

1 Full title: COVID-19 and the abrupt shift to remote learning:  
2 Impact on grades and perceived learning for undergraduate  
3 biology students

4  
5 Short title: Impact of COVID-19 on student learning

6

7 K. Supriya<sup>1\*</sup>, Chris Mead<sup>2\*</sup>, Ariel D. Anbar<sup>2</sup>, Joshua L. Caulkins<sup>3</sup>, James P. Collins<sup>3</sup>,  
8 Katelyn M. Cooper<sup>1</sup>, Paul C. LePore<sup>4</sup>, Tiffany Lewis<sup>3</sup>, Amy Pate<sup>3</sup>, Rachel A. Scott<sup>1</sup>, Sara  
9 E. Brownell<sup>1</sup>

10

11 <sup>1</sup> Research for Inclusive STEM Education Center, School of Life Sciences, Arizona State  
12 University

13 <sup>2</sup> Center for Education through Exploration, School of Earth and Space Exploration, Arizona  
14 State University

15 <sup>3</sup> School of Life Sciences, Arizona State University

16 <sup>4</sup> The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and T. Denny Sanford School of Social and Family  
17 Dynamics, Arizona State University

18

19 \*these authors contributed equally to this work

20

21 Corresponding Author: Sara E. Brownell ([Sara.Brownell@asu.edu](mailto:Sara.Brownell@asu.edu))

## 22 **Abstract**

23 Institutions across the world transitioned abruptly to remote learning in 2020 due to the COVID-  
24 19 pandemic. This rapid transition to remote learning has generally been predicted to negatively  
25 affect students, particularly those marginalized due to their race, socioeconomic class, or  
26 gender identity. In this study, we examined the impact of this transition in the Spring 2020  
27 semester on the grades of students enrolled in the in-person biology program at a large  
28 university in Southwestern United States as compared to the grades earned by students in the  
29 fully online biology program at the same institution. We also surveyed in-person instructors to  
30 understand changes in assessment practices as a result of the transition to remote learning  
31 during the pandemic. Finally, we surveyed students in the in-person program to learn about their  
32 perceptions of the impacts of this transition. We found that both online and in-person students  
33 received a similar small increase in grades in Spring 2020 compared to Spring 2018 and 2019.  
34 We also found no evidence of disproportionately negative impacts on grades received by  
35 students marginalized due to their race, socioeconomic class, or gender in either modality.  
36 Focusing on in-person courses, we documented that instructors made changes to their courses  
37 when they transitioned to remote learning, which may have offset some of the potential negative  
38 impacts on course grades. However, despite receiving higher grades, in-person students  
39 reported negative impacts on their learning, interactions with peers and instructors, feeling part  
40 of the campus community, and career preparation. Women reported a more negative impact on  
41 their learning and career preparation compared to men. This work provides insights into  
42 students' perceptions of how they were disadvantaged as a result of the transition to remote  
43 instruction and illuminates potential actions that instructors can take to create more inclusive  
44 education moving forward.

## 45 Introduction

46 In the early months of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic led to an unprecedented disruption of the  
47 normal mode of course instruction across most institutions of higher education. In the United  
48 States, most universities abruptly stopped conducting in-person classes and closed their  
49 campuses in March 2020 [1,2]. Mid-semester, many students and instructors were forced into  
50 learning and teaching remotely, respectively, for the first time due to the need for social  
51 distancing as a response to the pandemic [3,4]. Syllabi, teaching approaches, and assessments  
52 had to be modified to account for this altered mode of learning; most instructors only had one to  
53 two weeks to redesign their courses before remote instruction began. This abrupt shift to remote  
54 learning has been distinguished from online learning in general [5] and it is commonly assumed  
55 that this abrupt shift adversely affected student learning [6,7]. There are many factors directly  
56 associated with the shift to remote learning that could have affected student learning [5,7],  
57 which are in addition to the stress experienced by students in other aspects of their lives  
58 affected by the pandemic (e.g., health, employment, isolation, issues of inequality).

59  
60 The pandemic affected people across various social identities such as age, nationality,  
61 racial/ethnic background, LGBTQ+ status, and socio-economic status. Despite being termed as  
62 “the great equalizer” by politicians like New York’s Governor Andrew Cuomo and celebrities  
63 such as Madonna [8,9], it had differential impacts on people along the lines of power and  
64 privilege in our society due to various systems of oppression including, but not limited to,  
65 racism, classism, sexism, and ableism [9–13]. In the United States, case and death rates have  
66 been higher among Black, Hispanic/Latinx, and Native American people than white people [14–  
67 16]. COVID-19 infections and deaths were also higher for people living in areas with higher  
68 poverty levels compared to areas with little or no poverty [17,18]. Further, these more vulnerable  
69 communities experienced more negative financial impacts such as job losses or reduced

70 working hours due to the economic shutdowns [19]. Moreover, some studies have reported  
71 more negative mental health impacts of the pandemic on women, Hispanic, and Asian people  
72 [20], and on people living in lower-income households [21]. When considering the educational  
73 impact of this crisis, it is important to ask if these differential medical and financial impacts  
74 contributed to more negative educational consequences for students with marginalized social  
75 identities.

76

77 In addition to health and financial impacts, several other factors may have differentially  
78 exacerbated the negative effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on student learning in Spring 2020.  
79 Losing access to student housing and meal plans contributed to housing and food insecurities  
80 for many students, including low-income students and international students [22,23], and  
81 heightened housing and food insecurities impacted off-campus students as well [24]. Moreover,  
82 poor internet connection and lack of a quiet or safe space to study made it more difficult for  
83 students to complete their assignments and succeed during remote instruction [25–28]. For  
84 example, one recent study of college students in introductory sociology courses showed that  
85 more than 50% of all students experienced occasional internet problems during remote learning  
86 in Spring 2020 [29]. In the same study, about 90% of the students reported distractions in their  
87 new workspace and about 65% of the students reported the lack of a dedicated workspace [29].  
88 While these issues negatively affect all students, students from low-income families are  
89 disproportionately impacted by poor internet connections or distracting environments. Another  
90 factor that likely affected remote learning in Spring 2020 is additional caregiving responsibilities  
91 necessitated by remote learning in K-12 schools and greater health risks for older family  
92 members [30]. These additional responsibilities would reduce time for coursework and could  
93 affect academic outcomes. Likely due to societal gender roles that assume women take on  
94 primary caregiving, these responsibilities are reported to have disproportionately affected  
95 women [30–32]. The privilege of staying at home or having safe working conditions to reduce

96 the risk of exposure to COVID-19 has also been shaped by axes of power in our society [33–  
97 35]. Needing to work jobs that require frequent interaction with others at places such as grocery  
98 stores and pharmacies is yet another element influencing student learning during the pandemic,  
99 especially for Black, Hispanic/Latinx, immigrant students, and those from low-income  
100 households [36]. Working such jobs could increase students' risk of exposure to the virus and  
101 may cause greater anxiety in their daily lives [37,38]. All these factors are likely to differentially  
102 affect students depending on their locations along the various axes of power and privilege.

103

104 A limited number of studies have examined the educational impact of the pandemic on students.  
105 Several publications have reported that students were less engaged [39] and struggled with  
106 their motivation to study after the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 [25,29,40,41].  
107 One study on public health students at Georgia State University did not report lower motivation  
108 among students [42], perhaps because of the heightened awareness of the relevance of public  
109 health during a global pandemic. It has also been demonstrated that the transition to remote  
110 learning had a negative impact on student relationship-building, specifically the extent to which  
111 students interact with each other in and out of class [25,43], and on students' sense of  
112 belonging in the class [25]. In response to the pandemic, several universities changed course  
113 policies to extend the deadline for course withdrawals or to allow greater access to pass/fail  
114 grading options [44]. Villanueva and colleagues [28] found higher course withdrawal rates  
115 among general chemistry undergraduates after students were offered an extended deadline for  
116 withdrawing from the course. Despite these negative student experiences, some studies have  
117 reported small increases in student grades in Spring 2020 compared to similar courses in  
118 previous years [45–47].

119

120 There is some evidence for differential impacts of the transition to remote learning for students  
121 with different social identities. For example, a report based on survey data from 600

122 undergraduates in STEM courses across the US showed that women, Hispanic students, and  
123 students from low-income households experienced major challenges to continuing with remote  
124 learning more often than men, white students, and students from middle- or high-income  
125 households, respectively [25]. Another survey study found that the likelihood of lower-income  
126 students delaying graduation because of COVID-19 was 55% higher than higher-income  
127 students [48]. Additionally, Gillis and Krull [29] reported that women experienced challenges  
128 such as lack of a dedicated workspace more often than men, while non-white students  
129 experienced anxiety over personal finances and access to medical care more often than white  
130 students.

131

132 In contrast to students in in-person degree programs whose mode of learning changed  
133 drastically, the crisis did not fundamentally change the mode of learning for students who were  
134 already enrolled in fully online degree programs. Although other aspects of the lives of online  
135 students were still affected by the pandemic, online learning was not new to them or their  
136 instructors, courses did not need to be modified halfway through the term, and students  
137 expected to complete all coursework remotely when they signed up for the course. Therefore,  
138 comparing the impact of the pandemic on the grades of online and in-person students might  
139 allow us to tease apart the influence of the rapid transition to online learning from the stress of  
140 living through a global pandemic. One prediction would be that online students would  
141 experience less of a negative impact on learning due to the pandemic compared to their in-  
142 person counterparts because their educational modality did not change. An alternative  
143 prediction is that the differences in the student populations online and in-person, specifically the  
144 higher percentage of individuals in the online program who hold one or more marginalized social  
145 identities and may be more vulnerable to the negative effects of the pandemic outside the class,  
146 would lead to greater negative impacts for online students as a result of the COVID-19  
147 pandemic. Specifically, we know that the percentage of women, older students, students who

148 are primary caregivers, and students from low-income households are consistently higher in  
149 online programs compared to in-person programs [49–51]. These are groups that have been  
150 unequally disadvantaged during the pandemic in general. Therefore, it is important to control for  
151 demographic variables when comparing the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on grades  
152 between students in online and in-person degree programs.

153

## 154 **Current Study**

155 The biology program at Arizona State University (ASU) offers a unique opportunity to examine  
156 the impact of the emergency transition to remote learning on undergraduates. First, ASU offers  
157 equivalent in-person and fully online biology degree programs that have aligned curricula. This  
158 allows for comparison of the experiences of students in an in-person program transitioned to  
159 remote learning, to the experiences of students enrolled in an online program prior to the  
160 COVID-19 pandemic. In this study, following the recommendation from Hodges et al. [5] we use  
161 the term “remote” to refer to in-person courses that transitioned abruptly to online instruction,  
162 while using the term “online” for courses that were designed to be online from the beginning.  
163 One important difference between the online and in-person programs after the transition to  
164 remote learning in Spring 2020 was that courses in the online program were fully asynchronous.  
165 In contrast, the courses in the in-person program were generally taught synchronously using  
166 web conferencing (e.g., Zoom) for lectures and typical in-class activities.

167

168 Second, ASU has a large, diverse population of students that allows for the examination of the  
169 extent to which the transition affected students with different social identities. Science,  
170 technology, engineering, and math (STEM) disciplines, such as biology, have long been  
171 exclusionary spaces dominated by relatively wealthy white men [52–54]. Underrepresentation of  
172 women, people of color, people with disabilities, and people with low socioeconomic status is

173 well documented in the sciences [55]. Therefore, it is important to examine the impact of the  
174 transition to remote learning on STEM students with social identities historically  
175 underrepresented in the sciences, for which ASU's biology program provides a suitable context.

