

Geosci. Commun. Discuss., author comment AC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-18-AC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC1

Jennifer Jane Day

Author comment on "Transformation of geological sciences and geological engineering field methods course to remote delivery using manual, virtual, and blended tools in fall 2020" by Jennifer Jane Day, Geosci. Commun. Discuss.,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-18-AC2>, 2021

Thanks very much, Jacqueline, for your detailed review. I agree that more details on the experiential aspects of the course and the practical lessons learned would significantly improve this manuscript, and I will include more on this in the revision. I also agree that more details on which new course elements will be integrated into in-person offerings will improve the paper. I agree that revising section 3 as you suggest would improve the ease of comparison between the in-person and remote deliveries. This revision will also help set the stage for more in depth comparison between the experience and performance results between the in-person and remote deliveries. Regarding section 4, I can add some rationale about why I chose certain virtual learning course elements. I will also consider adding a brief discussion on other elements I did not use but am wary that elaborate discussion on this will distract from the primary scope of the manuscript. For your interest, students are normally required to purchase the same compass, notebook, and drafting equipment for the in-person delivery, so this did not pose an additional financial burden due to COVID-19. Your comments about section 5 do indeed touch on an interesting debate. While the remote delivery of this course did achieve all course learning outcomes, I agree the number of opportunities to practice certain techniques was limited in the remote setting compared to an in-person setting. I will add some discussion on this topic in the revision.