1 Adherence to and experiences of K–12 students in modified and standard home quarantine

2 during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Missouri

- 3 Authors: Mary Claire Worrell, M.P.H.¹¶, Sara Malone, M.S.W.³¶, Patrick Dawson, Ph.D.,
- 4 M.P.H.^{1,2}, Stephanie A. Fritz, M.D.³, Ebony Thomas¹, M.P.H., Bre Peeler Ed.D⁵, Catherine
- 5 Rains, M.P.H.⁴, Sarah C. Tinker, Ph.D., M.P.H.¹, John C. Neatherlin, M.P.H.¹, Lisa Barrios,
- 6 Dr.P.H.¹, Jon Mooney, M.S.⁴, Katie Towns, M.P.H.⁴, Jason Newland, M.D.³, Johanna S. Salzer,
- 7 D.V.M., Ph.D.¹
- 8

9 Affiliation	s:
---------------	----

- 10 1. COVID-19 Response Team, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA;
- 12 2. Epidemic Intelligence Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA,
- 12 USA;
- 13 3. Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, USA;
- 14 4. Springfield-Greene County Health Department, Springfield, MO, USA;
- 15 5. 4ES Corporation, San Antonio, Texas. Atlanta, GA, USA
- 16
- 17 Corresponding author:
- 18 Email: <u>yds5@cdc.gov</u> (MCW)
- 19
- 20 These authors contributed equally to the manuscript.
- 21
- 22 Disclaimer: The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not
- 23 necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

24

26 Abstract:

27 Background: In November 2020, during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, Missouri allowed local public health jurisdictions the option to implement a modified quarantine policy allowing 28 29 kindergarten through 12 (K-12) students with low-risk exposures to continue in-person learning. We assessed adherence to quarantine among participants in modified quarantine and standard 30 home quarantine and the psychosocial impacts of quarantine on students and families. 31 Methods: In January-March 2021, as part of an investigation of in-school transmission of SARS-32 CoV-2, parents of 586 participating K-12 students identified as a close contact with a person 33 with SARS-CoV-2 were sent a survey to assess their activities and psychosocial impacts to the 34 child and family. 35 **Results**: Among the 227 (39%) survey respondents, 26 (11%) participated in modified 36 quarantine and 201 (89%) participated in standard home quarantine. Forty-six percent of students 37 in modified quarantine and 72% of students in standard home quarantine reported abstaining 38 from non-school activities during quarantine. Parents of 17 (65%) students in modified 39 quarantine and 80 (40%) in standard home quarantine reported low or neutral levels of stress in 40 their children. Parents of students in standard home quarantine described greater stress, negative 41 impacts to family functioning, and interruptions to educational opportunities for students. 42 Conclusions: Students in modified guarantine reported lower adherence to guarantine 43 recommendations but lower daily impact and stressors than those in standard home quarantine. 44 Because in-school transmission of SARS-CoV-2 has been shown to be low when layered 45 prevention strategies are in place regardless of the use of modified or standard home quarantine, 46

this modified quarantine approach provides a reasonable option for balancing the needs of
students and families with SARS-CoV-2 prevention measures.

49 Key Words

50 SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, psycho-social impact, K-12 schools, modified quarantine

51 <u>Manuscript</u>

52 Background

The Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, caused by severe acute 53 54 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has resulted in substantial disruptions to kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) schools in the United States of America. As a result of the 55 pandemic, many schools transitioned to virtual or hybrid-learning models during the 2020-2021 56 school year as one of many COVID-19 prevention strategies. These prevention strategies also 57 include the implementation of universal face mask policies, physical distancing within schools, 58 vaccination of teachers, staff, and eligible students, and the isolation and guarantine of persons 59 who test positive with SARS-CoV-2, and individuals identified as being in close contact with 60 them. While virtual learning has provided continued education during the pandemic, resource 61 62 challenges, such as access to computers and internet, may be exacerbating existing educational inequities. Additionally, not all children are able to adapt to learning in a virtual environment (1). 63 Further, parents of children receiving virtual instruction more often reported their own emotional 64 distress and report concerns about loss of work and childcare challenges (2). Disruption to in-65 person learning also affects the mental health of students, especially students with existing 66 mental health issues. A study of Italian children aged 6 to 14 in virtual learning environments 67

