seek individual PCR testing at  
121 an outside facility (including free PCR testing offered at many state-sponsored testing sites).

122

123 Some STSS districts had previously contracted independently with vendors outside the state-supported  
124 program and continued to work with those vendors, while other STSS districts transitioned to the state-

125 supported screening program.<sup>27</sup> Reasons for continuing with previous vendors included familiarity with  
126 the vendor staff, consent processes, and result software. In addition, some vendors initially outside the  
127 state-supported program offered in-lab deconvolution, in which specimens from all individuals were  
128 retained and could be re-tested in the event of positive pool, without need for collection of a second  
129 sample. Over the course of Spring, 2021, the state-supported program expanded to include some  
130 vendors offering in-lab deconvolution.

131

### 132 *Data collection*

133 We developed and administered surveys to STSS districts participating in any screening program (state-  
134 supported or independent). De-identified, aggregated data were entered in an online form weekly from  
135 January 18, 2021 or the week of screening implementation (whichever was later) to June 7, 2021. Survey  
136 questions included screening approaches: type of specimen (saliva or AN swab), type of assay (PCR or  
137 NGS), individual or pooled analysis, approach to result-return and deconvolution of positive pools,  
138 population screened (educators/staff, students, or subsets or combinations of these), and  
139 screening frequency (twice monthly, weekly, or twice weekly). Additional questions evaluated number  
140 eligible for screening, number participating in screening, number of positive pools, number testing  
141 positive, and resulting decisions, if any, about transitions to remote learning at the classroom, school, or  
142 district level. Questions about program implementation included: the type (role) of personnel involved,  
143 the number of people involved each week (in strata of 1-5, 5-10, 10-15, 15-20, 20-25, 25-50, and >50),  
144 and the number of hours spent by all personnel each week (strata of 5-10, 10-15, 15-20, 20-25, 25-50,  
145 and >50 hours). Cost questions included the cost to the district for assays and sample processing,  
146 inclusive of assay costs, laboratory fees, and shipping/courier fees. The full text of the survey questions  
147 is in Appendix A, and a publicly available dashboard, created by the STSS team, shows weekly  
148 participation and positivity rates from the survey responses (<https://ma-k12testingcollaborative.org/>).



149

150 We identified publicly available demographic and financial data for STSS districts participating in this  
151 study and for all Massachusetts public school districts, including student enrollment; number of staff  
152 employed; distribution of student gender and race/ethnicity; proportion of students who are  
153 economically disadvantaged, defined by participation in one or more state-administered programs (e.g.,  
154 MassHealth or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program); proportions of students who are English  
155 language learners or students with disabilities, as defined by DESE;<sup>28</sup> and total and in-district  
156 expenditures per pupil.<sup>29</sup>

157

#### 158 *Costing approach*

159 In general, we analyzed data about resource consumption in each district in a time updated manner,  
160 such that districts that adjusted their model over the course of the school year contributed data to the  
161 appropriate model of testing at each time point. We then multiplied those units of consumption by an  
162 estimate of the cost per unit to translate consumption to dollar outcomes.

163

#### 164 *Costing labor*

165 To estimate personnel costs, we made several simplifying assumptions necessitated by the structure of  
166 the available survey data. The surveys reported the number of people required for program  
167 implementation and the number of hours spent per week on implementation in strata (1-5, 5-10, etc.).  
168 We used the midpoint of each stratum in the base-case analysis; in sensitivity analyses, we used the  
169 lower and upper end of each stratum. We assumed that districts would only involve one of certain types  
170 of personnel; we assumed equal distribution of personnel type among all remaining types of personnel  
171 (e.g., school nurses, volunteers, etc.). We assumed that the total number of hours spent by all personnel  
172 was equally distributed among all involved personnel. For example, if data indicated that all staff in a

173 district contributed 50 hours of labor, and there were 5 staff members, we assumed that each staff  
174 member contributed 10 hours. The sample calculations are in Appendix B.

175  
176 We used data from the Bureau of Labor and Statistics to estimate wages and fringe benefits for the  
177 reported personnel types, and multiplied the estimated number of hours per week by hourly wages.<sup>30-32</sup>

178 We estimated the cost of parent and other volunteer time by using the average hourly wage in the  
179 United States.

180

### 181 *Costing Assays*

182 We then calculated total (assay plus personnel) costs using data from each district's most recent week of  
183 reporting. Due to the differences in assay cost for individual versus pooled screening, costs were  
184 calculated separately for each week depending on whether a district provided pooled or individual tests  
185 during that week. For weeks when pooled screening was used, the cost of reflex testing (to deconvolute  
186 and identify which individual specimen(s) in a positive pool are positive) was estimated from the  
187 average number of positive pools and the average number of individuals included in a pool. We report  
188 the average per-person total assay cost (initial assay plus reflex testing). We then used the number of  
189 weeks in which either individual or pooled screening was offered to calculate a weighted average of the  
190 total weekly costs. We repeated these analyses varying several key assumptions: using the minimum  
191 and maximum of the reported range of the number of people involved in implementation and hours  
192 worked per week.

193

194 We calculated assay costs or total screening costs (including personnel costs) per person screened per  
195 week for all districts, as well as for those offering individual or pooled screening and those participating  
196 in the state-supported screening program or screening independently.