176

177 This study uses course grades during the Spring 2020, Spring 2019, and Spring 2018  
178 semesters and survey data from instructors and students about the Spring 2020 semester to  
179 examine the impacts of the abrupt transition to remote learning due to COVID-19 during the  
180 Spring 2020 semester.

181

182 Specifically, our research questions were:

183

184 1. Did the abrupt transition to remote learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic affect grades for  
185 undergraduate students in an in-person biology program during the Spring 2020 semester? Was  
186 this effect on grades different from that found in the equivalent online biology program during  
187 Spring 2020? To what extent did the abrupt transition to remote learning disproportionately  
188 affect students with identities historically underrepresented in STEM?

189

190 2. What changes did in-person biology instructors make to their assessment practices after the  
191 abrupt transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 and to what extent do these explain any  
192 differences in student grades observed?

193

194 3. To what extent do in-person biology students perceive that their learning, interactions with  
195 peers and instructors, career preparation, interest in science, and feeling a part of the biology  
196 community were affected because of the abrupt transition to remote learning? To what extent  
197 did the abrupt transition to remote learning disproportionately affect these perceptions for  
198 students with identities historically underrepresented in STEM?



## 199 **Positionality of the authors**

200 We acknowledge that our own identities influence the research questions that we ask and how  
201 we may interpret the data. Our author team includes individuals who identify as men, women,  
202 white, South Asian, Jewish, first-generation college-goers, first-generation immigrants, and  
203 members of the LGBTQ+ community; members of our team grew up in middle class families in  
204 the United States, except KS who grew up in India. All the authors are committed to diversity,  
205 equity and inclusion in the sciences and conduct education research focused on equity. This  
206 paper was motivated by our concerns regarding social inequities and how they are perpetuated  
207 and, in some cases, amplified in undergraduate science classrooms.

## 208 **Methods and Results**

209 **Research Question 1: Assessing the impact of the abrupt**  
210 **transition to remote learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic**  
211 **on grades for undergraduate students in an in-person**  
212 **biology program compared to an online biology program.**

213

### 214 **Research Question 1, Methods**

215 To study the impact on student course grades that resulted from the shift to remote learning  
216 during the COVID-19-impacted Spring 2020 semester, we obtained course grades from the  
217 university registrar for Spring 2020 and compared these grades to two spring semesters prior to  
218 the pandemic: Spring 2019 and Spring 2018. The population of interest is undergraduate  
219 biology majors enrolled in either the in-person biology degree program or the fully online biology

220 degree program. Therefore, we obtained course grades for 42 STEM courses that are  
221 commonly taken by students in these biology majors, including general biology courses,  
222 biochemistry, chemistry, physics, mathematics, and statistics. See Table S1 for the full list of  
223 courses.

224

225 Our grades analysis included a total of 25,100 student-course enrollments, with 8,323 from the  
226 Spring 2020 pandemic semester and the remainder from Spring 2018 or 2019. Of these, 19,181  
227 course enrollments were in-person courses and the remaining 5,919 were online degree  
228 program courses. Course grades were analyzed on a 0–4.33 scale (A+ = 4.33, A = 4.0, A- =  
229 3.66,..., E = 0). Grades other than A–E were excluded from analysis; this was a total of 2,404  
230 student-course enrollments, or 9.6% of the total dataset. In Spring 2018 and 2019, these  
231 excluded grades are almost exclusively W or “withdraw” grades. In response to the unique  
232 circumstances of the pandemic, some instructors assigned the “Y” grade which indicates  
233 “Satisfactory” work at a level of C or higher. In Spring 2020, about a third of the non-letter  
234 grades were Y grades. The combined proportion of non-letter grades held steady in Spring 2020  
235 compared to 2018 and 2019 in online courses and increased slightly in Spring 2020 for in-  
236 person courses. The withdrawal percentage declined, and the Y percentage rose both online  
237 and in-person. We cannot say definitively how many of the students who received a Y grade  
238 would have chosen to withdraw if this option had not been available. The decision to remove  
239 these grades from analysis is consistent with prior studies [51,56]. To control for prior academic  
240 performance, we use “GPAO,” which refers to a student’s grade point average in other courses,  
241 including both STEM and non-STEM courses [56,57].

242

243 We obtained student demographic information from the registrar in addition to course grades  
244 (summarized in Table 1). The categories of interest for this study are gender, race/ethnicity, and  
245 two proxies for socioeconomic status (college generation status and federal Pell grant eligibility).

246 The transition away from an in-person lecture and having to adapt to a large change mid-  
247 semester could also have negatively affected the learning of students with disabilities [7] as  
248 changing learning environments have presented novel challenges for deaf and hard of hearing  
249 students [58] and students with disabilities more broadly [7]. However, because we are using  
250 institutional data in these analyses and data on disabilities is protected by federal law, we were  
251 not able to examine the impact of the transition on students with disabilities in this study, nor  
252 were we able to explore other identities not routinely collected by the university registrar.  
253

254 **Table 1. Demographics for students in the in-person and online course grades data set.**

255 Pell eligibility and college generation status are included as proxies for socioeconomic status.

256 BLNP refers to Black, Latinx, Native American, and Pacific Islanders.

257

	In-Person Students	Online Students
Characteristic	N = 4,671 <sup>1</sup>	N = 2,586 <sup>1</sup>
Gender		
Man	1,652 (35%)	675 (26%)
Woman	3,019 (65%)	1,910 (74%)
Other	0 (0%)	1 (<0.1%)
BLNP		
N	3,058 (65%)	1,662 (64%)
Y	1,613 (35%)	924 (36%)
Race/Ethnicity		
White	2,242 (48%)	1,431 (55%)
Asian	625 (13%)	128 (4.9%)
Black	245 (5.2%)	224 (8.7%)

	In-Person Students	Online Students
Characteristic	N = 4,671 <sup>1</sup>	N = 2,586 <sup>1</sup>
Hispanic	1,168 (25%)	547 (21%)
Native	65 (1.4%)	39 (1.5%)
Two or more races	273 (5.8%)	159 (6.1%)
Decline to state	53 (1.1%)	58 (2.2%)
Pell Eligible		
N	2,689 (58%)	1,079 (42%)
Y	1,982 (42%)	1,507 (58%)
College Generation Status		
Continuing Generation	3,169 (68%)	1,458 (56%)
First Generation	1,502 (32%)	1,128 (44%)

<sup>1</sup>n (%)

258

259 To determine the direction and significance of the effect of the shift to remote learning on  
260 student grades, we performed a linear mixed-effects regression on the numerical course  
261 grades. The fixed effects in the model included a dummy variable for the Spring 2020 (“COVID-  
262 19”) semester, whether the student was enrolled in the in-person or online degree program, an  
263 interaction between these two variables, and the GPAO term. We included random effect terms  
264 for course section and student. These terms provided modest improvement to the models with a  
265 combined intraclass correlation coefficient equal to 0.256.

266

267 To determine the direction and significance of the effect of the shift to remote learning on grades  
268 received by students with identities historically underrepresented in STEM, we added interaction  
269 terms between the dummy variable for the Spring 2020 (“COVID-19”) semester and each of the  
270 demographic terms to the model described above. We again controlled for GPAO and included

271 random effect terms for course section and student in this model (see Table S2 for model  
272 specifications).

273

## 274 **Research Question 1, Results**

275 Overall, our linear mixed effects regression results show that the Spring 2020 semester was  
276 associated with a positive grade shift of 0.41 grade units. Students earned higher grades in  
277 Spring 2020 courses compared to students enrolled in those courses in Spring 2019 and Spring  
278 2018. Results also show that this Spring 2020 grade effect was not significantly different  
279 between the online and in-person programs (Table 2). The online program is also associated  
280 with lower course grades overall, which is consistent with our prior work [51].

281

282 **Table 2. Linear mixed effects regression results showing Spring 2020 (“COVID-19”) effect**  
283 **and its interaction with instruction mode.**

Variable	Beta	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value
(Intercept)	0.12	0.05, 0.20	0.002
GPAO	0.89	0.87, 0.91	<0.001
Spring 2020	0.41	0.36, 0.46	<0.001
Campus			
In-Person	—	—	
Online	-0.27	-0.38, -0.15	<0.001
Spring 2020 * Campus			
Spring 2020 * Online	-0.11	-0.33, 0.11	0.3

<sup>1</sup>CI = Confidence Interval

284

285 Our regression model testing for the presence of negative interaction effects between  
286 demographic groups and the Spring 2020 semester showed no significant negative interactions

287 for any of the demographic variables that we examined, including gender, race/ethnicity, and  
288 socioeconomic status (Table S3). Contrary to our prediction, the model shows positive, but  
289 mostly non-significant, interaction effects for all groups compared to their historically  
290 overrepresented counterparts. The two statistically significant interactions showed women to  
291 have a Spring 2020 effect 0.05 greater than men and Pell-eligible students to have an effect  
292 0.08 greater than non-Pell-eligible students.

293 **Research Question 2: Understanding biology instructor**  
294 **changes to assessment practices in the Spring 2020**  
295 **semester when they transitioned to remote learning and their**  
296 **effects on differences in student grades.**

297

298 **Research Question 2, Methods**

299 To better understand why the COVID-19 pandemic did not negatively affect course grades in  
300 the Spring 2020 semester for students who had to transition to remote learning, we sought to  
301 understand what steps in-person biology instructors took to ensure that their students could  
302 achieve the course goals after the abrupt transition to remote learning. To explore this, we  
303 created a survey with several open-ended questions regarding changes in instructional  
304 practices, such as modes of interaction with students and assessments used after the transition  
305 to remote learning (a copy of the survey questions analyzed is provided in the Supplemental  
306 Materials). Of the 132 biology instructors recruited to participate, 27 instructors responded to the  
307 survey (20% response rate). Faculty members were recruited first via email, and verbally

308 encouraged to participate at several follow-up virtual events attended by many of those in the  
309 recruitment group.

310

311 Building on the open-ended responses from the first instructor survey, we created a second  
312 survey that asked in more detail about instructional changes in response to the pandemic. To  
313 assess cognitive validity, we conducted two think-aloud interviews with biology faculty members  
314 who taught in person during Spring 2020 and had to transition to remote learning [59]. These  
315 think-aloud interviews indicated that the instructors understood the questions. We then  
316 distributed this revised survey to all biology instructors who taught in-person courses in Spring  
317 2020 (n=132). In the event that they taught multiple courses, the survey asked them to respond  
318 based on their largest course size. The survey first asked instructors to identify any changes  
319 they made in their course. This question used a multiple-selection format with a) 24 options  
320 provided, b) an option to say that no changes were made, and c) an option to describe other  
321 changes not listed. The survey also asked instructors to report the extent to which they tried to  
322 reduce cheating in their course, the extent to which they made their course more flexible, and  
323 the extent to which they made their course easier. Each of these questions was answered using  
324 a six-point Likert scale from strong agreement to strong disagreement with no neutral option and  
325 they were asked to explain each answer (a copy of the survey questions analyzed is provided in  
326 the Supplemental Materials). While instructors also experienced many of the same personal  
327 challenges resulting from the pandemic that students did, our focus was on the student  
328 experience and therefore we only asked instructors about instructional changes.

