| 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, <u>kardlie@broadinstitute.org</u> |
| 22 | AB: Move to Live More, LLC, Somerville, MA 02144, abantham@movetolivemore.com |
| 23 | MFS: Town of Weston Public Health, Weston MA 02493, schuckel.m@WestonMA.gov |

- 24 KG: Wellesley Education Foundation and Safer Teachers, Safer Students Collaborative, Wellesley, MA
- 25 02482 <u>kateygoehringer@yahoo.com</u>
- 26 CH: email hoguec@newton.k12.ma.us
- 27 RH: Broad Institute of MIT & Harvard; email crhosking@gmail.com
- 28 KMM: email: Mortimer.kathleen@gmail.com
- 29 AS: email alhams999@gmail.com
- 30 JSC: Public Schools of Brookline; email 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
- 40
- 41 Word Count: Abstract 353, Manuscript 3,347

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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
- 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.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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. ¹ 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; ²⁻⁴ including masking, physical distancing, |
| 80 | simple ventilation improvements, handwashing, diagnosis and contact tracing with appropriate isolation |
| 81 | and quarantine, and vaccination once available. ^{5–7} 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. ^{8,9} 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. ^{5,10–15} |
| 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. ⁵ 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 al 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. ^{16,17} 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. ^{18,19} 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. ^{20,21} 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.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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
- assay costs, advocate for access to screening for all public school districts, and develop online
- 106 resources.^{14,22–25} 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 screening to all Massachusetts K-12 public schools providing in-person learning.²⁶ The state provided 112 113 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,²³ or seek individual PCR testing at an outside facility (including free PCR testing offered at many state-sponsored testing sites). 121

122

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

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

positive, and resulting decisions, if any, about transitions to remote learning at the classroom, school, or

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),

and the number of hours spent by all personnel each week (strata of 5-10, 10-15, 15-20, 20-25, 25-50,

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 (<u>https://ma-k12testingcollaborative.org/</u>).

| 1 | 4 | g |
|---|---|---|
| _ | | - |

| 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; ²⁸ and total and in-district |
| 156 | expenditures per pupil. ²⁹ |
| 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 |

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

| 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

We used data from the Bureau of Labor and Statistics to estimate wages and fringe benefits for the
reported personnel types, and multiplied the estimated number of hours per week by hourly wages.^{30–32}
We estimated the cost of parent and other volunteer time by using the average hourly wage in the
United States.

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 screeding 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 the average per-person total assay cost (initial assay plus reflex testing). We then used the number of 188 189 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

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

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

197

- 198 *Human subjects*
- 199 This study was approved as "not human subjects research" by the Mass General Brigham institutional
- 200 review board.

201

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

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

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

PCR screening to screen educators/staff and pooled screening for students, while 20 districts reported
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

screening and 347 educators/staff per district were screened. While the absolute number changed over

the study period, so did the number of districts reporting. The participation rates among all educators

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.

Among the 21 school districts, 4 (19%) reported a classroom, school, or district temporarily transitioning

to remote learning due to a case identified through the screening programs.

241

242 Resource utilization and costs associated with screening programs

Among the 21 districts, the reported number and types of implementing personnel and personnel-hours

spent in program implementation are shown in Table 3 for all districts, as well as for district-weeks of

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

\$12.60, average personnel costs were \$4.27, and average total costs (assay plus personnel) were \$17.00.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

In sensitivity analyses using the upper and lower bounds of reported personnel and time strata, average
 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

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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
- approximately \$17.00 per person per week when including assay and personnel costs, and the total cost
- was higher for individual than pooled screening (\$46.68 vs. \$15.61); 95% of the total cost for programs
- 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.

Additionally, the total number of hours spent by staff/volunteers on implementation ranged from 8 to

100 hours per week, although the majority spent more than 25 hours. Importantly, these hours were

added to the time that school staff spent on additional COVID-19 mitigation strategies, such as contact

tracing and redesigning schedules and facilities to support smaller class sizes and greater distancing;

time for these activities was not reported in the surveys.

