

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 **Affiliations:**

- 10 1. COVID-19 Response Team, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA;
11 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: yds5@cdc.gov (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

25

26 **Abstract:**

27 **Background:** In November 2020, during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, Missouri allowed local
28 public health jurisdictions the option to implement a modified quarantine policy allowing
29 kindergarten through 12 (K-12) students with low-risk exposures to continue in-person learning.
30 We assessed adherence to quarantine among participants in modified quarantine and standard
31 home quarantine and the psychosocial impacts of quarantine on students and families.

32 **Methods:** In January-March 2021, as part of an investigation of in-school transmission of SARS-
33 CoV-2, parents of 586 participating K-12 students identified as a close contact with a person
34 with SARS-CoV-2 were sent a survey to assess their activities and psychosocial impacts to the
35 child and family.

36 **Results:** Among the 227 (39%) survey respondents, 26 (11%) participated in modified
37 quarantine and 201 (89%) participated in standard home quarantine. Forty-six percent of students
38 in modified quarantine and 72% of students in standard home quarantine reported abstaining
39 from non-school activities during quarantine. Parents of 17 (65%) students in modified
40 quarantine and 80 (40%) in standard home quarantine reported low or neutral levels of stress in
41 their children. Parents of students in standard home quarantine described greater stress, negative
42 impacts to family functioning, and interruptions to educational opportunities for students.

43 **Conclusions:** Students in modified quarantine reported lower adherence to quarantine
44 recommendations but lower daily impact and stressors than those in standard home quarantine.
45 Because in-school transmission of SARS-CoV-2 has been shown to be low when layered
46 prevention strategies are in place regardless of the use of modified or standard home quarantine,

47 this modified quarantine approach provides a reasonable option for balancing the needs of
48 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 Manuscript

52 **Background**

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

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) recommendations¹ (14) in existence at the time of the investigation except for
99 attending school in-person. Under a SQ policy², 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
106 transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in K-12 schools. CDC, Washington University in Saint Louis,
107 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**

124 Between January 25–March 21, 2021, parents or guardians of school-based student close
125 contacts were asked to participate in the overall investigation. In Greene County, school officials
126 in K-12 schools determined whether students met criteria for MQ based on contact tracing data
127 using the criteria detailed above. Starting on March 11, the parents or guardians of student close
128 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.

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

134

135 **Survey Questions**

136 The survey included 11 open- or close-ended questions in English. We collected
137 information from parents on student eligibility and decision making around MQ, psychosocial
138 effects of quarantine on the child and parent, and non-school activities conducted during
139 quarantine. Questions 1-7 were related to MQ and were asked only of parents of student close
140 contacts in Greene County (Table 1). Demographic characteristics of participants were collected
141 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

143

#	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 quarantine period?	Yes No	If yes to Q1	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

		<p>modified quarantine from a family member, friend, or healthcare professional</p> <p>Other</p> <p>Prefer not to say</p>		
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)	<p>Followed school’s recommendation</p> <p>Did not think your child continuing to attend school would put their health at any greater risk</p> <p>Did not think your child continuing to attend school would put any other family members health at greater risk</p> <p>Did not think your child continuing to attend school would affect the safety of the students/staff at school or in community</p> <p>Lack of availability of virtual learning if child was out of in-person learning</p> <p>Worried that staying home would harm your child’s mental health</p> <p>Challenges associated with virtual learning</p> <p>Lack of childcare options (e.g., parent/guardian or other family member</p>		Greene County

		<p>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</p>		
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?	<p>Much more stressful than usual</p> <p>Somewhat more stressful than usual</p> <p>Neither more nor less stressful than usual</p> <p>Somewhat less stressful than usual</p> <p>Much less stressful than usual</p> <p>Prefer not to say</p>		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)	<p>Interact in person with classmates who were also quarantined</p> <p>Interact in person with non-quarantined friends or classmates from their school</p> <p>Interact in person with non-quarantined friends not from their school</p> <p>Interact with family members who do not live in your household</p> <p>Go to a restaurant to dine in</p> <p>Attend events (e.g., church, parties, movies, entertainment, etc.)</p> <p>Enter stores or businesses (e.g., grocery shopping, shopping, takeout food, etc.)</p> <p>Go to work or volunteer</p> <p>Participate in afterschool or extracurricular activities (e.g., sports, band, dance, etc.)</p> <p>Travel outside of your city</p> <p>Cancel social events or choose not to participate in planned activities (e.g., church, parties, etc.)</p> <p>Leave home for reasons other than those mentioned above</p>		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

144

145

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**

158 The study team identified 586 student close contacts, 212 from Greene County and 374
159 from St. Louis County, that participated in the larger investigation and whose parents agreed to
160 receive emails. Among the 586 students, 227 (39%) responded to the survey; 62 of 212 (29%)
161 contacts from the group from Greene County and 165 of 374 (44%) from St. Louis County.
162 Demographic characteristics for the survey participants can be found in Table 2.
163
164
165
166
167
168

169

170

171 Table 2: Demographic characteristics of students in close contact with persons who tested
 172 positive for SARS-CoV-2

Student Characteristics	All, n(%)	Greene County Modified Quarantine, n(%)	Greene County Standard Quarantine, n(%)	St. Louis County Standard Quarantine, n(%)	Total Standard Quarantine, 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

174 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.

