

Geosci. Commun. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-26-RC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on AC1

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "A remote field course implementing high-resolution topography acquisition with geomorphic applications" by Sharon Bywater-Reyes and Beth Pratt-Sitaula, Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-26-RC2>, 2021

Absolutely! Sorry I wasn't more clear about that in my previous comments.

In general, you do an excellent job connecting each of the units/assessments to particular outcomes, but more needs to be done to support the assertion that those outcomes were achieved. At present, the reader largely has to take your word for it.

That's great that you have approval to include the student artefacts. They are very rich and can help provide solid evidence of the effectiveness of your curriculum. What I would recommend is revisiting the places in the text where you say that a certain outcome was achieved effectively and ensure that you are always supporting this with concrete data (student artefacts, assessment scores, etc). Right now you provide some nice peeks into student success (e.g., L184-185, L197-198), but these can be drawn out more so that the reader is convinced of their impact. For example, if you provide assessment scores, the reader needs to know how you marked those / how you defined student success. With student artefacts, identifying particular aspects that showed success or addressed specific outcomes would be helpful. You could do this by annotating the ones you include in the paper as figures. You could even summarize the strengths and weaknesses of multiple student assessments, and then use the example artefacts (figures) to support these points.

Hope this helps! Let me know if there's anything that needs further clarifying.