329

330 A total of 43 out of the 132 biology instructors who were contacted completed the second survey  
331 (33% response rate) based on their experiences teaching an in-person biology course that  
332 shifted to fully remote instruction in the Spring 2020 semester. Of these, 18 had taught an in-  
333 person course that transitioned during Spring 2020 with at least 100 students. Our analysis will

334 focus on these large courses because these instructors are subject to greater practical  
335 constraints when considering how to shift instruction to remote learning and because the larger  
336 sizes mean that a greater number of students in total are impacted by these decisions.

337

338 To understand the extent to which changes in assessment practices made by instructors might  
339 explain differences in student grades in Spring 2020 compared to previous semesters, we  
340 examined data from 10 instructors who responded to our survey who had taught the same  
341 course in Spring 2020 and either Spring 2019 or 2018. We performed course-level linear  
342 regressions on the relative grade difference using the following variables as predictors: total  
343 number of changes made, use of lockdown browsers for exams, whether they made efforts to  
344 reduce cheating, and whether they worked to make the course easier. All variables were  
345 dichotomous except number of changes made. The question about making the course more  
346 flexible was not included because all ten of the instructors who had taught the same course in  
347 Spring 2020 and Spring 2019 or 2018 agreed with this question.

348

## 349 **Research Question 2, Results**

350 Overall, most instructors reported making changes to their in-person courses when they needed  
351 to transition to remote learning during the COVID-19 pandemic, including being more flexible  
352 and making the course easier (Table 3). Focusing on the large courses, about 60% of  
353 instructors agreed that they took steps to reduce cheating. Nearly all large course instructors  
354 (94%) agreed that they made changes to be more flexible to help students who were  
355 experiencing challenges and most (78%) agreed that they made it easier for students to do well.

356

357 **Table 3. Summary of in-person instructor survey responses about the changes they**  
358 **made to their course after the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020.**



Survey Item	Large Class Instructors N = 18 <sup>1</sup>	Small Class Instructors N = 25 <sup>1</sup>	All Instructors N = 43 <sup>1</sup>
Made more flexible	94%	84%	88%
Made easier	78%	56%	65%
Tried to reduce cheating	61%	32%	44%
Number of changes selected	4.7 (3.2)	3.1 (3.5)	3.8 (3.4)
Zero changes selected	5.6%	24%	16%

<sup>1</sup>%; Mean (SD)

359

360 Instructors were also asked to select the changes they made to their largest in-person course  
 361 that had to transition to remote learning in that semester from a list of 24 options (Table 4, See  
 362 Supplemental Table 4 for the full set of options). On average, instructors of large courses  
 363 selected about five changes. The most frequently selected changes were generally related to  
 364 time and deadline extensions as well as conducting open-book exams. Changing the weighting  
 365 or number of exams or changing the difficulty of questions on quizzes or exams were less  
 366 commonly selected. Thirteen respondents added open-ended comments in addition to the  
 367 provided choices. Five of these related to changes needed to replace planned fieldwork or labs.  
 368 The remainder detailed specific content-related adjustments or discussed changes to increase  
 369 instructor availability to students.

370 **Table 4. Frequencies of selection of fixed choice options for course changes by in-**  
 371 **person instructors after the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020.** This table only  
 372 shows options chosen by  $\geq 25\%$  of respondents; for full results, see Table S4).

Response Option	Frequency N = 43
-----------------	---------------------

Gave individual students extensions on deadlines for out-of-class assignments that I wouldn't have normally provided	37%
Extended the deadline or allotted more time than I usually provide to complete out-of-class assignments	33%
Increased the amount of time students were allotted to complete a quiz or exam	33%
Gave students more opportunities to miss class and not lose participation/attendance points but still gave participation/attendance points for class	26%
Reduced or eliminated penalties for out-of-class assignments that were submitted late	26%
Changed assessments such as exams or quizzes from closed-book to open-book	26%
<hr/>	
In addition to delivering my content online I made a significant change to my course that is not reflected above	30%

373

374 Within our subset of surveyed instructors who had taught the same class in Spring 2020 and  
375 one of the prior Spring terms, our linear regression showed that none of the instructional  
376 changes in assessment practices were significant predictors of the difference in grades received  
377 by the analyzed students in Spring 2020 compared to previous two Spring semesters. Greater  
378 instructor flexibility could be associated with the increase in grades across all courses, but we  
379 were not able to test this relationship because all ten of the instructors in this subset reported  
380 increasing flexibility in their courses.

381

382 **Research Question #3: Understanding the impact of the**  
383 **abrupt transition to remote learning due to COVID-19 on**  
384 **biology student perceptions of learning, interactions with**

385 **peers and instructors, career preparation, interest in science**  
386 **and feeling a part of the biology community.**

387

### 388 **Research Question 3, Methods**

389 Although the transition to remote learning for students who were in the in-person biology degree  
390 program in Spring 2020 did not have adverse effects on their grades, likely in part because  
391 instructors made changes to their courses, we wanted to explore student perceptions of learning  
392 during Spring 2020. To do so, we surveyed students during Fall 2020 to ask specifically about  
393 their experiences during the Spring 2020 semester when their in-person courses rapidly  
394 transitioned to remote learning.

395

#### 396 **Student survey development**

397 To assess the perceptions of biology majors who experienced the rapid transition from in-  
398 person to remote instruction in Spring 2020, we developed a survey that contained both closed-  
399 ended and open-ended questions. We asked students to think about the largest biology course  
400 they took in the Spring 2020 semester to answer the survey questions that were course-specific,  
401 (i.e., impact on grades, impact on learning, and perceived instructional changes). For the rest of  
402 the survey questions, students were asked to think about all the in-person biology courses they  
403 took in Spring 2020. To assess cognitive validity of survey items, we conducted six think-aloud  
404 interviews with undergraduate students and iteratively revised survey items until no further  
405 changes were suggested [59]. The final survey contained questions about the perceived impact  
406 of the rapid transition to remote learning on student learning, grades, interest in their biology  
407 major, interest in learning about scientific topics, feeling a part of the biology community at the  
408 university, and career preparation. Each question was answered using a seven-point scale from

409 “strong negative impact” to “strong positive impact.” In addition, we asked about the impact of  
410 the transition on the amount of time spent interacting with instructors and other students, and  
411 the amount of spent time studying. These items were also answered using a seven-point scale  
412 ranging from “greatly decreased” to “greatly increased.” During our think-aloud interviews with  
413 undergraduate students, the necessity of a “neutral” option for these survey items was brought  
414 up by multiple students. Therefore, we used a seven-point scale for these items instead of the  
415 six-point scale used in our instructor survey. We also asked students about perceived  
416 instructional changes to the course in terms of measures to prevent cheating, increase flexibility,  
417 and make the course easier. These were on a six-point scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly  
418 disagree” with no neutral option for consistency with the instructor survey (see Supplemental  
419 Materials for the analyzed survey questions).

420

421 We included some demographic questions at the end of the survey so we could test for any  
422 differential effects on student experience by social identities, specifically gender, race/ethnicity,  
423 college generation status and eligibility for federal Pell grants. For race/ethnicity, we asked  
424 students two questions: whether they identified as Hispanic/Latinx and whether they identified  
425 as Black/African American, Native American/Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.  
426 Students that selected “yes” to either of these questions were grouped together as BLNP for our  
427 analyses. We grouped students in this manner because all these groups are historically  
428 underrepresented in the sciences and our sample sizes for the student survey were not large  
429 enough to allow us to disaggregate race/ethnicity data.

430

### 431 **Student survey distribution**

432 In Fall 2020, we used a convenience sampling approach to recruit eight biology instructors who  
433 agreed to distribute our survey to students in their classes. The survey was sent to a total of  
434 1,540 students in these eight courses and students were offered a small amount of extra credit

435 for completing the survey. A total of 798 students completed the survey, resulting in a response  
436 rate of 51.8%. However, only 601 of these students were enrolled in the in-person biology  
437 degree program in Spring 2020. Of these students, 70 reported that they did not take any  
438 biology courses in Spring 2020, so they were not included in any course-specific analyses. After  
439 removing these students and removing 21 students with missing data, we were left with  
440 responses from 510 students who had taken in-person biology courses that had transitioned to  
441 remote learning in Spring 2020 that we used for our analyses (Table 5). Students were asked to  
442 think about the largest in-person biology course they took in Spring 2020 for the survey. This  
443 gave us data about student experiences in 25 Spring 2020 courses, although for 13 of these  
444 Spring 2020 courses, we had fewer than 10 respondents.

445

446 **Table 5. Demographics for student survey respondents.** Three of the women among the  
447 survey respondents also identified as non-binary. One of the men also identified as non-binary  
448 and as transgender. BLNP refers to Black, Latinx, Native American, and Pacific Islanders. Pell  
449 eligibility and college generation status are included as proxies for socioeconomic status.

450

	Student survey respondents
Characteristic	N = 510 <sup>1</sup>
Gender	
Man	165 (32%)
Woman	345 (68%)
Other	0 (0%)
BLNP	
N	358 (70%)
Y	152 (30%)

	Student survey respondents
Race/Ethnicity	
Asian	98 (19%)
Black	17 (3.3%)
Hispanic	108 (21%)
Native	6 (1.2%)
Two or more races	38 (7.5%)
White	219 (43%)
Decline to state	24 (4.7%)
Pell Eligible	
N	336 (66%)
Y	174 (34%)
College Generation Status	
Continuing Generation	357 (70%)
First Generation	153 (30%)

<sup>1</sup>n (%)

451

## 452 **Student survey analyses**

453 We calculated the total percentage of students that reported negative impacts on their learning,  
454 amount of time studying and interacting with peers and instructors, career preparation, interest  
455 in science and feeling a part of the biology community. To analyze the open-ended data, we  
456 used open-ended coding methods to identify themes that emerged from student responses [60].  
457 We used constant comparison methods to develop the coding scheme; student responses were  
458 assigned to a category and were compared to ensure that the description of the category was  
459 representative of that response and not different enough to require a different category. Inter-

460 rater reliability was established by having two coders (S.E.B. and R.A.S.) analyze 20% of the  
461 data, after which one person coded the rest of the data. For student perceptions of the positive  
462 impact of the transition to remote instruction on learning codes: Two raters compared their  
463 codes and their inter-rater reliability was at an acceptable level ( $k = 0.88$ ). For student  
464 perceptions of the negative impact of the transition to remote instruction on learning codes: Two  
465 raters compared their codes and their inter-rater reliability was at an acceptable level ( $k = 0.88$ ).  
466 We report out any code that at least 10 students mentioned.

467

468 For eight of the Spring 2020 courses in our dataset, we had data from both the instructor and  
469 more than 10 students for each course. For these courses, we assessed if student responses to  
470 perceived instructional changes to the course aligned with the instructional changes as reported  
471 by the instructors. We analyzed the strength of this relationship through Pearson product-  
472 moment correlations between the percent of students agreeing with each statement and the  
473 strength of the instructor's agreement using a Likert scale.

474

475 To examine demographic differences in the perceived impact on students, we used ordinal  
476 mixed model regressions with the Likert scale option chosen by students as the outcome and  
477 gender, race/ethnicity, Pell-eligibility, and first-generation to college status as predictors. We  
478 used course section as a random effect with varying intercepts in all the models to account for  
479 the nested nature of our data. We used the R regression package *ordinal* [61] for these  
480 analyses.

481

### 482 **Research Question 3, Results**

483 About 56% of students reported that they think the transition to remote learning negatively  
484 impacted their grade, even though our grade analysis did not indicate that this was likely.