68	found 78% experienced symptoms of anxiety and adversely impacted children's sleeping and
69	eating habits (3). A review of literature from the US and other countries around the world on
70	stress related to quarantine for COVID-19 and other diseases found substantial psychological
71	impact during and after the quarantine (4). Loss of a school routine and reduced access to mental
72	health services at school can worsen students' existing mental health issues (5). Increases in
73	mental health emergency room visits for children under 18 years of age and in emergency visits
74	for suspected suicide attempts in female adolescents aged 12-25 years have been reported since
75	the start of the pandemic (6,7).
76	Numerous investigations have shown that the risk of classroom transmission of SARS-
77	CoV-2 in K-12 schools is low in settings with layered prevention measures, including case
78	investigation and contact tracing, quarantining close contacts, face mask policies, and physical
79	distancing (8–12). Continuation of in-person learning requires balancing the risk of transmission
80	and health of students, teachers, and staff with the benefits of in-person education for the social,
81	educational, and mental health needs of children and their families.
82	In November 2020, Missouri allowed local public health jurisdictions the option to
83	implement a modified quarantine (MQ) policy permitting K-12 students who had classroom-
84	associated contact with a student, teacher, or staff with COVID-19 and met masking
85	requirements during their exposure (classified as low-risk close contacts) to continue in-person
86	learning(13). Under this policy, students who were in close contact with a person with COVID-
87	19 were permitted to attend school in-person during their quarantine if the school 1) had a mask
88	mandate, 2) classrooms were arranged to maximize physical distancing, 3) had increased hand
89	hygiene practices, 4) screened students and staff members for COVID-19 symptoms and 5)
90	immediately isolated symptomatic persons. In addition, to be eligible for MQ, the exposure must

91	be classified as low risk according to the following criteria: 1) the student was aged ≤ 18 years, 2)
92	their only exposure to the person with COVID-19 was in the educational environment (e.g., a
93	classroom), 3) they did not have prolonged (≥ 15 minutes) direct physical contact with the person
94	with COVID-19, and 4) the close contact and person with COVID-19 had both been wearing
95	masks appropriately during the time of exposure. Students in MQ were permitted to continue in-
96	person learning, but could not attend any extracurricular activities; it was recommended that
97	those in MQ follow the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) standard home
98	quarantine (SQ) recommendations 1 (14) in existence at the time of the investigation except for
99	attending school in-person. Under a SQ policy ² , students typically must forfeit all in-person
100	activities including in-person instruction for 7-14 days after their last exposure. The objectives
101	of our work were to compare the adherence to quarantine recommendations between individuals
102	who participated in MQ and SQ, understand the psychosocial impacts of quarantine on students
103	and their families, and understand acceptability of MQ.

104 Methods

105 We analyzed data from a survey conducted as part of a larger investigation of secondary

transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in K-12 schools. CDC, Washington University in Saint Louis,

state and local health departments, and local school officials in Greene and St. Louis Counties,

¹ CDC quarantine recommendations included 1) staying home, 2) watching for fever (100.4°F), cough, shortness of breath, or other symptoms of COVID-19, and 3) if possible, stay away from people you live with, especially people who are at higher risk for getting very sick from COVID-19.

² Standard quarantine guidance for Greene County is available at:

https://www.springfieldmo.gov/5251/Quarantine-and-Isolation. Standard quarantine guidance for St. Louis County is available at: https://stlcorona.com/dr-pages-messages/covid-19-safe-operating-protocols/quarantine/.

108	Missouri, conducted an investigation of COVID-19 prevention measures in K-12 public schools
109	and their impact on in-school transmission of SARS-CoV-2 [8, unpublished data]. During this
110	time, schools in Greene and St. Louis Counties implemented COVID-19 mitigation strategies;
111	however, Greene County implemented a MQ policy, while St. Louis County did not. School
112	officials conducted contact tracing to identify school-based close contacts of students, faculty, or
113	staff with laboratory-confirmed COVID-19. Close contact was defined "as someone who was
114	within 6 feet of an infected person for at least 15 minutes within a 24-hour period starting from 2
115	days before illness onset (or, for asymptomatic cases 2 days prior to positive specimen
116	collection) until the time the patient is isolated" (15). Students in Greene County that do not meet
117	the MQ eligibility completed a SQ. Parents of a child eligible for MQ could choose to not
118	participate and keep their child home in SQ. We conducted a survey of the parents or guardians
119	of school-based student close contacts to understand attitudes and practices around quarantine.
120	This project was reviewed and approved by the Washington University in St. Louis Institutional
121	Review Board and was conducted consistent with applicable federal law and CDC policy. ³
122	

123 Sample

Between January 25–March 21, 2021, parents or guardians of school-based student close contacts were asked to participate in the overall investigation. In Greene County, school officials in K-12 schools determined whether students met criteria for MQ based on contact tracing data using the criteria detailed above. Starting on March 11, the parents or guardians of student close contacts that had agreed to receive emails from the investigation and completed their quarantine

³ See e.g., 45 C.F.R. part 46; 21 C.F.R. part 56; 42 U.S.C. §241(d), 5 U.S.C. §552a, 44 U.S.C. §3501 et seq.