197

198 *Human subjects*

199 This study was approved as "not human subjects research" by the Mass General Brigham institutional

200 review board.

201

## 202    **RESULTS**

### 203    *District characteristics*

204    All 33 districts ever participating in STSS were invited to participate in this study, and 24 submitted data  
205    (response rate: 73%). Of these 24 districts, 21 (88% of responding, 64% of total) had both participation  
206    and costing data available and were included in the analysis. Characteristics of the 21 participating  
207    districts and of all Massachusetts public K-12 districts are shown in Table 1. The 21 districts represented  
208    approximately 10% of all schools, students, and teachers in the state; participating districts included a  
209    median of 8 schools, 3,597 students, and 270 teachers per district. Compared to the state overall,  
210    participating STSS districts included a greater proportion of White students (63.9% vs. 56.7%); similar  
211    proportions of Asian (7.4% vs. 7.2%), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0.0% vs. 0.1%), and mixed-race  
212    students (5.1% vs. 4.1%); and smaller proportions of Black and Hispanic students (11.0% vs. 31.6%),  
213    economically disadvantaged students (10.8% vs. 36.6%), and English language learners (4.4% vs. 10.5%).  
214    Participating districts' publicly reported median in-district and total expenditures per pupil (\$18,986 and  
215    \$19,380) were higher than for the state overall (\$16,588 and \$17,150), as were average teacher salaries  
216    (\$86,331 vs. \$82,349).

### 217    *Characteristics of screening programs*

218    Of the 21 districts, at the time of the most recent reporting, 21 (100%) screened both educators/staff  
219    and students (Table 2). The majority (67%) screened students at all grade levels. More districts screened  
220    weekly (20) than twice monthly (1), and more districts used pooled screening (20) than individual  
221    screening (1). At the most recent reporting, twelve districts (57%) participated in the state-supported  
222    screening program. Over the entire study period, 3 (14%) districts reported using individual screening  
223    for a total of 12 district-weeks. All districts reported using pooled screening at some point during the  
224    study period, for a total of 178 district-weeks. During the last reporting week, 1 district used individual

225 PCR screening to screen educators/staff and pooled screening for students, while 20 districts reported  
226 using pooled screening for both educators/staff and students.

227

### 228 *Outcomes of screening programs*

229 Educators/staff and students underwent a total of 271,246 tests. In the first week of the study period,  
230 5,168 students from 5 districts (1,034 students per participating district) were offered screening, and  
231 3,424 students from 5 districts (685 students per participating district) underwent screening (Figure 1).  
232 These numbers increased to 4,137 students/district offered screening and 1,454 students/district  
233 screened in week 21. For educators and staff, in week 1,763 educators/staff per district were offered  
234 screening and 443 staff/ district were screened; in week 21,952 educators/staff per district were offered  
235 screening and 347 educators/staff per district were screened. While the absolute number changed over  
236 the study period, so did the number of districts reporting. The participation rates among all educators  
237 and/or staff (Figure 1, panel A) remained fairly constant, while participation among all students declined  
238 (Panel B). The positivity rate among students was 0.0%-0.21% and 0.0%-0.13% among educators/staff.  
239 Among the 21 school districts, 4 (19%) reported a classroom, school, or district temporarily transitioning  
240 to remote learning due to a case identified through the screening programs.

241

### 242 *Resource utilization and costs associated with screening programs*

243 Among the 21 districts, the reported number and types of implementing personnel and personnel-hours  
244 spent in program implementation are shown in Table 3 for all districts, as well as for district-weeks of  
245 individual and pooled PCR screening and of state-supported and non-state-supported programs.  
246 Per person screened each week, average assay costs (including shipping and laboratory processing) were  
247 \$12.60, average personnel costs were \$4.27, and average total costs (assay plus personnel) were \$17.00.

248 In sensitivity analyses using the upper and lower bounds of reported personnel and time strata, average  
249 weekly per-person cost varied from \$15.67 to \$18.34.

250

251 Average weekly per-person total cost was \$46.68 for districts when using individual screening and  
252 \$15.61 for districts when using pooled screening; the difference was due primarily to higher assay costs  
253 (\$44.44 vs. \$11.21). On average per person screened each week, non-state-supported programs  
254 compared to state-supported programs had higher assay costs (\$16.98 vs. \$7.11), lower personnel costs  
255 (\$2.17 vs. \$5.84), and higher total costs (\$19.15 vs. \$12.95). The main driver of costs across multiple  
256 strategies was the assay costs, which comprised 75% of costs for all districts, 73% of costs for district-  
257 weeks of pooled screening, 95% of costs for district-weeks of individual screening, 55% of costs for  
258 state-supported screening programs, and 89% of costs for non-state-supported screening programs  
259 (Figure 2).

260

261 Of the 21 districts, 8 (38%) used in-lab deconvolution for positive pools and 13 (62%) used in-school  
262 deconvolution for positive pools. Compared to in-school deconvolution, in-lab deconvolution had higher  
263 average weekly per-person assay costs (\$15.81 vs. \$8.59), lower personnel costs (\$3.11 vs. \$4.98), and  
264 higher total cost (\$18.92 vs. \$13.57). Of the 13 districts using in-school deconvolution, 7 (54%) reported  
265 using Abbot SARS CoV-2 Binax NOW™, 3 (23%) reported using PCR, and 3 (23%) reported using both  
266 Abbot SARS CoV-2 Binax NOW™ and PCR. Compared to Abbot SARS CoV-2 Binax NOW™, PCR  
267 deconvolution led to higher weekly per-person average assay cost (\$13.13 vs. \$6.59), lower personnel  
268 cost (\$2.45 vs. \$6.57), and higher total costs (\$15.58 vs. \$13.34; not shown in Table 3).