485 However, almost 70% of students said that transition to remote learning negatively impacted  
486 their learning in the same course (Fig 1). We analyzed the reasons why students felt that the  
487 transition to remote instruction either positively or negatively affected their learning (Tables 6  
488 and 7). For the 30% of students who thought that it positively impacted their learning, they said  
489 it did so because lectures were recorded so they could review them or see more of them  
490 (18.3%), they felt as though they could learn at their own pace (15.0%), they felt like remote  
491 learning allowed them to engage with the material in a more active learning way (11.7%), or  
492 they felt more comfortable learning at home as opposed to in a large classroom (8.3%). There  
493 was also a subset of students who felt as though they had more time in general during the  
494 pandemic, which allowed them to focus more on studying (16.7%). For the 70% of students who  
495 reported that the pandemic negatively impacted their learning, 27.2% of students reported that  
496 they felt as though they understood less and remembered less during remote instruction (Table  
497 7). Students also reported a loss of concentration or focus (26.6), fewer opportunities to interact  
498 with others and ask questions (17.0%), and having less motivation or interest (9.9%). Less  
499 common responses included: feeling overwhelmed by greater amounts of work after the  
500 transition to remote learning (5.9%), lack of hands-on learning, particularly in lab courses  
501 (4.0%), general stress associated with the pandemic that increased distractions outside of  
502 coursework (3.7%), procrastination and less accountability (3.1%), and technical issues (2.8%).

503

504 **Fig 1. Percentage of students who reported a negative impact or reported a decrease in**  
505 **the time spent on various activities during Spring 2020 along with ordinal regression**  
506 **results on demographic differences.** BLNP refers to Black, Latinx, Native American, and  
507 Pacific Islanders. Pell eligibility and college generation status were included as proxies for  
508 socioeconomic status. The reference groups for the regression analyses were: men, non-BLNP  
509 students, continuing-generation students and students that were not eligible for Pell grants.

510



511 **Table 6. Positive impacts of the transition to remote learning on student learning**  
 512 **experiences.**  
 513

Category	Description	Percent n=60	Example quotes		
Lectures were recorded	Students indicated that they could go back and review the lectures if they needed and they missed fewer classes because they had the recordings.	18.3%	“Recorded lectures greatly helped me understand the content taught.”	“Since all lectures from the point of the transition were moved to Zoom, the fact that things were recorded allowed the possibility for me to go back to the recording and stop at points that I needed in order to take notes on certain slides to further my understanding of the topics in case I missed a couple words or explanations through the fast explanations.”	“Lectures were recorded and posted online, allowing for the opportunity to review material.”
Had more time in general	Students indicated that the pandemic allowed them to have more time to dedicate to coursework and the online nature of courses gave them more time to study.	16.7%	“I had more time to stay home and actually teach myself the material “	“I do feel like I have more time to really understand the material.”	“I had more time to study in quarantine.”
Learn at own pace	Students could decide when to engage with the material and had autonomy over the pace.	15.0%	“Allowed me to learn at my own pace.”	“I could watch lectures on my own time throughout the week.”	“I liked being able to watch the lecture videos all at once.”
Engaged with	Students indicated that they engaged in	11.7%	“The instructor posted additional	“I use some of the PowerPoints to	“Because of the online format,

material in more of an active learning way	the material before the lecture, they taught themselves more, and they had the opportunity to engage with other students in active learning online.		lecture videos for students so we were familiar with the material before the actual Zoom lectures.”	answer practice questions and improve my understanding more independently.”	we're able to do small group discussions of papers in breakout rooms. That helps [me] to understand more complex material.”
Felt more comfortable learning at home and not in a classroom	Students indicated that they felt they learned better by being at home or not in a large classroom.	8.3%	“Being able to study in my own space comfortably helped me learn a little bit better.”	“Not being in lecture with other people distracting me allowed me to take better notes.”	“I felt more comfortable with online learning than having a large in-person classroom; there is something different about the ambient and inclusivity about digital learning.”

514

515 **Table 7. Negative impacts of the transition to remote learning on student learning**

516 **experiences.**

517

Category	Description	Percent n=353	Example quotes		
Less understanding/ comprehension/ retention	Students mentioned that online learning or video lectures were generally difficult to comprehend. Students indicated that the online format made them feel like they focused more on memorization and less on understanding or that they felt as though they retained and	27.2%	“It felt like I went from going to class and understanding the material to just memorizing to get assignments done. This is especially true for the lab portion of the class.”	“Did not comprehend and retain as much information as I could have in person.”	“Because everything was more for completion, I focused on getting the assignments answered rather than understanding material. I cannot remember any material from that course.”

	remembered less. They felt like they studied less because of open-note exams and were just trying to pass.				
Loss of focus/ concentration	Students felt as though they could not focus or concentrate as well online, and often cited more distractions.	24.6%	“The online teaching didn't click as well with me and I felt it was difficult to focus online because of the distractions that are not present in a classroom, but are present at home.”	“I found it more difficult to focus on the coursework compared to when I had my biology lecture in-person.”	“I found it more difficult to focus over Zoom.”
Fewer interactions/ opportunities to get help	Students indicated that online was anti-social, less personal, and they interacted less frequently with other students and the instructor. Specifically, they were not able to clarify their thinking, ask questions of students or instructors, and felt like they were on their own.	17.0%	“Not being in person to ask questions felt a little limiting. When going on campus I was also able to ask classmates questions before and after class.”	“It was harder to learn the material without being able to engage with the teacher. She did most of her lectures as pre-recorded ones.”	“For all my biology courses, it would have been better to have an in-person class where I could ask my friend beside me to explain small things or even the TA's who were walking around.”
Students had less motivation/ interest/effort	Students indicated that online they had less motivation, less interest in the topics online, and put in less effort. Students discussed a lack of connection with	9.9%	“It was more difficult to engage and interact with the material so I was less interested in actually learning it.”	“The feeling of determination and want to learn slipped for some reason for myself personally and I just slid by in the course instead of actually trying to learn the material.”	“It's incredibly hard to absorb information from a digital perspective, think about it, we (students) watch tons of videos online in our free time, watching an online lecture is like watching a super boring

	or engagement in the material.				YouTube video. I think professors need to think of ways to make things more engaging!"
Overwhelmed by work/ increased work	Students felt as though online learning increased the total amount of work in the course, increased the pace of the course, and/or the course felt rushed.	5.9%	"I felt the class was sped through [because] it moved online and it was all rushed and I didn't feel like I was retaining anything."	"I felt like we were being forced to do more work for not having to attend in person."	"I felt as though I couldn't learn anything because there was so much that needed done, so I was trying to meet deadlines."
Lack of hands-on learning	Students reported that online there were not opportunities for hands-on learning, specifically doing experiments in labs.	4.0%	"It was more difficult to learn the material by attending the online calls for lectures and labs. The hands-on connection was not there."	"With everything online, the topics were more impersonal. Usually being able to look at the cadavers and doing hands-on activities facilitated learning for me."	"Concepts became harder to understand, particularly for lab. This is because there was no hands-on learning."
Pandemic stress	Students felt stressed in general by the pandemic. Students worried about their health, employment, housing, schooling of their children, and other issues outside of academics that interfered with their learning.	3.7%	"It was difficult to pay attention to lectures knowing that my safety was uncertain and I may not have a place to live."	"It is difficult to remember the Krebs cycle when the world is burning down around you."	"So many students like myself were going through a 'grieving' period when the second quarter of this semester started, some of us had lost family members, had moved back in to abusive households, and to add the heavy load of school was anything but easy."

Procrastination/ less accountable/ less incentive to do well	Students felt as though they procrastinated on work and were less accountable for attending class and doing their work in the course.	3.1%	“In class, I was held accountable to pay attention and to focus. The lectures were really long and when I was at home I was spacing out and talking to my roommates etc. I also let myself get behind in lecture because I knew they were going to be available to watch at a later time.”	“I did not feel as motivated right away to keep up with topics on my own. Skipping lectures became easier than in-person ones.”	“Again, since the lectures in [an introductory biology course] had no clicker questions, I didn't attend them as regularly as I should have.”
Technical issues	Students cited technical issues online that took up time, including internet issues or not being able to access materials.	2.8%	“As classes transitioned, lots of technical difficulties amongst other things caused extreme stress and anxiety.”	“Sometimes the computer could skip a word or two that the professor said. This would make it a little harder to keep track of what was being lectured.”	“Sometimes not all the material was covered in class due to technology difficulties or the professor was not able to use this online platform.”

518

519 Our analyses of the closed-ended Likert scale data showed that a large proportion of students  
 520 (67.1%) reported that the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 had a negative impact on  
 521 their career preparation. A relatively smaller but still significant proportion of students reported a  
 522 negative impact of the transition to remote learning on their interest in their biology major  
 523 (31.5%) or interest in learning about scientific topics (37.1%). However, many more students  
 524 (66.9%) reported a negative impact of the transition to remote learning on their feeling of being  
 525 a part of the biology community at the university. See the Supplemental Materials for full Likert  
 526 scale response for each of the survey items.

527

528 Most students reported that the amount of time they spent on interactions with instructors and  
 529 other students, both in and outside of class, decreased as a result of the transition to remote

530 learning. In fact, about 63% of students said that the amount of time they spent interacting with  
531 other students in class and outside of class greatly decreased in Spring 2020, which was the  
532 strongest response option (Table S11). However, student responses were fairly split on the  
533 amount of time spent studying for a course, with about 45% of students reporting an increase in  
534 the amount of time they spent studying and 41% reporting a decrease (Fig 1).

535

536 We collected student and instructor data on instructional practices for eight courses. Among  
537 these, only four of the eight instructors agreed that they took steps to reduce cheating in their  
538 course and the percentage of students in a given course taught by one of these four instructors  
539 who agreed that their instructor took some steps to reduce cheating ranged from 90 to 100%.  
540 However, even for the courses where instructors disagreed that they took steps to reduce  
541 cheating, 83 to 86% of students agreed that their instructor took some steps to reduce cheating  
542 (Figure S1). By contrast, all eight of these instructors agreed that they tried to make their course  
543 more flexible. However, there was more variation in student response to whether their instructor  
544 tried to make the course more flexible with the percentage of students who agreed with this  
545 statement ranging from 61 to 91% across the eight courses. All but one instructor agreed that  
546 they tried to make the course easier, but the student agreement with this question was again  
547 mixed ranging from 47 to 81% across the courses. Overall, these data show that students  
548 tended to slightly overestimate instructor efforts to reduce cheating and slightly underestimate  
549 instructor efforts to make the course easier and more flexible.

550

551 We did not find significant demographic differences in the student Likert responses to most of  
552 the survey items. In Fig 1, we describe the few demographic differences we found through our  
553 ordinal mixed models (see full ordinal regression results in the Supplemental Materials).

554 Although most students reported that the time spent with instructors decreased or greatly  
555 decreased during the pandemic, the proportion of BLNP students that chose these options was

556 lower than non-BLNP students. Pell-eligible students were more likely to report that time spent  
557 with other students in class greatly decreased compared to students that were not Pell-eligible.  
558 Lastly, women were significantly more likely than men to report negative impacts on their  
559 learning in a course and on career preparation.