(at least 14 days following the date of last exposure) were sent an online REDCap (version 9.5.5,
Vanderbilt U) survey. For students who completed their quarantine following March 11, the
parents were sent a survey 14 days after their date of last exposure. For individuals with multiple
exposure events during the investigation period, only one survey was sent in the context of the
most recent exposure.

134

135 Survey Questions

The survey included 11 open- or close-ended questions in English. We collected information from parents on student eligibility and decision making around MQ, psychosocial effects of quarantine on the child and parent, and non-school activities conducted during quarantine. Questions 1-7 were related to MQ and were asked only of parents of student close contacts in Greene County (Table 1). Demographic characteristics of participants were collected during the initial interview conducted as part of the larger investigation.

142 Table 1: Survey questions and response options for parents/guardians of students participating in modified and standard quarantine

#	Question	Options	Branching Logic	Site Asked
Q1	During your child's recent quarantine period, was your child allowed to continue in-person learning at school under the modified quarantine policy?	Yes No		Greene County
Q2	If your child had been offered to participate in modified quarantine, would you have allowed your child to attend in-person learning during their quarantine period?	Yes No Unsure	If no to Q1	Greene County
Q2a	Why did you select no or unsure?	Open-ended	If selected "No" or Unsure from Q2	Greene County
Q3	Did your child attend school for in-person learning during any part of their modified guarantine period?	Yes No	If yes to O1	Greene County
Q4	What were the reasons you did NOT allow your child to participate? [select all that apply]	Concern for health of your child Concern for health of other family members Concern for safety for other students/staff at school or in community Virtual learning was preferred or easier for student or family Availability of childcare options (e.g., parent/guardian or other family member home or paid childcare was a preferred option) Did not understand the modified quarantine policy Child stayed home because their classmates stayed home Received advice to not participate in	If no to Q3	Greene County

		modified quarantine from a family member, friend, or healthcare professional Other Prefer not to say		
Q4a	What were the other reasons you did not allow your child to participate?	Open-ended	If selected "other" in Q4	Greene County
Q5	What were the reasons you ALLOWED your child to participate? (Select all that apply)	Followed school's recommendation Did not think your child continuing to attend school would put their health at any greater risk Did not think your child continuing to attend school would put any other family members health at greater risk Did not think your child continuing to attend school would affect the safety of the students/staff at school or in community Lack of availability of virtual learning if child was out of in-person learning Worried that staying home would harm your child's mental health Challenges associated with virtual learning Lack of childcare options (e.g., parent/guardian or other family member		Greene County

		home or paid childcare) Followed what other parents/guardians of classmates decided to do Received advice to participate in modified quarantine from a family member, friend, or healthcare professional Prefer in-person learning Other Prefer not to say		
Q5a	What were the other reasons you allowed your child to participate?	Open-ended	If selected "Other" in Q6	Greene County
Q6	Do you think your child attending in-person learning during their quarantine poses a risk to the health of teachers or other staff members at school?	Yes No Prefer not to say	If selected	Greene County
Q7	Would you feel safe having your child in the classroom with other students who are allowed to attend in-person learning during their quarantine period (i.e., they had been in close contact with a person known to have COVID-19 at school but both had worn masks)?	Yes No Prefer not to say		Greene County
Q8	How much was your family's day-to-day life impacted by your child's quarantine period?	Strongly negatively impacted Somewhat negatively impacted Neither negatively nor positively impacted Somewhat positively impacted Strongly positively impacted Prefer not to say		Greene County and St. Louis County

Q9	How stressful was your child's day-to-day life during their quarantine period?	Much more stressful than usual Somewhat more stressful than usual Neither more nor less stressful than usual Somewhat less stressful than usual Much less stressful than usual Prefer not to say	Greene County and St. Louis County
Q10	Please share any details about how you and your family were most affected by quarantine.	Open-ended	Greene County and St. Louis County
Q11	During your child's quarantine period, did your child do any of the following activities outside of in-person learning? (Select all that apply)	Interact in person with classmates who were also quarantined Interact in person with non-quarantined friends or classmates from their school Interact in person with non-quarantined friends not from their school Interact with family members who do not live in your household Go to a restaurant to dine in Attend events (e.g., church, parties, movies, entertainment, etc.) Enter stores or businesses (e.g., grocery shopping, shopping, takeout food, etc.) Go to work or volunteer Participate in afterschool or extracurricular activities (e.g., sports, band, dance, etc.) Travel outside of your city Cancel social events or choose not to participate in planned activities (e.g., church, parties, etc.) Leave home for reasons other than those mentioned above	Greene County and St. Louis County