269

270 **DISCUSSION**

271 We estimated the cost of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 screening among students and staff in 21  
272 Massachusetts public school districts, with two main findings. First, the cost of screening was  
273 approximately \$17.00 per person per week when including assay and personnel costs, and the total cost  
274 was higher for individual than pooled screening (\$46.68 vs. \$15.61); 95% of the total cost for programs  
275 offering individual tests was due to the costs of the assays themselves. We noted wide variation in costs  
276 between districts, mainly driven by the selection of pooled vs. individual screening.

277

278 Second, we found that a wide-ranging and often large number of personnel (3-100 per district) and  
279 person-hours per week (8-100 per district) were required to implement screening programs. The type of  
280 personnel also varied by district, as some dedicated 5-6 full-time equivalents, while others relied on 7-8  
281 part-time volunteers; we assigned the average US hourly wage for the cost of volunteer time.

282 Additionally, the total number of hours spent by staff/volunteers on implementation ranged from 8 to  
283 100 hours per week, although the majority spent more than 25 hours. Importantly, these hours were  
284 added to the time that school staff spent on additional COVID-19 mitigation strategies, such as contact  
285 tracing and redesigning schedules and facilities to support smaller class sizes and greater distancing;  
286 time for these activities was not reported in the surveys.

287

288 Assay costs reported by districts in this pilot study differ from others previously reported, partly due to  
289 prices negotiated between districts and vendors; other sources report higher individual testing costs  
290 (\$50-\$200) and lower pooled tests (\$50.00 per pool or \$5.00 per individual swab).<sup>18,33,34</sup> In addition, the  
291 costs for pooled tests depend on the pool size; variation in pool sizes in our study may partly explain the  
292 per-person cost.<sup>35</sup> Our estimated weekly personnel cost per person tested (\$4.27) was not directly

293 comparable to other reports (\$99-198), which included personnel costs for additional mitigation  
294 measures, such as sanitation.<sup>36</sup>  
295  
296 Massachusetts was one of the first states to implement state-wide pooled screenings in K-12 school  
297 settings, thus serving as a model of the feasibility and advantages of the approach.<sup>37,38</sup> While our  
298 analysis is limited to Massachusetts, these data provide useful information for schools across the U.S.  
299 For example, several schools in Washington use rapid antigen tests for assurance testing,<sup>39,40</sup> Davis  
300 County in Utah conducts widespread screening when cases in a school exceed 1% of the school  
301 population,<sup>41,42</sup> and Michigan's health department launched a weekly COVID testing program solely for  
302 educators.<sup>43,44</sup> Most states offer voluntary screening, while other states, such as New York, implemented  
303 a mandatory state-wide surveillance program, screening a sample of educators/staff and students in  
304 schools in areas at higher risk of COVID-19 transmission.<sup>45,46</sup> While the cost per person tested will differ  
305 across settings, based on local labor markets and the cost of assays and reagents, this analysis provides  
306 an estimate of both the resources needed to implement testing and the key drivers of cost. We  
307 anticipate that the high-level findings – that testing is expensive and that the choice of testing model has  
308 a large impact on cost considerations – will likely be generalizable to most K-12 school settings.  
309  
310 As schools weigh the trade-offs of implementing a screening program, they must consider a range of  
311 benefits and costs. In our study, despite relatively high participation rates among students and staff  
312 during a period of high community incidence before vaccination, the screening program identified only a  
313 small number of SARS-CoV-2 infections (positivity rates of 0-0.13% for educators/staff and 0-0.21% for  
314 students, consistent with overall positivity rates of 0.1% in the state-wide pooled screening program).<sup>47</sup>  
315 With an average pooled testing cost of \$15.61/person and the highest observed weekly positivity rate  
316 (0.16% among students and educators/staff), the cost per case identified from routine asymptomatic



317 testing in MA schools would be approximately \$9,756. These data do not provide a measure of the  
318 benefit of screening programs. In estimating those benefits and deciding whether routine testing  
319 programs provide enough benefit to justify the cost, decision-makers must consider the value of test  
320 results, both in terms of potential cases averted (which were few in this study), and also in terms of real-  
321 time, locally specific data and reassurance about the safety of in-person education provided by  
322 screening programs. Without this full assessment, the interpretation of cost/case detected is difficult.