287

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

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

comparable to other reports (\$99-198), which included personnel costs for additional mitigation
 measures, such as sanitation.³⁶

295

296 Massachusetts was one of the first states to implement state-wide pooled screenings in K-12 school settings, thus serving as a model of the feasibility and advantages of the approach.^{37,38} While our 297 298 analysis is limited to Massachusetts, these data provide useful information for schools across the U.S. For example, several schools in Washington use rapid antigen tests for assurance testing, ^{39,40} Davis 299 300 County in Utah conducts widespread screening when cases in a school exceed 1% of the school population,^{41,42} and Michigan's health department launched a weekly COVID testing program solely for 301 educators.^{43,44} Most states offer voluntary screening, while other states, such as New York, implemented 302 303 a mandatory state-wide surveillance program, screening a sample of educators/staff and students in schools in areas at higher risk of COVID-19 transmission.^{45,46} While the cost per person tested will differ 304 305 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

As schools weigh the trade-offs of implementing a screening program, they must consider a range of benefits and costs. In our study, despite relatively high participation rates among students and staff during a period of high community incidence before vaccination, the screening program identified only a small number of SARS-CoV-2 infections (positivity rates of 0-0.13% for educators/staff and 0-0.21% for students, consistent with overall positivity rates of 0.1% in the state-wide pooled screening program).⁴⁷ With an average pooled testing cost of \$15.61/person and the highest observed weekly positivity rate (0.16% among students and educators/staff), the cost per case identified from routine asymptomatic

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

| 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, guestions 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 parents and volunteers based on a state-wide estimate of hourly wage;³⁰ local opportunity costs may 331 332 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 for staff.^{36,48}

335

334

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

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

- 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.^{49,50} 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.⁵¹

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

| District Characteristics | Districts | State |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | N=21 | N= 400 |
| Student enrollment (all grades) | Total: 88,843 (9.7% of state) | Total: 911,465 |
| Median (IQR) | Per district: 3,597 (2,019-5,891) | |
| Number of schools (N) | Total: 176 (9.6% of state) | Total: 1,840 |
| Median (IQR) | Per district: 8 (4-11) | |
| Number of teachers (N) | Total: 7,508 (10.0% of state) | Total: 75,146 |
| Median (IQR) | Per district: 270 (173-423) | |
| Number of districts participating in | 12 | 190 (ever participating) |
| the state-funded program (N) | | |
| Enrollment by gender | Median (IQR) | (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 (%) | % (IQR) | (%) |
| 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 (%)** | % (IQR) | (%) |
| 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 (\$) | Median (IQR) | |
| 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* |

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

349

* Data are from the most recent available year

350 ** As defined by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education²⁸

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

| Characteristic | Most recent re (n= 21 districts) N (%) | porting | | | |
|---|--|------------------|--|--|--|
| 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%) | | | | |
| | All districts | Per district | | | |
| | | (Median, IQR) | | | |
| 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.

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

| Resource Utilization ¹ | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| N (%) | All districts n=21 | Individual screening (educators/ staff only) n=1 | Pooled screening n=20 | Pooled screening, deconvolute in-lab n=8 | Pooled screening, deconvolute in-school n=13 | State-supported screening program n=12 | Non-state-supported screening program n=9 |
| Implementation personnel | | | | | | | |
| 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%) |
| Number of people involved in | | | | | | | |
| implementation | | | | | | | |
| 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%) |
| Number of hours spent by personnel on | 1 | | | | | | |
| implementation | | | | | | | |
| 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

| Costs per person tested per week ² | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | All districts | Individual screening | Pooled screening | Pooled screening, deconvolute in- lab | Pooled screening, deconvolute in- school | State-supported screening program | Non-state- supported screening program |
| Mean assay cost ³ 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 ⁴ SD, range | \$4.27 5.53, 0.36-23.34 | \$2.24 1.04, 1.27-3.34 | \$4.26 5.53, 0.36-23.34 | \$3.11 3.45, 0.61-11.33 | \$4.98 6.53, 0.36-23.34 | \$5.84 6.91, 0.36-23.34 | \$2.17 1.48, 0.61-5.20 |
| (Sensitivity analysis ⁵) | (\$2.94, \$5.61) | (\$1.48, \$2.94) | (\$2.93, \$5.61) | (\$1.97, \$4.25) | (\$3.51 <i>,</i> \$6.45) | (\$4.16, \$7.50) | (\$1.29, \$3.09) |
| Mean total cost ⁶ SD, range | \$17.00 7.75, 5.37-32.84 | \$46.68 8.08, 37.67-53.27 | \$15.61 6.54, 5.37-28.35 | \$18.92 4.76, 13.14-27.55 | \$13.57 6.80, 5.37-28.35 | \$12.95 6.52, 5.37-28.35 | \$19.15 4.86, 13.14-27.55 |
| (Sensitivity analysis ⁵) | (\$15.67, \$18.34) | (\$45.92, \$47.38) | (\$14.28, \$16.96) | (\$17.78, \$20.06) | (\$12.10, \$15.04) | (\$11.27, \$14.61) | (\$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.