		Prefer not to say Other activities not asked in above questions you would like to share		
Q11a	What other activities did you participate in during your (your child's) quarantine period?	Open-ended	If selected "Other" in Q11	Greene County and St. Louis County

146 Analysis

147	Quantitative data were managed and analyzed in R (version 3.6.3, The R Foundation).
148	Univariate descriptive analyses were conducted to explore the responses. Statistical testing was
149	not performed due to low sample size. For the qualitative analysis, data were analyzed using a
150	thematic approach (16). The dataset was initially reviewed by a coordinator (S.M.), who
151	developed a codebook with a set of inductive codes (Appendix 1). Codes were divided into
152	student and parent/family categories. Two team members coded the data independently (B.P. and
153	E.T.), and added codes as needed. A third coder reconciled any discordant codes (M.C.W.). The
154	codes were reviewed and grouped together in themes. Initial coding agreement was 90%.
155	

156 **Results**

157 **Participants**

The study team identified 586 student close contacts, 212 from Greene County and 374 from St. Louis County, that participated in the larger investigation and whose parents agreed to receive emails. Among the 586 students, 227 (39%) responded to the survey; 62 of 212 (29%) contacts from the group from Greene County and 165 of 374 (44%) from St. Louis County. Demographic characteristics for the survey participants can be found in Table 2.

- 167
- 168

169

170

171 Table 2: Demographic characteristics of students in close contact with persons who tested

172 positive for SARS-CoV-2

		Greene	Greene	St. Louis	
		County	County	County	Total
		Modified	Standard	Standard	Standard
		Quarantine,	Quarantine,	Quarantine,	Quarantine,
Student Characteristics	All, n(%)	n(%)	n(%)	n(%)	n(%)
Total	227	26	36	165	201
Race					
White	185 (82)	22 (85)	29 (81)	134 (81)	163 (80)
Other	42 (19)	4 (15)	7 (19)	31 (19)	38 (20)
Ethnicity					
Hispanic/Latino	7 (3)	0 (0)	1 (3)	6 (4)	7 (0)
Non-Hispanic/Latino	218 (96)	26 (100)	34 (94)	158 (96)	192 (100)
Unknown/Prefer not to answer	2(1)	0 (0)	1 (3)	1 (1)	2 (0)
School Grade Level					
Elementary school grade (grades					
K-5)	62 (27)	6 (23)	16 (44)	40 (24)	56 (30)
Middle school grade (grades 6-8)	96 (42)	3 (12)	15 (42)	78 (47)	93 (50)
High school grade (grades 9-12)	69 (30)	17 (65)	5 (14)	47 (29)	52 (30)

¹⁷³

Abbreviations: K-12 = kindergarten through grade 12; K-5= kindergarten through grade 5

175 Gender was not presented due to small cell size. Overall, students were 51% female (54% in

176 MQ, 39% in SQ in Greene County, and 53% in SQ in St. Louis County). One person reported

177 other gender, which included transgender, non-binary, or other gender.

179

180 Modified Quarantine Decision Making

181	Among 62 Greene County survey respondents, 35 (57%) close contacts were eligible for
182	MQ, and 26 (43%) participated in MQ. All close contacts (165) from St. Louis County
183	participated in SQ and 36 contacts from Greene County participated in SQ for a total of 201
184	participants in SQ (Table 2). The most common reason (n=24, 96%) for the decision to
185	participate in MQ was following the school's recommendation, followed by parents not thinking
186	that their child continuing in-person education would put their child's health at risk (n=16, 62%).
187	Reasons that MQ eligible students did not participate in MQ were that the quarantine coincided
188	with a school break or dismissals due to a snowstorm ($n=4, 44\%$), followed by concerns for
189	health of the child and concerns for safety of other students/staff at school ($n=3, 33\%$) or in
190	community (n=3, 33%). Among the 27 Greene County students who were not eligible for MQ,
191	the parents of 17 (63%) would have accepted MQ if it had been offered. Among the 9 parents
192	who would not have accepted MQ or were unsure, the main reason was concerns of exposing
193	others (n=5, 63%). One parent did not answer the question. Several parents noted that their
194	decision would depend on the nature of exposure (i.e. time, location, masking).

195

196 Quarantine Behaviors

Overall, 12 (46%) parents of students in MQ reported the student refrained from participating in non-school-associated activities during the quarantine period while 145 (72%) parents of students in SQ reported refraining from non-school-associated activities. Parents of SQ students reported similar frequencies of activities between the two counties. Nine (35%) MQ parents and 19 (9%) parents of SQ students reported their child had interactions with other

students outside of school. Among those in quarantine that did not interact with other students
outside of school, 12 (67%) MQ students and 152 (84%) SQ students reported not participating
in other activities. Students who did interact with other students outside of school refrained from
participating in other activities during their quarantine at lower frequencies, two (25%) MQ
students and seven (37%) SQ students (Table 3).