323

324 There were several limitations inherent to our study. First, district participation was incomplete and  
325 varied weekly, leading us to rely primarily on last-reported-week data. While higher and more regular  
326 participation would improve generalizability, we are thankful for voluntary survey responses by district  
327 staff already working tirelessly to implement both virtual and in-person learning during the pandemic.  
328 Second, questions about the personnel number and hours spent offered responses only in strata (e.g., 1-  
329 5 hours; 10-15 people). Our cost estimates assumed the mid-point of these ranges, although use of  
330 upper and lower bounds did not substantially change results. Third, we assigned hourly wages for  
331 parents and volunteers based on a state-wide estimate of hourly wage;<sup>30</sup> local opportunity costs may  
332 have differed. Fourth, costs reported here do not include the materials needed at school to administer  
333 tests, including disposable gloves, hand sanitizer, cleaning supplies, and personal protective equipment  
334 for staff.<sup>36,48</sup>

335

336 Importantly, the 21 districts in this study include a lower proportion of Black and Hispanic students,  
337 English-language learners, and economically disadvantaged students than the state-wide average. While  
338 the costs of assays will likely be similar in most settings, resources needed for implementation may  
339 differ widely, for example, the availability of parent volunteers and the time needed for outreach,  
340 education, and obtaining consent for all participating students. The Massachusetts state-supported

341 program paid many of the costs for participating districts; other districts used privately-raised funds  
342 and/or Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act/Elementary and Secondary Emergency Relief  
343 Funds funds.<sup>49,50</sup> Without state or federal funding, access to screening will be inequitable.

344

345 As schools offer in-person learning in 2021-22 with fewer mitigation measures and viral variants with  
346 greater transmissibility than in 2020-21, information about the resources needed to implement CDC-  
347 recommended screening programs can inform program planning.<sup>51</sup>

348 **Table 1.** District Characteristics from 21 Participating Massachusetts K-12 School Districts

<b><i>District Characteristics</i></b>	<b><i>Districts N=21</i></b>	<b><i>State N= 400</i></b>
Student enrollment (all grades) <i>Median (IQR)</i>	Total: 88,843 (9.7% of state) Per district: 3,597 (2,019-5,891)	Total: 911,465 --
Number of schools (N) <i>Median (IQR)</i>	Total: 176 (9.6% of state) Per district: 8 (4-11)	Total: 1,840 --
Number of teachers (N) <i>Median (IQR)</i>	Total: 7,508 (10.0% of state) Per district: 270 (173-423)	Total: 75,146 --
Number of districts participating in the state-funded program (N)	12	190 (ever participating)
Enrollment by gender	<i>Median (IQR)</i>	(N)
Male	1,810 (1,025-2,947)	467,362
Female	1,754 (993-2,849)	443,625
Non-Binary	1 (0-3)	478
Enrollment by race/ethnicity (%)	<i>% (IQR)</i>	(%)
Black	4.4 (3.3-5.7)	9.3
Asian	7.4 (3.4-14.9)	7.2
Hispanic	6.6 (5.5-18.9)	22.3
Native American	0.1 (0.0-0.2)	0.2
White	63.9 (49.3-74.6)	56.7
Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander	0.0 (0.0-0.1)	0.1
Multi-race, Non-Hispanic	5.1 (4.2-6.4)	4.1
Student Groups (%)**	<i>% (IQR)</i>	(%)
Economically disadvantaged	10.8 (8.4-30.7)	36.6
English language learner	4.4 (2.0-7.5)	10.5
Students with disabilities	17.1 (16.0-18.8)	18.7
Finances (\$)	<i>Median (IQR)</i>	
In-District expenditures per pupil	\$18,986 (\$15,070-19,677)*	\$16,588*
Total expenditures per pupil	\$19,380 (\$16,049-20,825)*	\$17,150*
Teacher average salary (\$)	\$86,331 (80,382-92,906)*	\$82,349*

349 \* Data are from the most recent available year

350 \*\* As defined by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education<sup>28</sup>

351 **Table 2.** Characteristics of school-based SARS-CoV-2 surveillance programs in participating districts

Characteristic	Most recent reporting (n= 21 districts) N (%)	
	Target population for surveillance testing* Educators, staff, and students	21 (100%)
Frequency of screening		
Weekly	20 (95%)	
Twice monthly	1 (5%)	
Grades of students included in the program*		
All grades	14 (67%)	
Elementary only	1 (5%)	
Elementary, Middle only	2 (9%)	
Middle, High only	2 (9%)	
High only	2 (9%)	
Screening strategy (educators/staff)*		
Individual	1 (5%)	
Pooled	20 (95%)	
Screening strategy (students)*		
Pooled	21 (100%)	
	<b>All districts</b>	<b>Per district (Median, IQR)</b>
N of students and educators/staff ever screened	271,246	--
N screened (per week)*		
Educators/staff	4,923	216 (109, 354)
Students	20,991	781 (606, 1,162)
% participating among those offered screening*		
Educators/staff	40%	41% (35%, 76%)
Students	38%	43% (28%, 63%)

352 \*Data are from each district's most recent reporting week during the study period.

353 **Table 3.** Resource Utilization and Costs Associated with Implementing Screening Programs