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

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 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

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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





3 2 3

4 2 0

0 0 0

1

366

pos

3 3 3 3

3 4 4 5 3



367

- Figure 1 legend. The bar graphs represent the educators/staff and students tested among those offered
 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

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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



375

Figure 2 legend. The bar graphs represent the mean costs (\$) for assay type (includes cost of initial assay

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

the source of funding for the screening programs. Across all the groups, assay type accounted for more

of the costs, though with a greater proportion in the individual testing and for non-state-supported

381 screening programs.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

382 **REFERENCES**

- CDC, CDC. Community, Work, and School. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published
 February 11, 2020. Accessed July 21, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019 ncov/community/schools-childcare/operation-strategy.html
- Ciaranello A, Bell T. Using Data and Modeling to Understand the Risks of In-Person Education. JAMA
 Netw Open. 2021;4(3):e214619. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.4619
- Naimark D, Mishra S, Barrett K, et al. Simulation-Based Estimation of SARS-CoV-2 Infections
 Associated With School Closures and Community-Based Nonpharmaceutical Interventions in
 Ontario, Canada. JAMA Netw Open. 2021;4(3):e213793. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.3793
- Zimmerman KO, Akinboyo IC, Brookhart MA, et al. Incidence and Secondary Transmission of SARS CoV-2 Infections in Schools. *Pediatrics*. 2021;147(4):e2020048090. doi:10.1542/peds.2020-048090
- CDC. Guidance for COVID-19 Prevention in K-12 Schools and ECE Programs. Centers for Disease
 Control and Prevention. Published July 9, 2021. Accessed July 21, 2021.
 https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/schools-childcare/k-12-guidance.html
- Tupper P, Colijn C. COVID-19 in schools: Mitigating classroom clusters in the context of variable
 transmission. *PLOS Comput Biol*. 2021;17(7):e1009120. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009120
- Falk A, Benda A, Falk P, Steffen S, Wallace Z, Høeg TB. COVID-19 Cases and Transmission in 17 K–12
 Schools Wood County, Wisconsin, August 31–November 29, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(4):136-140. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7004e3
- CDC. Healthcare Workers. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Published February 11, 2020.
 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
- 10. Doron S, Ingalls RR, Beauchamp A, et al. Weekly SARS-CoV-2 Screening of Asymptomatic Students
 and Staff to Guide and Evaluate Strategies for Safer in-Person Learning. Infectious Diseases (except
 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-
- 422 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 425 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 428 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 K430 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/S2468433 2667(21)00002-5
- 20. Schools Should Prioritize Reopening in Fall 2020, Especially for Grades K-5, While Weighing Risks and
 Benefits. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Published July 15, 2021.
 Accessed July 26, 2021. https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2020/07/schools-shouldprioritize-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-to440 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
- Pollock NR, Berlin D, Smole SC, et al. *Implementation of SARS-CoV2 Screening in K-12 Schools Using In-School Pooled Molecular Testing and Deconvolution by Rapid Antigen Test*. Public and Global
 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/
- Profiles Help About the Data. School and District Profiles. Accessed July 28, 2021.
 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
- 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
- Abdalhamid B, Bilder CR, Garrett JL, Iwen PC. Cost Effectiveness of Sample Pooling to Test for SARS 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
- 36. Rice KL. Estimated Resource Costs for Implementation of CDC's Recommended COVID-19 Mitigation
 Strategies in Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 12 Public Schools United States, 2020–21 School
 Year. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2020;69. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6950e1
- 37. Baker-Polito Administration Announces Pooled Testing Initiative for Massachusetts Schools, Districts
 | Mass.gov. Accessed July 27, 2021. https://www.mass.gov/news/baker-polito-administrationannounces-pooled-testing-initiative-for-massachusetts-schools
- 38. MA students return to school to new COVID testing programs. Boston 25 News. Accessed
 September 13, 2021. https://www.boston25news.com/news/health/ma-students-return-schoolnew-covid-testing-programs/4QBRJK5705HUZHS6LEQIH4OW4Y/
- 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/education482 lab/a-handful-of-washington-schools-are-rapid-testing-staff-and-students-for-covid-19-is-it483 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/centers486 programs/science-education-department/school-covid-testing/

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

520