Summary of reported activities conducted during the quarantine period	All n(%)	Modified Quarantine n(%)	Standard Quarantine, n(%)
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Qualitation, n(70)	n(/0)
Total	227	26	201
All activities ^a			
0 activities	157 (69.2)	12 (46.2)	145 (72.1)
1-2 activities	48 (21.1)	9 (34.6)	39 (19.4)
3 or more activities	20 (8.8)	4 (15.4)	16 (8.0)
Prefer not to answer	2 (0.9)	1 (3.8)	0 (0)
Interacted with other students outside of school ^c	28 (12.3)	9 (34.6)	19 (9.4)
Additional non-school activities ^b			
0 activities	9 (32.1)	2 (22.2)	7 (36.8)
1-2 activities	9 (32.1)	4 (44.4)	5 (26.3)
3 or more activities	10 (35.7)	3 (33.3)	7 (36.8)
Prefer not to answer	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Table 3: Summary of non-school related activities reported by parents/guardian of K-12 student
 close contacts

Did not interact with other students outside of school	200 (88.1)	18 (69.2)	182 (90.5)
Additional non-school activities			
0 activities	164 (82)	12 (66.7)	152 (83.5)
1-2 activities	29 (14.5)	4 (22.2)	5 (13.7)
3 or more activities	5 (2.5)	1 (5.6)	4 (2.2)
Prefer not to answer	2(1)	1 (5.6)	1 (0.5)

210

a: Includes both interactions with students and other activities

b: Other activities include: interacting with non-school friends, interacting with family members
outside their household, going to a restaurant to dine in, attend events (such as church, parties,
movies, etc), enter stores or businesses (such as grocery shopping, shopping, takeout food, etc),
go to work or volunteer, visit gym or play sports, travel outside the city, or leave home for other

reasons.

c: Includes interaction with students outside of school who are quarantined and not quarantined

218

Interaction with other quarantined or non-quarantined friends was the most common nonschool-associated activity for students in MQ (35%) and SQ (9%). Thirty-five percent of
students in MQ, 33% of students in SQ in Greene County, and 50% of students in St. Louis
County in SQ reported canceling social events or not participating in planned non-schoolassociated activities (data not shown).

225 Quarantine Psychosocial Impacts

226	Parents provided data on how quarantine affected the family's day-to-day life and their
227	child's overall stress. The parents of 10 (38%) students in MQ, 19 (53%) Greene County
228	students in SQ, and 111 (67%) St. Louis County students in SQ reported negative impacts of
229	quarantine on the family's day-to-day life (data not shown). When asked about the child's stress
230	during their quarantine, the parents of 9 (35%) students in MQ (Fig 1a), 19 (53%) Greene
231	County students in SQ (Fig 1b) and 102 (62%) St. Louis County students in SQ reported more
232	levels of stress (Fig 1c).
233	
234	Fig 1. Reported quarantine experiences from parents/guardians of modified quarantine (a) and
235	standard quarantine (b) in Greene County, Missouri and in standard quarantine (c) in St. Louis,
236	County Missouri, January-March 2021.
237	
238	One-hundred and eighteen parents (51%) supplied expanded qualitative information
239	about the child's quarantine and its impact on the family (Table 1 - Q10). For responses that
240	included information about the child's experiences, four themes emerged out of the codes: (1)
241	negative mental health impacts, (2) activity disruptions, (3) educational impacts, and (4) positive
242	experiences. Examples of quotes, arranged by quarantine type and stress level, can be found in
243	Fig 1. Parents of students in SQ in St. Louis County more frequently reported negative mental
244	health impacts (n=46, 28%) than parents of students in MQ (n=4, 15%) and parents of students
245	in SQ in Greene County (n=2, 6%). Parents of both SQ and MQ students in both counties
246	
	described students as having an array of mental health impacts, including increased social