<b>Resource Utilization<sup>1</sup></b>							
<i>N (%)</i>	<i>All districts n=21</i>	<i>Individual screening (educators/ staff only) n=1</i>	<i>Pooled screening n=20</i>	<i>Pooled screening, deconvolute in-lab n=8</i>	<i>Pooled screening, deconvolute in-school n=13</i>	<i>State-supported screening program n=12</i>	<i>Non-state-supported screening program n=9</i>
<b>Implementation personnel</b>							
Town or city staff	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (16%)	2 (25%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)
District Physician	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (11%)	1 (13%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	1 (11%)
Educators/staff	10 (48%)	1 (100%)	9 (47%)	4 (50%)	6 (46%)	5 (42%)	5 (55%)
Superintendent	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (15%)	2 (17%)	0 (0%)
Paid project managers	6 (29%)	0 (0%)	6 (32%)	2 (25%)	4 (31%)	4 (33%)	2 (22%)
School nurses at each school	21 (100%)	1 (100%)	20 (100%)	8 (100%)	13 (100%)	12 (100%)	9 (100%)
School nurses at each district	13 (62%)	1 (100%)	12 (63%)	7 (88%)	6 (46%)	6 (50%)	7 (78%)
District health department	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (16%)	1 (13%)	2 (15%)	2 (17%)	1 (11%)
Parent/other volunteers	7 (33%)	0 (0%)	7 (37%)	3 (38%)	4 (31%)	3 (25%)	4 (44%)
<b>Number of people involved in implementation</b>							
1-5	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)
5-10	5 (24%)	1 (100%)	4 (20%)	0 (0%)	5 (38%)	5 (42%)	0 (0%)
10-15	4 (19%)	0 (0%)	4 (20%)	1 (13%)	3 (23%)	3 (25%)	1 (11%)
15-20	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	2 (25%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)
20-25	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	2 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)
>25	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)
>50	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
<b>Number of hours spent by personnel on implementation</b>							
5-10 hours/week	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)	3 (23%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)
10-15 hours/week	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
15-20 hours/week	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (15%)	1 (8%)	1 (11%)
20-25 hours/week	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	2 (25%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	2 (22%)
>25 hours/week	7 (33%)	1 (100%)	6 (30%)	3 (38%)	4 (31%)	5 (42%)	2 (22%)
>50 hours/week	6 (29%)	0 (0%)	6 (30%)	3 (38%)	3 (23%)	2 (17%)	4 (44%)


355 **Table 3.** Resource Utilization and Costs Associated with Implementing Screening Programs, continued

<b>Costs per person tested per week <sup>2</sup></b>							
	<i>All districts</i>	<i>Individual screening</i>	<i>Pooled screening</i>	<i>Pooled screening, deconvolute in-lab</i>	<i>Pooled screening, deconvolute in-school</i>	<i>State-supported screening program</i>	<i>Non-state-supported screening program</i>
Mean assay cost <sup>3</sup> SD, range	\$12.73 7.92, 5.00-31.54	\$44.44 9.11, 34.33-52.00	\$11.35 6.14, 5.00-25.00	\$15.81 5.61, 6.98-25.00	\$8.59 4.78, 5.00-18.32	\$7.11 3.24, 5.00-15.04	\$16.98 4.14, 12.18-25.00
Mean personnel cost <sup>4</sup> SD, range  (Sensitivity analysis <sup>5</sup> )	\$4.27 5.53, 0.36-23.34  (\$2.94, \$5.61)	\$2.24 1.04, 1.27-3.34  (\$1.48, \$2.94)	\$4.26 5.53, 0.36-23.34  (\$2.93, \$5.61)	\$3.11 3.45, 0.61-11.33  (\$1.97, \$4.25)	\$4.98 6.53, 0.36-23.34  (\$3.51, \$6.45)	\$5.84 6.91, 0.36-23.34  (\$4.16, \$7.50)	\$2.17 1.48, 0.61-5.20  (\$1.29, \$3.09)
Mean total cost <sup>6</sup> SD, range  (Sensitivity analysis <sup>5</sup> )	\$17.00 7.75, 5.37-32.84  (\$15.67, \$18.34)	\$46.68 8.08, 37.67-53.27  (\$45.92, \$47.38)	\$15.61 6.54, 5.37-28.35  (\$14.28, \$16.96)	\$18.92 4.76, 13.14-27.55  (\$17.78, \$20.06)	\$13.57 6.80, 5.37-28.35  (\$12.10, \$15.04)	\$12.95 6.52, 5.37-28.35  (\$11.27, \$14.61)	\$19.15 4.86, 13.14-27.55  (\$18.27, \$20.07)


- 356 1. Data are from each district's most recent reporting week during the study period.  
357 2. Costs were calculated over a period of time rather than the most recent reporting  
358 3. For districts that did not report the cost of assays, we estimated those costs based on the vendor used.  
359 4. Estimated personnel costs were calculated from mean number of hours \* average publicly reported salary for each type of employee, weighted across types of employee  
360 reported. Numbers of personnel and hours were reported in strata; we assumed an inclusive upper bound for each stratum. For ranges where an upper bound was not explicitly  
361 specified (>25 and >50), we assumed a range of 25-50 and 50-150, respectively.  
362 5. Sensitivity analyses: lower and upper bound of mean cost estimate, using lower and upper bounds of strata of number of personnel and personnel-hours spent.  
363 6. Sum of reported assay and other costs plus estimated personnel costs

364 **Figure 1. Massachusetts School-Based SARS-CoV-2 Testing Volume Per Week 1/18/2021-6/7/2021**

365



366




367

368 **Figure 1 legend.** The bar graphs represent the educators/staff and students tested among those offered  
 369 testing (%) from Jan 18 to Jun 07. The columns underneath the bar graphs show the number of districts,  
 370 number offered testing, number tested, number of those who tested positive, and the positivity rate  
 371 (%). The positivity rate ranged from 0.0%-0.13% for educators and staff and 0.0%-0.21% for students.