## 560 **Discussion**

561 Contrary to our predictions, transition to remote learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic in  
562 Spring 2020 did not have a negative effect on student grades and instead had a small positive  
563 effect across demographic groups among students enrolled in the in-person and online biology  
564 degree programs. Our instructor surveys showed that instructors who had to transition to remote  
565 learning increased flexibility and made several other changes in assessment practices that  
566 might have contributed to the slight increase in student grades in the in-person courses. Despite  
567 this increase in grades, our student surveys revealed several negative impacts of the transition  
568 to remote learning, particularly on students' perceived understanding of course content,  
569 interactions with other students and instructors, feeling like a part of the biology community at  
570 the university, and career preparation. These negative impacts do not seem to have a stronger  
571 effect on students with certain social identities over others for the most part. However, women  
572 were more likely to report negative impacts on their learning and career preparation compared  
573 to men, a result consistent with concerns about widening gender inequities due to the COVID-  
574 19 pandemic. Additionally, Pell-eligible students reported a decrease in the amount of time  
575 spent in and outside of class interacting with other students more often, which is consistent with  
576 concerns regarding logistical difficulties for students from less wealthy backgrounds. Together  
577 these findings suggest that instructor responses were effective in mitigating negative impacts on  
578 student grades across all demographic groups examined in this study, and notably did not seem  
579 to induce any new inequities based on demographics, but that the abrupt transition to remote

580 learning still led to a diminished perception of learning and career development during the  
581 Spring 2020 semester for many students.

582

583 The observed mismatch between grades and student perceptions of their learning might be  
584 because students underestimated their learning [62]. Some studies have shown that student  
585 perceptions of learning can be positively correlated with their grades [63–65]. However, a recent  
586 study comparing the effects of active and passive (i.e., lectures) instruction on student learning  
587 found that students who received active instruction scored higher on the learning assessment  
588 but perceived that they learned less than their peers who received passive instruction [66].

589 Thus, even though it has been shown that students, on average, learn more from active learning  
590 [67,68], students' perception of learning might not match their actual learning. A meta-analysis  
591 showed that student perceptions of their learning are more strongly related to affective  
592 outcomes, such as motivation and satisfaction, and have a much weaker relationship to learning  
593 outcomes, such as scores [69]. However, one reason for this may be that grades are often not  
594 an accurate measure of student learning [70]. Given this background and our results that  
595 instructors were more flexible with grading after the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020,  
596 we think it is likely that the increase in grades does not actually reflect an increase in student  
597 understanding of the course material. In contrast, students earned higher grades while self-  
598 reporting that they learned less, which we find concerning for the extent to which their  
599 completion of these college courses is preparing them for their future careers.

600

601 The slight increase in average student grades in Spring 2020 compared to previous semesters  
602 is consistent with other studies that have examined student grades in Spring 2020 at other  
603 institutions [45–47]. Interestingly, this increase in student grades was observed both in courses  
604 that experienced the emergency transition to remote learning and courses in the online degree  
605 program that did not experience a transition in modality. Although we did not survey the online



606 instructors, this suggests that both in-person and online instructors may have been responsive  
607 to the public health and economic crisis due to the COVID-19 pandemic and became more  
608 lenient and flexible in their grading. The increase in student grades was seen across all  
609 demographic groups. More specifically, women, Black, Latinx, Native American, Multiracial and  
610 Asian students, and Pell-eligible students experienced a similar or slightly larger positive shift in  
611 grades as men, white students, and students who were not eligible for Pell grants. Thus, the  
612 grade increase in Spring 2020 did not fall along the lines of power and privilege in our society  
613 and benefited students with all social identities. A similar result was found in a study on student  
614 scores at Victoria University in Australia where the researchers found statistically significant but  
615 very small differences in the impact of COVID-19 on student scores between demographic  
616 groups [45].

617

618 The instructor surveys show that among our study population, most instructors made  
619 accommodations related to deadlines and stated that they took steps to make their courses  
620 easier for students to do well. Other studies have also reported greater flexibility among  
621 instructors in Spring 2020, including instructors in general chemistry courses at a liberal arts  
622 college in the US [28]. A survey study of faculty members and administrators across the US  
623 found that 64% of faculty members changed the kinds of exams or assignments they asked  
624 students to complete in the course and about half of them lowered expectations on the amount  
625 of work from their students in the Spring 2020 semester [3]. Additionally, many universities  
626 expanded access to pass/fail grading structure instead of the more traditional A-F letter grades  
627 for students, with some institutions even making the pass/fail grading structure mandatory for all  
628 courses [44]. Arizona State University allowed faculty members to use the range of grading  
629 options that have always been available but perhaps not used as often prior to Spring 2020.  
630 That included the traditional A through E grading scale, plus the use of the I or Incomplete grade  
631 (allowing students to complete coursework within 1 year of the end of the term) and the Y grade

632 which indicates “Satisfactory” work at a level of C or higher, similar to the Pass grade at other  
633 universities. Thus, our study affirms other reports that the focus across colleges and universities  
634 to make courses more flexible and less stressful for students in Spring 2020 may have off-set  
635 potential drops in student grades. While we see the benefit of this flexibility for students,  
636 particularly that we did not see demographic differences in these grade increases, we do find it  
637 concerning that students still felt as though they learned less. We encourage instructors to be  
638 thoughtful of what they are doing to make their courses flexible while maintaining the quality of  
639 teaching and providing students with ways to engage in deep learning so that they are not  
640 disadvantaged at a later timepoint because they have not learned as much as they needed to in  
641 that earlier course.

642

643 Many students recognized the positive impact of greater instructor flexibility and changes in  
644 assessment practices on their grades, while recognizing the negative impact of the transition on  
645 their understanding of the course material. This is consistent with other survey studies that show  
646 that students perceived a negative impact on their learning or were less satisfied with their  
647 learning after the transition to remote learning [25,41,45]. In our study, most students also  
648 reported negative impacts on interactions with other students and instructors, career  
649 preparation, and a feeling of being a part of the biology community at the university. These are  
650 also consistent with other studies on student experiences [25,43]. A larger survey study of in-  
651 person students at Arizona State University across various degree programs, the same  
652 institution where our study was conducted, found several striking negative impacts on career  
653 preparation due to COVID-19. According to this study, 13% of students delayed graduation,  
654 40% suffered the loss of a job/internship, and 29% of students expected to earn less by age 35  
655 [48].

656

657 We found similar perceptions of negative impacts on student learning, interactions and career  
658 preparation across demographic groups with few significant differences. We found that women  
659 were more likely to report negative impacts on their learning and career preparation compared  
660 to men. This is not surprising given the greater childcare obligations with school closures and  
661 that women spend more time doing unpaid care work compared to men [32]. In an interview  
662 study of engineering students, women reported having to spend more time on domestic duties  
663 while men described having more free time after the transition to remote learning during the  
664 Spring 2020 semester [71]. Together this suggests that the COVID-19 pandemic has  
665 exacerbated gender inequities and could have long-term negative impacts on women's  
666 education and careers that are not captured in simply examining student course grades. We  
667 encourage future studies to explore how the COVID-19 pandemic affected the persistence of  
668 women in STEM careers.

669

670 The only survey item in which we found a significant difference between BLNP and non-BLNP  
671 students was the time spent with instructors, where BLNP students chose the option "greatly  
672 decreased" less often. Previous studies show that BLNP students often have more interactions  
673 with faculty members compared to white students, although they also have negative interactions  
674 with faculty members more often [72,73]. Still, their greater experience of interacting with faculty  
675 members might have prepared them better to communicate with instructors during emergency  
676 remote learning. High-quality interactions with faculty members have been shown to have  
677 positive effects on student learning [72,74,75]. However, BLNP students did not report less  
678 negative impacts on learning compared to non-BLNP students. This suggests that even though  
679 BLNP students reported a decrease in the time spent with instructors less often, it might not  
680 have translated into benefits for their learning.

681

682 We also found that students from less wealthy backgrounds (operationalized through federal  
683 Pell grant eligibility) more often reported a reduction in time spent with other students in class  
684 after the transition to remote learning. Pell-eligible students were also 1.2 times more likely to be  
685 working a job after the transition to remote learning and 1.5 times more likely to be working  
686 more than 20 hours a week compared to students that were not eligible for federal Pell grants  
687 (Table S12). With greater availability of recorded lectures, Pell-eligible students may have  
688 attended fewer synchronous sessions, thus further reducing their interactions with other  
689 students. Although the decrease in interactions with other students is not desirable, making  
690 lectures available for students to watch later might offer students greater flexibility in juggling  
691 coursework with other work/family responsibilities. Indeed, some students reported positive  
692 impacts on learning after the transition to remote learning due to the availability of recorded  
693 lectures and being able to learn at their own pace (Table 6). Overall, instructors may need to  
694 find a balance between asynchronous learning to make learning more accessible with  
695 synchronous learning to foster peer interactions.

696

697 The transition to remote learning had a negative impact on students' interest in their biology  
698 major or interest in learning about scientific topics in about a third of the students. A similar  
699 study of students enrolled in a general chemistry course at a large public university in the  
700 southern United States found no significant change to students' identities and intention to  
701 pursue a career in science due to COVID-19 [76]. However, we did not find any demographic  
702 differences in student responses to questions about science interest, which is encouraging  
703 given the importance of increasing representation of women, Black students, Latinx students,  
704 and students that grew up in low-income households in STEM. Almost two-thirds of students  
705 reported a negative impact of the transition to remote learning on students' feelings of being a  
706 part of the biology community at the university, which is alarming, although not surprising, given  
707 that students reported spending less time interacting with both instructors and their peers.

708 Creating opportunities for increasing interactions using various modes of synchronous and  
709 asynchronous communication (e.g., online office hours, discussion boards, apps) might help  
710 students feel a greater sense of community and social presence of others in the class.  
711  
712 Instructor responses to our survey items about whether they took steps to prevent cheating,  
713 increased flexibility, or made the course easier are in broad agreement with student responses  
714 to those survey items. Most students seem to recognize their instructors' efforts during the  
715 transition to adapt their courses to the online modality as well as the public health and economic  
716 crisis. However, students' underestimation of instructor flexibility and changes to make courses  
717 easier suggests that communication between students and instructors might need to be  
718 strengthened. Instructors may have needed to use more "instructor talk," which is defined as  
719 any discussion that is not specific to the course content, to signify the changes that they were  
720 making to the courses and why they were making these changes [77]. It is also possible that the  
721 steps that instructors took might not have been sufficient to reach students' needs or  
722 expectations. Because instructors tend to be in better financial situations than their students,  
723 perhaps they underestimated some of the student challenges. Setting up robust systems of  
724 communication among students, instructors, student support staff members, and administrators  
725 might improve the academic climate for all stakeholders and prepare us better for future  
726 emergencies or needs to change instruction rapidly. Indeed, an interview study with engineering  
727 students found that faculty members communicating care and increasing flexibility was a key  
728 element for supporting students [71]. In another study, students indicated the need for constant  
729 communication from instructors during remote learning [78]. Thus, developing stronger  
730 communication with students and improving "instructor social presence" in online courses, i.e.,  
731 the sense that the instructor is connected and available for interactions is critical [79–81]. This  
732 may be done through casual conversations in discussion boards, leveraging social media and  
733 using time in class and during office hours to build classroom community.

## 734 **Limitations**

735 Prior work shows that grades are not an accurate measure of student learning, thus we are  
736 limited in our ability to accurately measure the effects of the abrupt transition to remote learning  
737 due to COVID-19 on student learning [70,82,83]. Moreover, student perceptions of negative  
738 impacts of the transition on their learning that we observed might be attributed to the abrupt  
739 transition itself or the difficulty of learning during a pandemic. Surveying students in the online  
740 program about their experiences in the Spring 2020 semester could have helped us tease apart  
741 these two factors more.