248	described the psychosocial impact on children including what they described as depression
249	(n=10, 6%), which was not reported by MQ parents. Not being able to participate in
250	extracurricular activities was the most frequent concern reported by parents of MQ students
251	(n=5, 19%) furthering these feelings of social isolation and frustration. For students in SQ,
252	activity impacts (Greene County n=2, 6%; St. Louis County n=26, 16%) as well as educational
253	impacts (Greene County n=12, 33%; St. Louis County n=52, 32%) were reported. There were
254	descriptions of students in SQ missing the benefits of in-person learning as well as having
255	difficulties, both logistical and psychosocial, with virtual learning. No educational impacts were
256	reported by the parents with children in MQ. Some parents reported neutral or positives impacts
257	of SQ, such as reduced commute times and increased flexibility for a child's schedule.
258	
259	In the qualitative analysis, themes emerged regarding the consequences of student
260	quarantines on parents. Three parental areas were identified: (1) challenges with work, (2)
261	decision making around safety for student and family, and (3) positives of quarantine. Parents of
262	students in SQ described disruption of their daily routine, including missing work and having to
263	aid with virtual schooling (Greene County, n=7, 20%; St. Louis County, n=17, 10%), while no
264	MQ parents reported these disruptions. Parents of children in MQ and SQ also described the
265	stress of having to make decisions about splitting the family within the home and managing the
266	student's stress around being ill or getting other family members sick, with nearly equal
267	frequency (4-6%). Finally, some parents mentioned reductions in stress due to having fewer
268	commitments during quarantine (3%).
269	

271

272 **Discussion**

Prior literature suggests that students in virtual learning and standard home quarantine 273 274 experience associated stress and anxiety. MQ is a new strategy being employed in parts of the 275 state of Missouri, but limited data are available regarding the acceptability of the MQ strategy. This work aimed to explore parental reports of students' behaviors and attitudes of those in MQ 276 versus SQ being used by most of the schools around the country. We first explored the 277 acceptance of MQ as an alternative strategy to standard home quarantine. MQ was accepted by 278 most parent respondents of eligible students, but for some parents the decision may depend on 279 280 the type of exposure. There may have been additional participation in MQ if the quarantine period had not coincided with school breaks and school cancellations due to weather, which was 281 282 the most frequent reason for not participating. Parents most often reported using the school's 283 advice as part of their decision making, demonstrating a high level of trust with school guidance. Some parents noted concerns regarding their child's health and concerns for safety for other 284 students and staff at school or in the community for those who were in MO. MO provides parents 285 the opportunity to decide whether keeping their child home during guarantine or allow them to 286 attend school is the best option for their family. 287

288

In allowing students to attend school during quarantine, there was concern that this strategy could decrease adherence to quarantine in other aspects of a student's life. Therefore, we surveyed parents about their child's activities to understand if MQ students showed lower adherence to quarantine guidelines (i.e. increased participation in non-school-associated activities), than those in SQ. Parents of students in MQ reported participating in more non-

school-associated activities during their quarantine in comparison to those in SQ. However, 294 many parents reported these interactions to be with other students (quarantined and non-295 quarantined) from school signaling that keeping children in schools during quarantine could 296 increase interaction with schoolmates outside of the school setting. Among MQ students who did 297 not interact with other schoolmates, there were lower frequencies of reported other non-school-298 299 associated activities. Similar trends can be seen in the SQ students, suggesting that if students interact with other students during their quarantine, they are more likely to participate in other 300 activities as well. While students in MQ reportedly conducted more non-school associated 301 302 activities than those in SQ, the risk of secondary transmission was found to be low in the larger investigation [unpublished data]. Schools should continue to provide strong messaging about 303 quarantine recommendations for close contacts in both MQ and SQ as 17% of all parents 304 reported non-school-associated activities during their quarantine. 305

306

While prior studies reported high rates of stress amongst students (3,5,17), our work 307 explored the potential impact of MQ strategies on students' stress. Parents of students in SQ 308 reported higher frequencies of negative impacts on the family's day-to-day life and increased 309 310 stress of students in SQ when compared to those in MQ. Parents of students in MQ and SQ described how the quarantine of students also affected both the child in terms of mental health 311 and education and caused disruptions to parents' daily routines, household dynamics, and work. 312 313 This work highlights the instances of stress, negative impact to family functioning, and frustration with reduced educational opportunity for students that complement findings from 314 315 other interviews with children during the COVID pandemic (3).

Virtual school was a major concern for parents of students in SQ and is an important 316 example of the wide-ranging effects of quarantine on students. Virtual school affected the 317 student themselves, whose parents reported struggling with virtual learning and impacting 318 education, as well as larger effects on parents and the family, which had to contend with 319 monitoring virtual school that impacted the parents' work. While there is limited evidence about 320 321 this topic, this investigation begins to explore how virtual school not only affected the child's education, but also affected their emotional well-being in terms of anxiety and feelings of 322 isolation and created a challenge for parents trying to work and support their child with 323 324 schooling. This work expands on prior studies through a comparison of stress between different quarantine types. While mental health effects were more frequently related in SQ, students in 325 MQ were also impacted and focused on missing extracurricular activities and experiences of 326 327 isolation and anxiety. For example, some parents noted that students felt isolated because the school had separate seating for MQ students at lunch. This suggests that areas of intervention for 328 those in MQ may also need to be developed. 329

Finally, this survey captured some parental stress around quarantine and its impact on the family unit. While parents with children in MQ reported fewer parental and familial impacts in comparison to parents with students in SQ, this work aligns with other reports of family stress during the COVID-19 pandemic (18). The daily impacts on the family are likely different depending on the family's situation, such as work flexibility and ability to work from home.