372

373 **Figure 2.** Components of average weekly cost per person tested

374



375

376 **Figure 2 legend.** The bar graphs represent the mean costs (\$) for assay type (includes cost of initial assay  
377 as well as reflex testing, if applicable) and personnel and its percentage (%) in proportion to the total  
378 costs. Pooled and individual refer to the type of test; state-supported or non-state-supported refers to  
379 the source of funding for the screening programs. Across all the groups, assay type accounted for more  
380 of the costs, though with a greater proportion in the individual testing and for non-state-supported  
381 screening programs.



## 382 REFERENCES

- 383 1. CDC, CDC. Community, Work, and School. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published  
384 February 11, 2020. Accessed July 21, 2021. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/operation-strategy.html)  
385 [ncov/community/schools-childcare/operation-strategy.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/operation-strategy.html)
- 386 2. Ciaranello A, Bell T. Using Data and Modeling to Understand the Risks of In-Person Education. *JAMA*  
387 *Netw Open*. 2021;4(3):e214619. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.4619
- 388 3. Naimark D, Mishra S, Barrett K, et al. Simulation-Based Estimation of SARS-CoV-2 Infections  
389 Associated With School Closures and Community-Based Nonpharmaceutical Interventions in  
390 Ontario, Canada. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(3):e213793. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.3793
- 391 4. Zimmerman KO, Akinboyo IC, Brookhart MA, et al. Incidence and Secondary Transmission of SARS-  
392 CoV-2 Infections in Schools. *Pediatrics*. 2021;147(4):e2020048090. doi:10.1542/peds.2020-048090
- 393 5. CDC. Guidance for COVID-19 Prevention in K-12 Schools and ECE Programs. Centers for Disease  
394 Control and Prevention. Published July 9, 2021. Accessed July 21, 2021.  
395 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/k-12-guidance.html>
- 396 6. Tupper P, Colijn C. COVID-19 in schools: Mitigating classroom clusters in the context of variable  
397 transmission. *PLOS Comput Biol*. 2021;17(7):e1009120. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009120
- 398 7. Falk A, Benda A, Falk P, Steffen S, Wallace Z, Høeg TB. COVID-19 Cases and Transmission in 17 K–12  
399 Schools — Wood County, Wisconsin, August 31–November 29, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*  
400 *Rep*. 2021;70(4):136-140. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7004e3
- 401 8. CDC. Healthcare Workers. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published February 11, 2020.  
402 Accessed July 21, 2021. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/testing-overview.html>
- 403 9. Rafiei Y, Mello MM. The Missing Piece — SARS-CoV-2 Testing and School Reopening. *N Engl J Med*.  
404 2020;383(23):e126. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2028209
- 405 10. Doron S, Ingalls RR, Beauchamp A, et al. *Weekly SARS-CoV-2 Screening of Asymptomatic Students*  
406 *and Staff to Guide and Evaluate Strategies for Safer in-Person Learning*. Infectious Diseases (except  
407 HIV/AIDS); 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.03.20.21253976
- 408 11. Pollock NR, Berlin D, Smole SC, et al. *Implementation of SARS-CoV2 Screening in K-12 Schools Using*  
409 *In-School Pooled Molecular Testing and Deconvolution by Rapid Antigen Test*. Public and Global  
410 Health; 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.05.03.21256560
- 411 12. Bi C, Mendoza R, Cheng H-T, et al. *Pooled Surveillance Testing Program for Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-*  
412 *2 Infections in K-12 Schools and Universities*. Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS); 2021.  
413 doi:10.1101/2021.02.09.21251464
- 414 13. Bilinski A, Ciaranello A, Fitzpatrick MC, et al. *Asymptomatic COVID-19 Screening Tests to Facilitate*  
415 *Full-Time School Attendance: Model-Based Analysis of Cost and Impact*. Infectious Diseases (except  
416 HIV/AIDS); 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.05.12.21257131