742

743 Another limitation of our study is the relatively small sample size for our survey dataset which  
744 caused us to group data from Black/African American, Hispanic/Latinx, Native American/Alaska  
745 Native and Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian students for analyses. The histories and  
746 experiences of racial oppression of these groups in the United States are different from each  
747 other and grouping them together erases these differences. Similarly, grouping white and Asian  
748 students together into a group is problematic as well, because there are several different  
749 ethnicities included in the category of “Asian” in the US which includes ethnicities that are  
750 underrepresented in STEM in the US [84]. Despite limited statistical power, we ran ordinal  
751 regressions on the survey data with disaggregated race/ethnicity data and have included the  
752 results in the Supplemental Materials. We found some significant effects by race/ethnicity in  
753 those analyses. Specifically, Asian students perceived being negatively impacted less often on  
754 grades, sense of community and career preparation. Also, Black students reported a positive  
755 impact on the amount of time studying more often and multiracial students reported a negative  
756 impact on grades more often.

757

758 Finally, the indicators of socioeconomic status we used (federal Pell grant eligibility and first-  
759 generation status) are coarse measures that do not capture socioeconomic status accurately.  
760 However, these were the only indicators that we could access from the university registrar.

761

## 762 **Beyond COVID-19: preparing for the next emergency.**

763 Instructors responded with greater flexibility in grading in response to the rapid transition to  
764 remote learning in Spring 2020 and students received higher grades on average. This shows  
765 that instructor response was effective in preventing grade declines for students and doing so  
766 equitably across the student population. However, student perceptions of the Spring 2020  
767 semester were less positive, including a sense of diminished learning, loss of community, and  
768 reduced career preparation. Even if students' perception of their learning is not accurate,  
769 perceived learning losses might still have important effects on students' confidence in the  
770 course content or interest in pursuing a career in biology. Similar learning losses may have  
771 occurred in the Fall 2020 semester and Spring 2021 as the COVID-19 pandemic continued to  
772 spread in the US and worldwide.

773

774 As we look ahead, these students affected by the pandemic may need more support in  
775 subsequent courses, especially in courses that build on prior learning. Dedicating class time to  
776 reminding students of important concepts at the beginning of each course or course module  
777 could be one form of support. However, upper-level courses may not have class time to spare,  
778 so adding supplemental tutorials or instruction may be an alternative way to counteract these  
779 potential learning deficits of pre-requisite knowledge. Further, the loss of feeling a part of the  
780 biology community needs to be addressed. More intentional community building exercises in  
781 classes or in the larger department outside of classes could be ways to heal the damage to  
782 students' sense of belonging.

783 Although COVID-19 may only affect college education for a particular timeframe, it is important  
784 to garner lessons from this experience to prepare for the next emergency, which could be global  
785 such as a pandemic, or local such as a natural disaster. Building robust networks of  
786 communication among students, instructors, and staff members, and offering greater training  
787 and support for online teaching for instructors are steps that could help us prevent some of the  
788 challenges associated with the rapid transition to remote learning experienced during the  
789 COVID-19 pandemic. We hope that some of the flexibility afforded to students during the  
790 pandemic is carried on even after in-person courses resume as instructors may have a better  
791 understanding of the myriad of challenges that college students experience daily. Lastly, as the  
792 COVID-19 pandemic reminded us, our classrooms and universities do not exist in isolation and  
793 are a part of the larger society and therefore, affected by the larger societal forces and power  
794 structures that impact student learning in our institutions. Therefore, we must continue to strive  
795 toward social justice inside and outside our higher education institutions.

796

## 797 **Acknowledgements**

798 We would like to thank the instructors who filled out our survey and those who distributed our  
799 survey to students. We would also like to thank the students who filled out our survey and  
800 shared their experiences. Lastly, we want to thank the instructors and undergraduate  
801 researchers who participated in our think-aloud interviews to establish cognitive validity of our  
802 survey instruments.

803

804

805



## 806 Literature cited

- 807 1. Baker M, Hartocollis A, Weise K. First U.S. Colleges Close Classrooms as Virus Spreads.  
808 More Could Follow. The New York Times. 6 Mar 2020. Available:  
809 <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/06/us/coronavirus-college-campus-closings.html>.  
810 Accessed 10 Dec 2020.
- 811 2. Hartocollis A. 'An Eviction Notice': Chaos After Colleges Tell Students to Stay Away. The  
812 New York Times. 11 Mar 2020. Available:  
813 <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/11/us/colleges-cancel-classes-coronavirus.html>.  
814 Accessed 10 Dec 2020.
- 815 3. Johnson N, Veletsianos G, Seaman J. U.S. Faculty and Administrators' Experiences and  
816 Approaches in the Early Weeks of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Online Learning*. 2020;24: 6–  
817 21.
- 818 4. Moralista R, Oducado RM. Faculty Perception toward Online Education in a State College  
819 in the Philippines during the Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19) Pandemic. Rochester,  
820 NY: Social Science Research Network; 2020 Oct. Report No.: ID 3636438. Available:  
821 <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3636438>
- 822 5. Hodges C, Moore S, Lockee B, Trust T, Bond A. The Difference Between Emergency  
823 Remote Teaching and Online Learning. *EDUCAUSE Review*. 2020: 12.
- 824 6. Kimble-Hill AC, Rivera-Figueroa A, Chan BC, Lawal WA, Gonzalez S, Adams MR, et al.  
825 Insights Gained into Marginalized Students Access Challenges During the COVID-19  
826 Academic Response. *J Chem Educ*. 2020 [cited 1 Sep 2020].  
827 doi:10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00774

- 828 7. Gin LE, Guerrero F, Brownell SE, Cooper K. Undergraduates with disabilities and COVID-  
829 19: Challenges resulting from the rapid transition to online course delivery for students with  
830 disabilities in undergraduate STEM. Under review at CBE LSE.
- 831 8. van Buuren A, Tang V, Martimianakis MA (Tina). “COVID-19 as the equalizer”: Evolving  
832 discourses of COVID-19 and implications for medical education. *Can Med Educ J*.  
833 2020;11: e129–e131. doi:10.36834/cmej.70401
- 834 9. Gaynor TS, Wilson ME. Social Vulnerability and Equity: The Disproportionate Impact of  
835 COVID-19. *Public Administration Review*. 2020;80: 832–838.  
836 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13264>
- 837 10. Copley A, Decker A, Delavelle F, Goldstein M, O’Sullivan M, Papineni S. COVID-19  
838 Pandemic Through a Gender Lens. World Bank; 2020. doi:10.1596/34016
- 839 11. Garcia MA, Homan PA, García C, Brown TH. The Color of COVID-19: Structural Racism  
840 and the Disproportionate Impact of the Pandemic on Older Black and Latinx Adults. *The*  
841 *Journals of Gerontology: Series B*. 2020 [cited 11 Dec 2020]. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbaa114
- 842 12. Lokot M, Avakyan Y. Intersectionality as a lens to the COVID-19 pandemic: implications for  
843 sexual and reproductive health in development and humanitarian contexts. *Sexual and*  
844 *Reproductive Health Matters*. 2020;28: 1764748. doi:10.1080/26410397.2020.1764748
- 845 13. Mein SA. COVID-19 and Health Disparities: the Reality of “the Great Equalizer.” *J GEN*  
846 *INTERN MED*. 2020;35: 2439–2440. doi:10.1007/s11606-020-05880-5
- 847 14. Gold JAW, Rossen LM, Ahmad FB, Sutton P, Li Z, Salvatore PP, et al. Race, Ethnicity,  
848 and Age Trends in Persons Who Died from COVID-19 — United States, May–August

- 849 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69: 1517–1521.  
850 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6942e1
- 851 15. Wortham JM. Characteristics of Persons Who Died with COVID-19 — United States,  
852 February 12–May 18, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2020;69.  
853 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6928e1
- 854 16. Karaca-Mandic P, Georgiou A, Sen S. Assessment of COVID-19 Hospitalizations by  
855 Race/Ethnicity in 12 States. JAMA Internal Medicine. 2020 [cited 11 Dec 2020].  
856 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.3857
- 857 17. Krieger N, Waterman PD, Chen JT. COVID-19 and Overall Mortality Inequities in the Surge  
858 in Death Rates by Zip Code Characteristics: Massachusetts, January 1 to May 19, 2020.  
859 Am J Public Health. 2020;110: 1850–1852. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.305913
- 860 18. Chen JT, Krieger N. Revealing the Unequal Burden of COVID-19 by Income,  
861 Race/Ethnicity, and Household Crowding: US County Versus Zip Code Analyses. Journal  
862 of Public Health Management and Practice. 2021;27: S43–S56.  
863 doi:10.1097/PHH.0000000000001263
- 864 19. Moen P, Pedtke JH, Flood S. Disparate Disruptions: Intersectional COVID-19 Employment  
865 Effects by Age, Gender, Education, and Race/Ethnicity. Work, Aging and Retirement.  
866 2020;6: 207–228. doi:10.1093/workar/waaa013
- 867 20. Fitzpatrick KM, Drawve G, Harris C. Facing new fears during the COVID-19 pandemic: The  
868 State of America’s mental health. Journal of Anxiety Disorders. 2020;75: 102291.  
869 doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2020.102291

- 870 21. Ettman CK, Abdalla SM, Cohen GH, Sampson L, Vivier PM, Galea S. Prevalence of  
871 Depression Symptoms in US Adults Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA*  
872 *Netw Open*. 2020;3: e2019686. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.19686
- 873 22. Chen JH, Li Y, Wu AMS, Tong KK. The overlooked minority: Mental health of International  
874 students worldwide under the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond. *Asian J Psychiatr*.  
875 2020;54: 102333. doi:10.1016/j.ajp.2020.102333
- 876 23. Lederer AM, Hoban MT, Lipson SK, Zhou S, Eisenberg D. More Than Inconvenienced:  
877 The Unique Needs of U.S. College Students During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Health Educ*  
878 *Behav*. 2020; 1090198120969372. doi:10.1177/1090198120969372
- 879 24. Goldrick-Rab S, Coca V, Kienzl G, Welton C, Dahl S, Magnelia S. #RealCollege During the  
880 Pandemic: New Evidence on Basic Needs Insecurity and Student Well-Being. *Rebuilding*  
881 *the Launchpad: Serving Students During Covid Resource Library*. 2020; 1–23.
- 882 25. Means B, Neisler J. Unmasking Inequality: STEM Course Experience During the COVID-  
883 19 Pandemic. *Digital Promise*; 2020 Aug. Available:  
884 <https://digitalpromise.dspacedirect.org/handle/20.500.12265/102>
- 885 26. Ramachandran R, Rodriguez MC. Student Perspectives on Remote Learning in a Large  
886 Organic Chemistry Lecture Course. *J Chem Educ*. 2020;97: 2565–2572.  
887 doi:10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00572
- 888 27. Tigaa RA, Sonawane SL. An International Perspective: Teaching Chemistry and Engaging  
889 Students During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Chem Educ*. 2020;97: 3318–3321.  
890 doi:10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00554