335

The findings of this report are subject to several limitations. First, with a 32% response rate, we may not have captured the full spectrum of views and experiences of parents of all close contacts, and we were unable to perform statistical testing due to insufficient power. Second,

some parents received the survey several weeks following their child's guarantine and parents 339 may have had a different perception of their experience as time passed. Third, for the reporting 340 of activities completed during a quarantine, social desirability bias could have skewed responses 341 toward fewer reported activities conducted during guarantine. Additionally, we collected binary 342 data on whether an activity was conducted during the quarantine period, but we did not collect 343 344 quantitative data on how many times that activity was conducted. Therefore, the results only can report whether certain activities were conducted and not the extent to which student close 345 contacts did those activities. Fourth, a snowstorm affecting both Greene and St. Louis Counties 346 347 during the investigation led to school cancellations and several school breaks affected the quarantine of some students. These students and families may have had different experiences 348 than students who were quarantined during normal school session. Lastly, our investigation 349 350 could be affected by extreme bias. Respondents with strong views on quarantine could have been more likely to complete the survey which could bias our results, particularly negative extremes. 351 For the qualitative analysis, participants with negative experiences were more likely to provide 352 additional information compared to the participants with neutral or positive experiences, which 353 could bias our data towards more negative impact themes. 354

355 **Conclusion:**

Findings suggest that the negative impacts of on an individual's daily life and stress on student close contacts and their families may occur less frequently in students in MQ than those in SQ and that the MQ policy has been accepted by many parents in Greene County as an alternative to SQ. Despite students in MQ having increased frequencies of participation in nonschool associated activities as compared to students in SQ, the risk of transmission of SARS-CoV-2 among students in MQ has been demonstrated to be low. Thus, the MQ approach taken

362	by Greene County in schools implementing layered prevention strategies, such as vaccination,
363	physical distancing, and masking of unvaccinated individuals, may provide an option for
364	balancing mitigation of SARS-CoV-2 transmission, maintaining in-person education, and
365	decreasing the negative psychosocial impacts on student close contacts and their families. It is
366	important to increase education around the quarantine recommendations for both students in MQ
367	and SQ to reduce frequency of non-school activities during quarantine.

368 369

Acknowledgments 370

All the students, families, educators, nurses, administrators, and staff members from participating 371

schools and school districts in Saint Louis and Springfield, Missouri; CDC COVID-19 Response 372

373 Team (Catherine Rasberry, Elizabeth Haller, Hailey Reid, Monica LaBelle, Neha Cramer); Saint

Louis University (Adrienne Beckett-Ansa, Allie Bodin, Ashley Gomel, Rachel Leimkuehler, 374

Elena Dalleo Locascio, Mary Beal, Rachel L. Mazzara, Riley Voss, Ruband Mahmood, 375

376 Samantha Haves); Springfield-Greene County Health Department (Kathryn Wall, Brad Stulce,

Sean Barnhill); University of Missouri School of Medicine (Dr. David Haustein, Evan Garrad, 377

Hosea Covington, Tricia Haynes, Spencer Blake Price), and Washington University in St. Louis 378

(Alex Plattner, Cole Tipton, Ian T. Lackey, Jenna Rideout, Savanah Low, Suong Nguyen). We 379

thank the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services who funded this investigation. 380

381

References: 382

383

1.

- 384 Black E, Ferdig R, Thompson LA. K-12 Virtual Schooling, COVID-19, and Student Success. Vol. 385 175, JAMA Pediatrics. 2021.
- 386 2. Verlenden J V., Pampati S, Rasberry CN, Liddon N, Hertz M, Kilmer G, et al. Association of 387 Children's Mode of School Instruction with Child and Parent Experiences and Well-Being During