- 417 14. Ciaranello A, Goehringer C, Nelson SB, Ruark LJ, Pollock NR. Lessons learned from implementation  
418 of SARS-CoV-2 screening in K-12 public schools in Massachusetts. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. Published  
419 online June 4, 2021:ofab287. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofab287
- 420 15. Covid-19 Testing in K-12 Settings: A Playbook for Educators and Leaders. The Rockefeller  
421 Foundation. Accessed September 14, 2021. [https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/report/covid-](https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/report/covid-19-testing-in-k-12-settings-a-playbook-for-educators-and-leaders/)  
422 [19-testing-in-k-12-settings-a-playbook-for-educators-and-leaders/](https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/report/covid-19-testing-in-k-12-settings-a-playbook-for-educators-and-leaders/)
- 423 16. Updates to DESE COVID-19 Guidance. Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary  
424 Education. Published May 27, 2021. [https://www.doe.mass.edu/covid19/on-desktop/covid19-](https://www.doe.mass.edu/covid19/on-desktop/covid19-guide-updates.pdf)  
425 [guide-updates.pdf](https://www.doe.mass.edu/covid19/on-desktop/covid19-guide-updates.pdf)
- 426 17. CDC. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published  
427 February 11, 2020. Accessed July 26, 2021. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/transmission_k_12_schools.html)  
428 [ncov/science/science-briefs/transmission\\_k\\_12\\_schools.html](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/science/science-briefs/transmission_k_12_schools.html)
- 429 18. Wang CJ, Bair H. Operational Considerations on the American Academy of Pediatrics Guidance for K-  
430 12 School Reentry. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2021;175(2):121. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.3871
- 431 19. Du Z, Pandey A, Bai Y, et al. Comparative cost-effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 testing strategies in the  
432 USA: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*. 2021;6(3):e184-e191. doi:10.1016/S2468-  
433 [2667\(21\)00002-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00002-5)
- 434 20. Schools Should Prioritize Reopening in Fall 2020, Especially for Grades K-5, While Weighing Risks and  
435 Benefits. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Published July 15, 2021.  
436 Accessed July 26, 2021. [https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2020/07/schools-should-](https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2020/07/schools-should-prioritize-reopening-in-fall-2020-especially-for-grades-k-5-while-weighing-risks-and-benefits)  
437 [prioritize-reopening-in-fall-2020-especially-for-grades-k-5-while-weighing-risks-and-benefits](https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2020/07/schools-should-prioritize-reopening-in-fall-2020-especially-for-grades-k-5-while-weighing-risks-and-benefits)
- 438 21. Abbott B. Covid-19 Testing in Schools Bolsters Safety but Is Hard to Set Up, Studies Find. *Wall Street*  
439 *Journal*. [https://www.wsj.com/articles/covid-19-testing-in-schools-bolsters-safety-but-is-hard-to-](https://www.wsj.com/articles/covid-19-testing-in-schools-bolsters-safety-but-is-hard-to-set-up-studies-find-11612414860)  
440 [set-up-studies-find-11612414860](https://www.wsj.com/articles/covid-19-testing-in-schools-bolsters-safety-but-is-hard-to-set-up-studies-find-11612414860). Published February 4, 2021. Accessed September 14, 2021.
- 441 22. Wellesley Education Foundation | Back-to-School Testing Program. WEF. Accessed July 26, 2021.  
442 <https://www.wellesleyeducationfoundation.org/testing-collaborative>
- 443 23. Pollock NR, Berlin D, Smole SC, et al. *Implementation of SARS-CoV2 Screening in K-12 Schools Using*  
444 *In-School Pooled Molecular Testing and Deconvolution by Rapid Antigen Test*. Public and Global  
445 Health; 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.05.03.21256560
- 446 24. Open and Safe Schools. Open & Safe Schools. Accessed July 26, 2021.  
447 <https://www.openandsafeschools.org>
- 448 25. Boehm JS. The power of parent scientists. *Cell*. 2021;184(9):2263-2270.  
449 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2021.03.049
- 450 26. Coronavirus/COVID-19: Pooled Testing in K-12 Schools. Accessed July 26, 2021.  
451 <https://www.doe.mass.edu/covid19/pooled-testing/>

- 452 27. Coronavirus/COVID-19: COVID-19 Testing Program. Accessed September 13, 2021.  
453 <https://www.doe.mass.edu/covid19/testing/>
- 454 28. Profiles Help - About the Data. School and District Profiles. Accessed July 28, 2021.  
455 <https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/help/data.aspx?section=students#selectedpop>
- 456 29. School and District Profiles. Accessed July 27, 2021. <https://profiles.doe.mass.edu/>
- 457 30. Massachusetts - May 2020 OEWS State Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates. Accessed  
458 July 27, 2021. [https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes\\_ma.htm](https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_ma.htm)
- 459 31. Employer Costs for Employee Compensation Summary. Accessed October 27, 2021.  
460 <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/ecec.nr0.htm>
- 461 32. Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics Home Page. Accessed October 27, 2021.  
462 <https://www.bls.gov/oes/home.htm>
- 463 33. Abdalhamid B, Bilder CR, Garrett JL, Iwen PC. Cost Effectiveness of Sample Pooling to Test for SARS-  
464 CoV-2. *J Infect Dev Ctries*. 2020;14(10):1136-1137. doi:10.3855/jidc.13935
- 465 34. Meiselbach MK, Bai G, Anderson GF. Charges of COVID-19 Diagnostic Testing and Antibody Testing  
466 Across Facility Types and States. *J Gen Intern Med*. Published online September 15, 2020.  
467 doi:10.1007/s11606-020-06198-y
- 468 35. Simas AM, Crott JW, Sedore C, et al. Pooling for SARS-CoV2 Surveillance: Validation and Strategy for  
469 Implementation in K-12 Schools. Published online December 16, 2020:2020.12.16.20248353.  
470 Accessed September 2, 2021. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.12.16.20248353v1>
- 471 36. Rice KL. Estimated Resource Costs for Implementation of CDC's Recommended COVID-19 Mitigation  
472 Strategies in Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 12 Public Schools — United States, 2020–21 School  
473 Year. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6950e1
- 474 37. Baker-Polito Administration Announces Pooled Testing Initiative for Massachusetts Schools, Districts  
475 | Mass.gov. Accessed July 27, 2021. [https://www.mass.gov/news/baker-polito-administration-  
476 announces-pooled-testing-initiative-for-massachusetts-schools](https://www.mass.gov/news/baker-polito-administration-announces-pooled-testing-initiative-for-massachusetts-schools)
- 477 38. MA students return to school to new COVID testing programs. Boston 25 News. Accessed  
478 September 13, 2021. [https://www.boston25news.com/news/health/ma-students-return-school-  
479 new-covid-testing-programs/4QBRJK57O5HUZHS6LEQIH4OW4Y/](https://www.boston25news.com/news/health/ma-students-return-school-new-covid-testing-programs/4QBRJK57O5HUZHS6LEQIH4OW4Y/)
- 480 39. Furfaro H. A handful of Washington schools are rapid testing staff and students for COVID-19. Is it  
481 working? The Seattle Times. Published February 8, 2021. [https://www.seattletimes.com/education-  
482 lab/a-handful-of-washington-schools-are-rapid-testing-staff-and-students-for-covid-19-is-it-  
483 working/](https://www.seattletimes.com/education-lab/a-handful-of-washington-schools-are-rapid-testing-staff-and-students-for-covid-19-is-it-working/)
- 484 40. Washington State School-Based COVID-19 Rapid Testing Program. Seattle Children's Hospital.  
485 Accessed September 13, 2021. [https://www.seattlechildrens.org/research/centers-  
486 programs/science-education-department/school-covid-testing/](https://www.seattlechildrens.org/research/centers-programs/science-education-department/school-covid-testing/)