178

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**

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

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

207

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

Summary of reported activities conducted during the quarantine period	All, n(%)	Modified Quarantine, n(%)	Standard Quarantine, n(%)
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			
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)

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

211 a: Includes both interactions with students and other activities

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

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

218

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

224

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
247 isolation, anxiety, and frustration. Additionally, parents of students in SQ in St. Louis County

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

270

271

272 **Discussion**

273 Prior literature suggests that students in virtual learning and standard home quarantine
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.
276 This work aimed to explore parental reports of students' behaviors and attitudes of those in MQ
277 versus SQ being used by most of the schools around the country. We first explored the
278 acceptance of MQ as an alternative strategy to standard home quarantine. MQ was accepted by
279 most parent respondents of eligible students, but for some parents the decision may depend on
280 the type of exposure. There may have been additional participation in MQ if the quarantine
281 period had not coincided with school breaks and school cancellations due to weather, which was
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.
284 Some parents noted concerns regarding their child's health and concerns for safety for other
285 students and staff at school or in the community for those who were in MQ. MQ provides parents
286 the opportunity to decide whether keeping their child home during quarantine or allow them to
287 attend school is the best option for their family.

288

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

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

306
307 While prior studies reported high rates of stress amongst students (3,5,17), our work
308 explored the potential impact of MQ strategies on students' stress. Parents of students in SQ
309 reported higher frequencies of negative impacts on the family's day-to-day life and increased
310 stress of students in SQ when compared to those in MQ. Parents of students in MQ and SQ
311 described how the quarantine of students also affected both the child in terms of mental health
312 and education and caused disruptions to parents' daily routines, household dynamics, and work.
313 This work highlights the instances of stress, negative impact to family functioning, and
314 frustration with reduced educational opportunity for students that complement findings from
315 other interviews with children during the COVID pandemic (3).

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

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

335

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

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

355 **Conclusion:**

356 Findings suggest that the negative impacts of on an individual’s daily life and stress on
357 student close contacts and their families may occur less frequently in students in MQ than those
358 in SQ and that the MQ policy has been accepted by many parents in Greene County as an
359 alternative to SQ. Despite students in MQ having increased frequencies of participation in non-
360 school associated activities as compared to students in SQ, the risk of transmission of SARS-
361 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

370 **Acknowledgments**

371 All the students, families, educators, nurses, administrators, and staff members from participating
372 schools and school districts in Saint Louis and Springfield, Missouri; CDC COVID-19 Response
373 Team (Catherine Rasberry, Elizabeth Haller, Hailey Reid, Monica LaBelle, Neha Cramer); Saint
374 Louis University (Adrienne Beckett-Ansa, Allie Bodin, Ashley Gomel, Rachel Leimkuehler,
375 Elena Dalleo Locascio, Mary Beal, Rachel L. Mazzara, Riley Voss, Ruband Mahmood,
376 Samantha Hayes); Springfield-Greene County Health Department (Kathryn Wall, Brad Stulce,
377 Sean Barnhill); University of Missouri School of Medicine (Dr. David Haustein, Evan Garrad,
378 Hosea Covington, Tricia Haynes, Spencer Blake Price), and Washington University in St. Louis
379 (Alex Plattner, Cole Tipton, Ian T. Lackey, Jenna Rideout, Savannah Low, Suong Nguyen). We
380 thank the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services who funded this investigation.

381

382 **References:**

383

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

- 428 15. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Appendices [Internet]. 2021. Available from:
429 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/php/contact-tracing/contact-tracing->
430 [plan/appendix.html](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 17. Yard E, Radhakrishnan L, Ballesteros MF, Sheppard M, Gates A, Stein Z. Emergency Department
433 Visits for Suspected Suicide Attempts Among Persons Aged 12 – 25 Years Before and During the
434 COVID-19 Pandemic — United States , January 2019 – May 2021. *MMWR Morbidity and*
435 *Mortality Weekly Report*. 2021;70(May).
- 436 18. Russell BS, Hutchison M, Tambling R, Tomkunas AJ, Horton AL. Initial Challenges of
437 Caregiving During COVID-19: Caregiver Burden, Mental Health, and the Parent–Child
438 Relationship. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*. 2020;51(5).
- 439

440 **Supporting Information**

441 **S1 File. Limited Dataset**

442

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