388 389		the COVID-19 Pandemic — COVID Experiences Survey, United States, October 8–November 13, 2020. MMWR Recommendations and Reports. 2021;70(11).
390 391 392	3.	Segre G, Campi R, Scarpellini F, Clavenna A, Zanetti M, Cartabia M, et al. Interviewing children: the impact of the COVID-19 quarantine on children's perceived psychological distress and changes in routine. BMC Pediatrics. 2021;21(1).
393 394 395	4.	Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, Woodland L, Wessely S, Greenberg N, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid review of the evidence. Vol. 395, The Lancet. 2020.
396 397	5.	Lee J. Mental health effects of school closures during COVID-19. The Lancet Child and Adolescent Health. 2020;4(6).
398 399 400 401	6.	Yard E, Radhakrishnan L, Ballesteros MF, Sheppard M, Gates A, Stein Z. Emergency Department Visits for Suspected Suicide Attempts Among Persons Aged 12 – 25 Years Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States , January 2019 – May 2021. MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2021;70(May).
402 403 404 405	7.	Leeb RT, Bitsko RH, Radhakrishnan L, Martinez P, Njai R, Holland KM. Mental Health–Related Emergency Department Visits Among Children Aged <18 Years During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, January 1–October 17, 2020. MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2020;69(45).
406 407 408 409	8.	Dawson P, Worrell MC, Malone S, Tinker SC, Fritz S, Maricque B, et al. Pilot Investigation of SARS-CoV-2 Secondary Transmission in Kindergarten Through Grade 12 Schools Implementing Mitigation Strategies — St. Louis County and City of Springfield, Missouri, December 2020. MMWR Surveillance Summaries. 2021;70(12).
410 411 412	9.	Hershow RB, Wu K, Lewis NM, Milne AT, Currie D, Smith AR, et al. Low SARS-CoV-2 Transmission in Elementary Schools — Salt Lake County, Utah, December 3, 2020-January 31, 2021. MMWR Surveillance Summaries. 2021;70(12).
413 414 415	10.	Volpp KG, Kraut BH, Ghosh S, Neatherlin J. Minimal SARS-CoV-2 Transmission After Implementation of a Comprehensive Mitigation Strategy at a School — New Jersey, August 20– November 27, 2020. MMWR Recommendations and Reports. 2021;70(11).
416 417 418	11.	Zimmerman KO, Akinboyo IC, Brookhart MA, Boutzoukas AE, McGann KA, Smith MJ, et al. Incidence and secondary transmission of SARS-CoV-2 infections in schools. Pediatrics. 2021;147(4).
419 420 421 422	12.	Polly van den Berg M, Elissa M. Schechter-Perkins MM, Rebecca S. Jack M, Isabella Epshtein M, Richard Nelson P, Emily Oster P, et al. Effectiveness of three versus six feet of physical distancing for controlling spread of COVID-19 among primary and secondary students and staff: A retrospective, state-wide cohort study. Oxford University Press. 2021;
423 424	13.	Springfield-Greene County Health Department. Modified Quarantine [Internet]. Available from: https://www.springfieldmo.gov/5369/Modified-Quarantine
425 426 427	14.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. When to Quarantine: Stay home if you might have been exposed to COVID-19 [Internet]. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/quarantine.html

428 429 430	15.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Appendices [Internet]. 2021. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing-plan/appendix.html
431	16.	Saldaña J. The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers (No. 14). Sage. 2016;
432 433 434 435	17.	Yard E, Radhakrishnan L, Ballesteros MF, Sheppard M, Gates A, Stein Z. Emergency Department Visits for Suspected Suicide Attempts Among Persons Aged 12 – 25 Years Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic — United States , January 2019 – May 2021. MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2021;70(May).
436 437 438	18.	Russell BS, Hutchison M, Tambling R, Tomkunas AJ, Horton AL. Initial Challenges of Caregiving During COVID-19: Caregiver Burden, Mental Health, and the Parent–Child Relationship. Child Psychiatry and Human Development. 2020;51(5).
439		

440 Supporting Information

441 S1 File. Limited Dataset

a. How stressful was your child's day-to-day life during their quarantine period?



Modified Quarantine Greene County

Please share any details about how you and your family were most affected by quarantine.

"Mental health is so severely impacted and our lack of education that has been provided by [school district] over these past months..." [Missed school, frustration/anger]

"Lunchtime was difficult for my child. She was alone and segregated from everyone. She felt like an outcast." [Isolation]

"The biggest stressor was her inability to practice for her upcoming test session and competition with ice skating" [Virtual school, Extracurricular"

"My daughter only had a few extra activities that we canceled during this time. I feel it is most likely most kids have been exposed to the virus and had mild or no visible symptoms so sending my daughter to school at this time or anytime during this pandemic has not worried me. I feel the staff and teachers are at a much higher risk of complications when exposed." [Extracurricular]

"She was allowed to go to school but not after school events even if she had her mask on. She never got COVID and was disappointed not to be able to go to practices." [Extracurricular]

None of the participants who selected "Much less stressful" from the modified quarantine group left additional comments

Figure 1