- 487 41. Standard-Examiner EA. Davis School District making second attempt to employ “Test to Stay” at  
488 Davis High School. Standard-Examiner. Accessed July 27, 2021.  
489 [https://www.standard.net/news/education/davis-school-district-making-second-attempt-to-](https://www.standard.net/news/education/davis-school-district-making-second-attempt-to-employ-test-to-stay-at-davis-high-school/article_aa93f2c8-dced-5a06-9235-b839412178bf.html)  
490 [employ-test-to-stay-at-davis-high-school/article\\_aa93f2c8-dced-5a06-9235-b839412178bf.html](https://www.standard.net/news/education/davis-school-district-making-second-attempt-to-employ-test-to-stay-at-davis-high-school/article_aa93f2c8-dced-5a06-9235-b839412178bf.html)
- 491 42. Dashboard - Davis School District. Accessed September 13, 2021.  
492 <https://www.davis.k12.ut.us/departments/risk-management/covid19/dashboard>
- 493 43. Booth D. Michigan health department launches program offering weekly COVID testing to  
494 educators. WDIV. Published February 3, 2021. Accessed July 27, 2021.  
495 [https://www.clickondetroit.com/news/michigan/2021/02/03/michigan-health-department-](https://www.clickondetroit.com/news/michigan/2021/02/03/michigan-health-department-launches-program-offering-weekly-covid-testing-to-educators/)  
496 [launches-program-offering-weekly-covid-testing-to-educators/](https://www.clickondetroit.com/news/michigan/2021/02/03/michigan-health-department-launches-program-offering-weekly-covid-testing-to-educators/)
- 497 44. Coronavirus - MDHHS to provide COVID tests to educators to keep staff, students and community  
498 safe as schools offer in-person learning. Accessed September 13, 2021.  
499 <https://www.michigan.gov/coronavirus/0,9753,7-406-98158-551193--,00.html>
- 500 45. Faherty LJ, Master BK, Steiner ED, et al. *COVID-19 Testing in K–12 Schools: Insights from Early*  
501 *Adopters*. RAND Corporation; 2021. Accessed September 1, 2021.  
502 [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RRA1103-1.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA1103-1.html)
- 503 46. Governor Cuomo Announces New Testing Initiatives to Improve COVID-19 Detection & Control  
504 Across New York State. Accessed July 27, 2021. [https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-](https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-announces-new-testing-initiatives-improve-covid-19-detection-control-across-new)  
505 [cuomo-announces-new-testing-initiatives-improve-covid-19-detection-control-across-new](https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-announces-new-testing-initiatives-improve-covid-19-detection-control-across-new)
- 506 47. Coronavirus/COVID-19: Positive COVID-19 Cases in Schools. Accessed September 1, 2021.  
507 <https://www.doe.mass.edu/covid19/positive-cases/>
- 508 48. Binnicker MJ. Challenges and Controversies to Testing for COVID-19. Kraft CS, ed. *J Clin Microbiol.*  
509 2020;58(11). doi:10.1128/JCM.01695-20
- 510 49. Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund Tracker. Accessed July 28, 2021.  
511 [https://www.ncsl.org/ncsl-in-dc/standing-committees/education/cares-act-elementary-and-](https://www.ncsl.org/ncsl-in-dc/standing-committees/education/cares-act-elementary-and-secondary-school-emergency-relief-fund-tracker.aspx)  
512 [secondary-school-emergency-relief-fund-tracker.aspx](https://www.ncsl.org/ncsl-in-dc/standing-committees/education/cares-act-elementary-and-secondary-school-emergency-relief-fund-tracker.aspx)
- 513 50. Division N. Biden Administration to Invest More Than \$12 Billion to Expand COVID-19 Testing.  
514 HHS.gov. Published March 17, 2021. Accessed July 29, 2021.  
515 [https://www.hhs.gov/about/news/2021/03/17/biden-administration-invest-more-than-12-billion-](https://www.hhs.gov/about/news/2021/03/17/biden-administration-invest-more-than-12-billion-expand-covid-19-testing.html)  
516 [expand-covid-19-testing.html](https://www.hhs.gov/about/news/2021/03/17/biden-administration-invest-more-than-12-billion-expand-covid-19-testing.html)
- 517 51. Lam-Hine T. Outbreak Associated with SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant in an Elementary School  
518 — Marin County, California, May–June 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70.  
519 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7035e2
- 520