- 891 28. Villanueva O, Behmke DA, Morris JD, Simmons R, Anfuso C, Woodbridge CM, et al.  
892 Adapting to the COVID-19 Online Transition: Reflections in a General Chemistry Sequence  
893 Taught by Multiple Instructors with Diverse Pedagogies. *J Chem Educ.* 2020;97: 2458–  
894 2465. doi:10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00752
- 895 29. Gillis A, Krull LM. COVID-19 Remote Learning Transition in Spring 2020: Class Structures,  
896 Student Perceptions, and Inequality in College Courses. *Teach Sociol.* 2020;48: 283–299.  
897 doi:10.1177/0092055X20954263
- 898 30. Collins C, Landivar LC, Ruppner L, Scarborough WJ. COVID-19 and the gender gap in  
899 work hours. *Gender, Work & Organization.* 2020; 1–12.  
900 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12506>
- 901 31. Alon T, Doepke M, Olmstead-Rumsey J, Tertilt M. The Impact of COVID-19 on Gender  
902 Equality. National Bureau of Economic Research; 2020 Apr. Report No.: w26947.  
903 doi:10.3386/w26947
- 904 32. Fortier N. COVID-19, gender inequality, and the responsibility of the state. *Intl J*  
905 *Wellbeing.* 2020;10. Available:  
906 <https://www.internationaljournalofwellbeing.org/index.php/ijow/article/view/1305>
- 907 33. McClure ES, Vasudevan P, Bailey Z, Patel S, Robinson WR. Racial Capitalism Within  
908 Public Health—How Occupational Settings Drive COVID-19 Disparities. *Am J Epidemiol.*  
909 2020;189: 1244–1253. doi:10.1093/aje/kwaa126
- 910 34. Magsino I. Self-Isolating Is a Privilege Many Queer Hourly Workers Don't Have. In: them.  
911 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 14 Dec 2020]. Available: [https://www.them.us/story/lgbtq-retail-](https://www.them.us/story/lgbtq-retail-restaurant-workers-coronavirus)  
912 [restaurant-workers-coronavirus](https://www.them.us/story/lgbtq-retail-restaurant-workers-coronavirus)

- 913 35. Valentino-DeVries J, Lu D, Dance GJX. Location Data Says It All: Staying at Home During  
914 Coronavirus Is a Luxury. *The New York Times*. 3 Apr 2020. Available:  
915 <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/04/03/us/coronavirus-stay-home-rich-poor.html>.  
916 Accessed 14 Dec 2020.
- 917 36. McCormack G, Avery C, Spitzer AK-L, Chandra A. Economic Vulnerability of Households  
918 With Essential Workers. *JAMA*. 2020;324: 388–390. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.11366
- 919 37. Pappa S, Ntella V, Giannakas T, Giannakoulis VG, Papoutsis E, Katsaounou P. Prevalence  
920 of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare workers during the COVID-19  
921 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*.  
922 2020;88: 901–907. doi:10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.026
- 923 38. Parks CA, Nugent NB, Fleischhacker SE, Yaroch AL. Food System Workers are the  
924 Unexpected but Under Protected COVID Heroes. *The Journal of Nutrition*. 2020;150:  
925 2006–2008. doi:10.1093/jn/nxaa173
- 926 39. Perets EA, Chabeda D, Gong AZ, Huang X, Fung TS, Ng KY, et al. Impact of the  
927 Emergency Transition to Remote Teaching on Student Engagement in a Non-STEM  
928 Undergraduate Chemistry Course in the Time of COVID-19. *J Chem Educ*. 2020 [cited 1  
929 Sep 2020]. doi:10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00879
- 930 40. Al-Tammemi AB, Akour A, Alfalah L. Is It Just About Physical Health? An Online Cross-  
931 Sectional Study Exploring the Psychological Distress Among University Students in Jordan  
932 in the Midst of COVID-19 Pandemic. *Front Psychol*. 2020;11.  
933 doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.562213

- 934 41. Petillion RJ, McNeil WS. Student Experiences of Emergency Remote Teaching: Impacts of  
935 Instructor Practice on Student Learning, Engagement, and Well-Being. *J Chem Educ.*  
936 2020;97: 2486–2493. doi:10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00733
- 937 42. Armstrong-Mensah E, Ramsey-White K, Yankey B, Self-Brown S. COVID-19 and Distance  
938 Learning: Effects on Georgia State University School of Public Health Students. *Front*  
939 *Public Health.* 2020;8. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.576227
- 940 43. Jeffery KA, Bauer CF. Students' Responses to Emergency Remote Online Teaching  
941 Reveal Critical Factors for All Teaching. *J Chem Educ.* 2020;97: 2472–2485.  
942 doi:10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00736
- 943 44. Burke L. Colleges go pass/fail to address coronavirus. In: *Inside HigherEd* [Internet]. 19  
944 Mar 2020 [cited 16 Dec 2020]. Available:  
945 [https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/03/19/colleges-go-passfail-address-](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/03/19/colleges-go-passfail-address-coronavirus)  
946 [coronavirus](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/03/19/colleges-go-passfail-address-coronavirus)
- 947 45. Loton D, Parker P, Stein C, Gauci S. Remote learning during COVID-19: Student  
948 satisfaction and performance. *EdArXiv*; 2020 Jul. doi:10.35542/osf.io/n2ybd
- 949 46. Bawa P. Learning in the age of SARS-COV-2: A quantitative study of learners'  
950 performance in the age of emergency remote teaching. *Computers and Education Open.*  
951 2021;1: 100016. doi:10.1016/j.caeo.2020.100016
- 952 47. Gonzalez T, Rubia MA de la, Hincz KP, Comas-Lopez M, Subirats L, Fort S, et al.  
953 Influence of COVID-19 confinement on students' performance in higher education. *PLOS*  
954 *ONE.* 2020;15: e0239490. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0239490

- 955 48. Aucejo EM, French J, Araya MPU, Zafar B. The Impact of COVID-19 on Student  
956 Experiences and Expectations: Evidence from a Survey. *Journal of Public Economics*.  
957 2020; 104271. doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104271
- 958 49. Wladis C, Hachey AC, Conway KM. The representation of minority, female, and non-  
959 traditional STEM majors in the online environment at community colleges: A nationally  
960 representative study. *Community College Review*. 2015;43: 89–114.  
961 doi:10.1177/0091552114555904
- 962 50. Cooper KM, Gin LE, Brownell SE. Diagnosing differences in what Introductory Biology  
963 students in a fully online and an in-person biology degree program know and do regarding  
964 medical school admission. *Advances in Physiology Education*. 2019;43: 221–232.  
965 doi:10.1152/advan.00028.2019
- 966 51. Mead C, Supriya K, Zheng Y, Anbar AD, Collins JP, LePore P, et al. Online biology degree  
967 program broadens access for women, first-generation to college, and low-income students,  
968 but grade disparities remain. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15: e0243916.  
969 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0243916
- 970 52. Noordenbos G. Women in academies of sciences: From exclusion to exception. *Women's*  
971 *Studies International Forum*. 2002;25: 127–137. doi:10.1016/S0277-5395(02)00215-7
- 972 53. Hill C, Corbett C, St. Rose A. Why So Few? Women in Science, Technology, Engineering,  
973 and Mathematics. American Association of University Women. American Association of  
974 University Women; 2010. Available: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED509653>
- 975 54. Ong M, Wright C, Espinosa L, Orfield G. Inside the Double Bind: A Synthesis of Empirical  
976 Research on Undergraduate and Graduate Women of Color in Science, Technology,



- 977           Engineering, and Mathematics. *Harvard Educational Review*. 2011;81: 172–209.  
978           doi:10.17763/haer.81.2.t022245n7x4752v2
- 979   55. National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics.  
980           Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in science and engineering: 2019.  
981           Alexandria, VA: National Science Foundation; 2019. Report No.: Special Report NSF 19-  
982           304. Available: <https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/wmpd>
- 983   56. Matz RL, Koester BP, Fiorini S, Grom G, Shepard L, Stangor CG, et al. Patterns of  
984           gendered performance differences in large introductory courses at five research  
985           universities. *AERA Open*. 2017;3: 2332858417743754. doi:10.1177/2332858417743754
- 986   57. Huberth M, Chen P, Tritz J, McKay TA. Computer-tailored student support in Introductory  
987           Physics. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10: e0137001. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0137001
- 988   58. Lynn MA, Templeton DC, Ross AD, Gehret AU, Bida M, Sanger TJ, et al. Successes and  
989           Challenges in Teaching Chemistry to Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Students in the Time of  
990           COVID-19. *J Chem Educ*. 2020;97: 3322–3326. doi:10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00602
- 991   59. Beatty PC, Willis GB. *Research Synthesis: The Practice of Cognitive Interviewing*. *Public*  
992           *Opinion Quarterly*. 2007;71: 287–311. doi:10.1093/poq/nfm006
- 993   60. Strauss A, Corbin JM. *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and*  
994           *techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications;  
995           1990.
- 996   61. Christensen RHB. *Analysis of ordinal data with cumulative link models—estimation with*  
997           *the R-package ordinal*. 2015.

- 998 62. Carpenter SK, Witherby AE, Tauber SK. On Students' (Mis)judgments of Learning and  
999 Teaching Effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*. 2020;9:  
1000 137–151. doi:10.1016/j.jarmac.2019.12.009
- 1001 63. Anaya G. College impact on student learning: Comparing the Use of Self-Reported Gains,  
1002 Standardized Test Scores, and College Grades. *Research in Higher Education*. 1999;40:  
1003 499–526. doi:10.1023/A:1018744326915
- 1004 64. Kuhn K-A, Rundle-Thiele S. Curriculum alignment: Student perception of learning  
1005 achievement measures. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher*  
1006 *Education*. 2009;21: 351–361.
- 1007 65. Rockinson-Szapkiw AJ, Wendt J, Whighting M, Nisbet D. The Predictive Relationship  
1008 Among the Community of Inquiry Framework, Perceived Learning and Online, and  
1009 Graduate Students' Course Grades in Online Synchronous and Asynchronous Courses.  
1010 *irrodl*. 2016;17: 18–35. doi:<https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i3.2203>
- 1011 66. Deslauriers L, McCarty LS, Miller K, Callaghan K, Kestin G. Measuring actual learning  
1012 versus feeling of learning in response to being actively engaged in the classroom. *PNAS*.  
1013 2019;116: 19251–19257. doi:10.1073/pnas.1821936116
- 1014 67. Freeman S, Eddy SL, McDonough M, Smith MK, Okoroafor N, Jordt H, et al. Active  
1015 learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics.  
1016 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*. 2014;111: 8410–8415.  
1017 doi:10.1073/pnas.1319030111
- 1018 68. Theobald EJ, Hill MJ, Tran E, Agrawal S, Arroyo EN, Behling S, et al. Active learning  
1019 narrows achievement gaps for underrepresented students in undergraduate science,

