A Remote Field Course Implementing High-Resolution Topography Acquisition with Geomorphic Applications

- 3 Sharon Bywater-Reyes¹, Beth Pratt-Sitaula²
- ¹Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado, 80639, United States

1

- ⁵ ²Education and Community Engagement, UNAVCO, Boulder, Colorado, 80301, United States
- 6 Correspondence to: Sharon Bywater-Reyes (sharon.bywaterreyes@unco.edu)

9 Abstract

10 Here we describe the curriculum and outcomes from a data-intensive geomorphic analysis course: "Geoscience Field Issues 11 Using High-Resolution Topography to Understand Earth Surface Processes," which pivoted to virtual in 2020 due to the 12 COVID-19 pandemic. The curriculum covers technologies for manual and remotely sensed topographic data methods, 13 including: 1) Global Positioning Systems and Global Navigation Satellite System (GPS/GNSS) surveys, 2) structure from 14 motion (SfM) photogrammetry, 3) and ground-based (terrestrial laser scanning; TLS) and airborne lidar. Course content 15 focuses on earth-surface process applications, but could be adapted for other geoscience disciplines. Many other field courses 16 were cancelled in summer 2020, so this course served a broad range of undergraduate and graduate students in need of a field 17 course as part of degree or research requirements. Resulting curricular materials are available freely within the National 18 Association of Geoscience Teachers' (NAGT's) Teaching with Online Field Experiences collection. The authors pre-collected 19 GNSS data, uncrewed-aerial-system- (UAS-) derived photographs, and ground-based lidar, which students then used in course 20 assignments. The course was run over a two-week period and had synchronous and asynchronous components. Students 21 created SfM models that incorporated post-processed GNSS ground control points and created derivative SfM and TLS 22 products including classified point clouds and digital elevation models (DEMs). Students were successfully able to 1) evaluate 23 the appropriateness of a given survey/data approach given site conditions; 2) assess pros and cons of different data collection 24 and postprocessing methods in light of field and time constraints and limitations of each; 3) conduct error and geomorphic 25 change analysis; and 4) propose or implement a protocol to answer a geomorphic question. Overall, our analysis indicates the 26 course had a successful implementation that met student needs as well as course-specific and NAGT learning outcomes, with 27 91 % of students receiving an A, B, or C grade. Unexpected outcomes of the course included student self-reflection and 28 redirection and classmate support through a daily reflection and discussion post. Challenges included long hours in front of a 29 computer, computing limitations, and burnout because of the condensed nature of the course. Recommended implementation 30 improvements include spreading the course out over a longer period of time or adopting only part of the course and providing 31 appropriate computers and technical assistance. This manuscript and published curricular materials should serve as an 32 implementation and assessment guide for the geoscience community to use in virtual or in-person high-resolution topographic 33 data courses that can be adapted for individual labs or for an entire field or data course.

2

35 1 Introduction

36 1.1 Background on course format and partners

37 The COVID-19 pandemic forced most higher education courses to use virtual delivery modes for part or all of 2020 (Ali, 38 2020), which posed a challenge for all disciplines. This change was particularly challenging for the many United States (US) undergraduate geoscience programs, which require field camp or a field course for degree completion (Wilson, 2016). The 39 40 majority of these field courses had been planned for in-person implementation and were quickly redesigned for remote 41 delivery. Most US universities closed campuses March 2020 and did not return to in-person until fall 2020 or later; whereas 42 the field courses needed to occur May through August 2020. In response to this crisis, geoscience field instructors worked 43 together with the National Association of Geoscience Teachers (NAGT) to develop and share remote field teaching resources 44 through the Designing Remote Field Experiences project (Egger et al., 2021).

45 This manuscript describes one such impacted course that pivoted to remote teaching, "Using High-Resolution Topography to Understand Earth Surface Processes," taught through the University of Northern Colorado (UNC). It was 46 originally planned as an in-person course with Structure from Motion photogrammetry (SfM), Terrestrial Laser Scanning 47 48 (TLS), and Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS)¹ data collection and analysis applied to geomorphic issues in a mixed 49 field/classroom setting. The course implementation and curriculum were adjusted to a remote delivery mode by collecting TLS, GNSS, and uncrewed aerial system (UAS) imagery for SfM prior to the course start. Informational videos about the field 50 51 site and data collection were also provided to the students. The data were collected near Greeley, Colorado on the Cache la 52 Poudre River by Bywater-Reyes from the University of Northern Colorado, in collaboration with UNAVCO (unavco.org). 53 Other geomorphic datasets were drawn from UNAVCO and OpenTopography (https://opentopography.org/) archives. The 54 class had 23 students total (16 undergraduates and 7 graduate students).

55 Bywater-Reves was the primary course designer and instructor for the course and led the adjustments to remote 56 teaching. UNAVCO runs the National Science Foundation (NSF) and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) 57 geodetic facility (GAGE: Geodetic Facility for the Advancement of Geoscience). Its mission includes providing educational 58 support to the broader geodesy and geoscience communities; thus, UNAVCO staff collaborated on the prepared data collection. 59 The teaching activities developed for this course were adapted from UNAVCO's GEodesy Tools for Societal Issues (GETSI; 60 https://serc.carleton.edu/getsi/index.html) modules: Analyzing High Resolution Topography with TLS and SfM (https://serc.carleton.edu/getsi/teaching materials/high-rez-topo/index.html) and High Precision Positioning with Static and 61 Kinematic GPS/GNSS (https://serc.carleton.edu/getsi/teaching materials/high-precision/index.html) 62

This course, and the activities it included, were contributed to the NAGT *Designing Remote Field Experiences* collection (<u>https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_field/index.html</u>) (Egger et al., 2021). The overall course is at

¹ GNSS (Global Navigation Satellite System) is the general term that refers to all Earth's satellite navigation systems. Most people are more familiar with the term GPS (Global Positioning System), which technically, refers to only the US satellite constellation. Hereafter this paper will refer to GNSS or GPS/GNSS.

65 https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_field/courses/240348.html and the individual activities are linked within 66 the course page, as well as being contributed individually to the *Online Field Teaching Activities* collection 67 (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online field/index.html).

68 **1.2 Value of course topic**

69 High-resolution topographic datasets (SfM and ground-based and airborne lidar) are valuable in disciplines ranging from geomorphology and tectonics to engineering and construction (Bemis et al., 2014; Passalacqua et al., 2015; Robinson et al., 70 71 2017; Tarolli, 2014; Westoby et al., 2012). Use of high-resolution data in Earth Science education allows students to quantify 72 landscapes and their change at sub-meter resolution (Pratt-Sitaula et al., 2017; Robinson et al., 2017). Understanding surface 73 processes is listed as very important in the recent "Vision of Change in the Geosciences" with the objective "Students will be 74 able to recognize key surface processes and their connection to geological features and possible natural and man-made hazards" 75 (Mosher et al., 2021, p. 17). Furthermore, use of multiple types of data allows students to practise critical thinking skills such 76 as assessing which acquisition method is appropriate for different scenarios and what errors are associated with different 77 methods. Critical thinking, integrating diverse data sources, and strong quantitative skills were all identified as very important 78 skills for undergraduate students to master (e.g., Kober, 2015). Similarly, making inferences about the Earth system; making 79 spatial and temporal interpretations; working with uncertainty; and developing field, GIS, computational, and data skills were 80 all listed as very important skills for geoscience students to demonstrate (Mosher et al., 2021). Furthermore, learning to collect, 81 post-process, and analyse large datasets is a marketable transferable skill that prepares students for the job market, with 82 cartography and photogrammetry job prospects being "excellent" according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. For historically 83 marginalized students, high-paying job prospects are particularly important (O'Connell and Holmes, 2011).

84 **1.3 Value of remote learning to removing barriers**

85 Fieldwork, while valuable to building students' self-efficacy and problem-solving skills (Elkins and Elkins, 2007), can pose a 86 barrier to diversifying the geosciences because of ableism (Carabajal and Atchison, 2020), cost (Abeyta et al., 2020), cultural factors (Hughes, 2015), racism (Abbott, 2006), and sexism (Fairchild et al., 2021) in the field. COVID-19 forced the 87 88 geosciences to develop virtual field experiences, with a positive side effect of removing many of the aforementioned barriers 89 to fieldwork completion. For example, the computer-based nature of remote field learning removes many physical accessibility 90 issues present for typical field courses. The option to learn from home may make the remote courses more feasible for students 91 with family or work responsibilities, as well as reduce real and perceived safety issues related to gender, sexual orientation, 92 and race that may occur in tradition field camp settings. Although remote field courses are not necessarily the most desirable 93 for all students, the development of high quality remote field options can be one component of diversifying the geosciences 94 (Egger et al., 2021).

96 2.1 Course objectives and geodetic methods

97 The objective of the course was for students to learn manual and remote sensing methods of topographic data collection, 98 including 1) GPS/GNSS, 2) SfM, and 3) TLS surveying and airborne lidar use. GNSS uses ground-based receivers to trilaterate 99 positions calculated from signals sent by orbiting satellites (to accuracies of a couple centimetres in this use case). SfM is a 100 photogrammetric technique that uses overlapping images to construct three-dimensional models with widespread research 101 applications in geodesy, geomorphology, structural geology, and other subfields in the geosciences (Passalacqua et al., 2015; Westoby et al., 2012). Lidar also generates three-dimensional models valuable for the same range of applications; but it uses 102 103 laser scanners to send out thousands of laser pulses per second, measure the return time, and calculate distances. Scanners can 104 be ground-based (TLS) or airborne. SfM requires less expensive equipment and less field time, but more processing time, than 105 TLS. In low-vegetation field areas, SfM can yield similarly valuable high-resolution topographic models with point densities usually hundreds of points per square metre (depending on instrument-to-object distance; Westoby et al., 2012); however, TLS 106 is much more effective in areas with dense vegetation. For both methods, ground control points (GCP), usually measured with 107 GNSS, are needed for georeferencing the topographic model. For SfM, they are also critical for reducing distortions and errors 108 109 (James et al., 2019). One of the key outcomes for students was to understand the benefits and challenges of each method and 110 how to determine the most valuable in different circumstances.