- 1020 technology, engineering, and math. PNAS. 2020;117: 6476–6483.
- 1021 doi:10.1073/pnas.1916903117
- 1022 69. Sitzmann T, Ely K, Brown KG, Bauer KN. Self-Assessment of Knowledge: A Cognitive  
1023 Learning or Affective Measure? AMLE. 2010;9: 169–191. doi:10.5465/amle.9.2.zqr169
- 1024 70. Yorke M. Summative assessment: dealing with the ‘measurement fallacy.’ null. 2011;36:  
1025 251–273. doi:10.1080/03075070903545082
- 1026 71. Gelles LA, Lord SM, Hoople GD, Chen DA, Mejia JA. Compassionate Flexibility and Self-  
1027 Discipline: Student Adaptation to Emergency Remote Teaching in an Integrated  
1028 Engineering Energy Course during COVID-19. Education Sciences. 2020;10: 304.  
1029 doi:10.3390/educsci10110304
- 1030 72. Lundberg CA, Schreiner LA. Quality and Frequency of Faculty-Student Interaction as  
1031 Predictors of Learning: An Analysis by Student Race/Ethnicity. Journal of College Student  
1032 Development. 2004;45: 549–565. doi:10.1353/csd.2004.0061
- 1033 73. Park JJ, Kim YK, Salazar C, Hayes S. Student-Faculty Interaction and Discrimination from  
1034 Faculty in STEM: The Link with Retention. Research in Higher Education. 2020;61: 330–  
1035 356. doi:10.1007/s11162-019-09564-w
- 1036 74. Cole D. Debunking Anti-Intellectualism: An Examination of African American College  
1037 Students’ Intellectual Self-Concepts. The Review of Higher Education. 2011;34: 259–282.  
1038 doi:10.1353/rhe.2010.0025
- 1039 75. Tovar E. The Role of Faculty, Counselors, and Support Programs on Latino/a Community  
1040 College Students’ Success and Intent to Persist. Community College Review. 2015;43:  
1041 46–71. doi:10.1177/0091552114553788

- 1042 76. Forakis J, March JL, Erdmann M. The Impact of COVID-19 on the Academic Plans and  
1043 Career Intentions of Future STEM Professionals. *J Chem Educ.* 2020;97: 3336–3340.  
1044 doi:10.1021/acs.jchemed.0c00646
- 1045 77. Seidel SB, Reggi AL, Schinske JN, Burrus LW, Tanner KD. Beyond the Biology: A  
1046 Systematic Investigation of Noncontent Instructor Talk in an Introductory Biology Course.  
1047 *LSE.* 2015;14: ar43. doi:10.1187/cbe.15-03-0049
- 1048 78. Murphy L, Eduljee NB, Croteau K. College Student Transition to Synchronous Virtual  
1049 Classes during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Northeastern United States. *PEDAGOGICAL*  
1050 *RES.* 2020;5: em0078. doi:10.29333/pr/8485
- 1051 79. Pollard H, Minor M, Swanson A. Instructor Social Presence within the Community of  
1052 Inquiry Framework and Its Impact on Classroom Community and the Learning  
1053 Environment. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration.* 2014;17. Available:  
1054 <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/152959/>
- 1055 80. Oyarzun B, Barreto D, Conklin S. Instructor Social Presence Effects on Learner Social  
1056 Presence, Achievement, and Satisfaction. *TechTrends.* 2018;62: 625–634.  
1057 doi:10.1007/s11528-018-0299-0
- 1058 81. Richardson J, Lowenthal P. Instructor Social Presence: Learners' Needs and a Neglected  
1059 Component of the Community of Inquiry Framework. *Social Presence in Online Learning:*  
1060 *Multiple Perspectives on Practice and Research.* 2017. Available:  
1061 [https://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/edtech\\_facpubs/206](https://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/edtech_facpubs/206)
- 1062 82. Allen JD. Grades as Valid Measures of Academic Achievement of Classroom Learning.  
1063 *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas.* 2005;78: 218–  
1064 223. doi:10.3200/TCHS.78.5.218-223

1065 83. Schinske J, Tanner K. Teaching More by Grading Less (or Differently). LSE. 2014;13:  
1066 159–166. doi:10.1187/cbe.cbe-14-03-0054

1067 84. Teranishi RT. Asian Pacific Americans and critical race theory: an examination of school  
1068 racial climate. *Equity & Excellence in Education*. 2002;35: 144–154.  
1069 doi:10.1080/713845281

1070

## 1071 **Supporting Information**

1072 **S1 File. Instructor survey.docx** Instructor survey questions analyzed in this study.

1073 **S2 File. Student survey.docx** Student survey questions analyzed in this study.

1074 **S1 Table. Number of students in the courses analyzed for the grades data.**

1075 **S2 Table. Regression model specifications.** Model 1 estimates the Spring 2020 effect and its  
1076 interaction with instruction mode. Model 2 extends Model 1 to consider the possibility of  
1077 demographic interaction effects. Model 3 estimates the predictive value of instructors' reported  
1078 course changes on the Spring 2020 grade shift as compared to the same course in Spring  
1079 2018/19.

1080 **S3 Table. Linear regression results for courses in in-person and online degree program.**

1081 This model shows interaction effects among each demographic category and the COVID-19  
1082 semester.

1083 **S4 Table. Changes in assessment practices.** Frequency at which instructors chose various  
1084 options regarding changes made to their assessment practices following the transition to remote  
1085 learning in Spring 2020.

1086 **S5 Table. Ordinal regression results for the perceived impact of the transition to remote**  
1087 **learning on students.** Ordinal regression output with survey items about impact on students as  
1088 the outcomes and demographics as predictors.

1089 **S6 Table. Ordinal regression results for the perceived impact of the transition to remote**  
1090 **learning on student interactions.** Ordinal regression output with survey items about impact on  
1091 time spent studying and interactions as the outcomes and demographics as predictors.

1092 **S7 Table. Ordinal regression results for perceived impact on students with disaggregated**  
1093 **race/ethnicity data.** Ordinal regression output with survey items about impact on students as  
1094 the outcomes and demographics as predictors with disaggregated race/ethnicity data.

1095 **S8 Table. Ordinal regression results for perceived impact on student interactions with**  
1096 **disaggregated race/ethnicity data.** Ordinal regression output with survey items about impact  
1097 on time spent studying and interactions as the outcomes and demographics as predictors with  
1098 disaggregated race/ethnicity data.

1099 **S9 Table. Impact on grades, learning and career preparation.** Full distribution of Likert scale  
1100 responses on the student survey on the perceived impact of the transition to remote learning in  
1101 Spring 2020 on grades, learning and career preparation.

1102 **S10 Table. Impact on interest in biology major, interest in learning science and sense of**  
1103 **community.** Full distribution of Likert scale responses on the student survey on the perceived  
1104 impact of the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 on interest in biology major, interest in  
1105 learning science and sense of community.

1106 **S11 Table. Impact on time spent studying and interacting with others.** Full distribution of  
1107 Likert scale responses on the student survey on the perceived impact of the transition to remote  
1108 learning in Spring 2020 on time spent studying and interacting with others.

1109 **S12 Table. Pell-eligible and students who worked a job in the student survey dataset.**

1110 **S1 Figure. Distribution of student responses about instructional practices.** Blue points  
1111 indicate the option that the instructor for the course chose.

1112 **S2 Figure. Distribution of student responses on perceived impact of transition to remote**  
1113 **learning on grades by social identities.** Bar plot showing student responses by gender,  
1114 race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on the perceived impact of the transition to remote  
1115 learning in Spring 2020 on their grades. BLNP refers to Black, Latinx, Native American, and  
1116 Pacific Islanders. Pell eligibility and college generation status are included as proxies for  
1117 socioeconomic status.

1118 **S3 Figure. Distribution of student responses on perceived impact of transition to remote**  
1119 **learning on learning by social identities.** Bar plot showing student responses by gender,  
1120 race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on the perceived impact of the transition to remote  
1121 learning in Spring 2020 on their learning. BLNP refers to Black, Latinx, Native American, and  
1122 Pacific Islanders. Pell eligibility and college generation status are included as proxies for  
1123 socioeconomic status.

1124 **S4 Figure. Distribution of student responses on perceived impact of transition to remote**  
1125 **learning on interest in biology major by social identities.** Bar plot showing student  
1126 responses by gender, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on the perceived impact of the  
1127 transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 on their interest in biology major. BLNP refers to  
1128 Black, Latinx, Native American, and Pacific Islanders. Pell eligibility and college generation  
1129 status are included as proxies for socioeconomic status.

1130 **S5 Figure. Distribution of student responses on perceived impact of transition to remote**  
1131 **learning on interest in learning about scientific topics by social identities.** Bar plot  
1132 showing student responses by gender, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on the  
1133 perceived impact of the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 on their interest in learning  
1134 about scientific topics. BLNP refers to Black, Latinx, Native American, and Pacific Islanders. Pell  
1135 eligibility and college generation status are included as proxies for socioeconomic status.

1136 **S6 Figure. Distribution of student responses on perceived impact of transition to remote**  
1137 **learning on feeling a part of the biology community at the university by social identities.**

1138 Bar plot showing student responses by gender, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on the  
1139 perceived impact of the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 on their feeling a part of the  
1140 biology community at the university. BLNP refers to Black, Latinx, Native American, and Pacific  
1141 Islanders. Pell eligibility and college generation status are included as proxies for  
1142 socioeconomic status.

1143 **S7 Figure. Distribution of student responses on perceived impact of transition to remote**  
1144 **learning on career preparation by social identities.** Bar plot showing student responses by  
1145 gender, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on the perceived impact of the transition to  
1146 remote learning in Spring 2020 on their career preparation. BLNP refers to Black, Latinx, Native  
1147 American, and Pacific Islanders. Pell eligibility and college generation status are included as  
1148 proxies for socioeconomic status.

1149 **S8 Figure. Distribution of student responses on perceived impact of transition to remote**  
1150 **learning on amount of time spent studying by social identities.** Bar plot showing student  
1151 responses by gender, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on the perceived impact of the  
1152 transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 on their amount of time spent studying. BLNP refers  
1153 to Black, Latinx, Native American, and Pacific Islanders. Pell eligibility and college generation  
1154 status are included as proxies for socioeconomic status.

1155 **S9 Figure. Distribution of student responses on perceived impact of transition to remote**  
1156 **learning on amount of time spent interacting with instructors by social identities.** Bar plot  
1157 showing student responses by gender, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on the  
1158 perceived impact of the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 on their amount of time  
1159 spent interacting with instructors. BLNP refers to Black, Latinx, Native American, and Pacific  
1160 Islanders. Pell eligibility and college generation status are included as proxies for  
1161 socioeconomic status.

1162 **S10 Figure. Distribution of student responses on perceived impact of transition to remote**  
1163 **learning on amount of time interacting with other students in class by social identities.**



1164 Bar plot showing student responses by gender, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on the  
1165 perceived impact of the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 on their amount of time  
1166 spent interacting with other students in class. BLNP refers to Black, Latinx, Native American,  
1167 and Pacific Islanders. Pell eligibility and college generation status are included as proxies for  
1168 socioeconomic status.

1169 **S11 Figure. Distribution of student responses on perceived impact of transition to remote**  
1170 **learning on amount of time interacting with other students outside of class by social**  
1171 **identities.** Bar plot showing student responses by gender, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic  
1172 status on the perceived impact of the transition to remote learning in Spring 2020 on their  
1173 amount of time spent interacting with other students outside of class. BLNP refers to Black,  
1174 Latinx, Native American, and Pacific Islanders. Pell eligibility and college generation status are  
1175 included as proxies for socioeconomic status.

Survey Item	% students reporting negative effect	Demographic differences
Impact on grades	55.8	No differences
Impact on learning	69.1	Women reported negative impact more often
Interest in biology major	31.5	No differences
Interest in learning science	37.1	No differences
Feeling like a part of University biology community	66.9	No differences
Impact on career preparation	67.1	Women reported negative impact more often
	% students reporting decrease in time	Demographic differences
Time spent studying	41.2	No differences
Time spent with instructors	88.7	BLNP students reported decrease less often
Time spent in class with students	84.9	Pell-eligible students reported decrease more often
Informal time with students	77.7	No differences

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

Figure