111 **2.2** Course delivery

- 112 Course content focused on earth-surface process applications, but could be adapted to other geoscience topics. The course was taught workshop style, composed of multiple synchronous work sessions with asynchronous work time in between. The bulk 113 114 of the instruction occurred within a 2-week period during the summer. Synchronous lectures were conducted via Zoom and 115 course content distributed via Canvas. The class used Slack as an asynchronous way to exchange questions, comments, and solutions amongst the students and between the students and instructor. During the course, students worked with three different 116 117 analytical software packages: Agisoft MetaShape, CloudCompare, and ArcGIS Map. Five students attended an optional inperson field collection campaign (one student travelled from out-of-state and the remainder were UNC students). The course 118 119 was divided into two units: Unit 1 focused on the SfM workflow, including integrating GNSS and point cloud processing; and Unit 2 on lidar products and workflows, including TLS, topographic differencing, airborne lidar, and methods comparison. 120 121 Each unit ended in a unit report, with the second providing students an opportunity to improve workflows and explore 122 additional data sources and analyses.
- 123

124 **2.3 Learning outcomes**

125 The course-specific learning outcomes were, students should be able to:

- A. Make necessary calculations to determine the optimal survey parameters and survey design based on site and available
 time.
- B. Integrate GNSS targets with ground-based lidar and SfM workflows to conduct a geodetic survey.
- 129 C. Process raw point cloud data and transform a point cloud into a digital elevation model (DEM).
- 130 D. Conduct an appropriate geomorphic analysis, such as geomorphic change detection.
- E. Justify which survey tools and techniques are most appropriate for a scientific question.
- 132

The course activities also helped students meet many of the NAGT Capstone Field Experience Learning Outcomes. These nine outcomes were developed by a group of 32 experienced field educators, who came together in spring 2020 to develop comprehensive learning outcomes for field experiences that are relevant to both in-person or online delivery modes (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_field/learning_outcomes.html). By the end of a capstone field experience, whether that experience is online or in-person, students should be able to:

- 138 1. Design a field strategy to collect or select data in order to answer a geologic question.
- Collect accurate and sufficient data on field relationships and record these using disciplinary conventions (field notes, map symbols, etc.).

3. Synthesize geologic data and integrate with core concepts and skills into a cohesive spatial and temporal scientific interpretation.

- 143 4. Interpret earth systems and past/current/future processes using multiple lines of spatially distributed evidence.
- 144 5. Develop an argument that is consistent with available evidence and uncertainty.
- Communicate clearly using written, verbal, and/or visual media (e.g., maps, cross-sections, reports) with discipline specific terminology appropriate to your audience.
- 147 7. Work effectively independently and collaboratively (e.g., commitment, reliability, leadership, open for advice,148 channels of communication, supportive, inclusive).
- 149 8. Reflect on personal strengths and challenges (e.g. in study design, safety, time management, independent and150 collaborative work).
- 9. Demonstrate behaviors expected of professional geoscientists (e.g., time management, work preparation, collegiality,
 health and safety, ethics).
- 153
- Table 1 shows the alignment between the daily activities and course-specific and NAGT learning outcomes. It also
- 155 provides links to the activity pages within the NAGT *Online Field Teaching Activities* collection.

156 2.4 Field site and prepared data

- 157 The course field site was the Cache la Poudre River at Sheep Draw Open Space (City of Greeley Natural Areas) in northern
- 158 Colorado. It was selected because: 1) the site shows both standard river features and evidence of extreme flooding; 2) the
 - 6

159 Poudre River is important to several local communities; and 3) the site is proximal to the UNC campus. According to the 160 Coalition for the Poudre River Watershed, "The Cache la Poudre River Watershed drains approximately 1,056 square miles above the canyon mouth west of Fort Collins, Colorado. The watershed supports the Front Range cities of Fort Collins, Greeley, 161 162 Timnath and Windsor. In an average year, the watershed produces approximately 274,000 acre feet of water. More than 80 peak Julv" 163 percent of the production occurs during the snowmelt months of April through 164 (https://www.poudrewatershed.org/cache-la-poudre-watershed). In 2013, the Front Range and plains of Colorado experienced extensive flooding. The region received the average annual rainfall in one week (Gochis et al., 2015). There was extensive 165 damage to infrastructure and in some cases the erosion of a 1000-years' worth of weathered material (Anderson et al., 2015). 166 167 Near Greeley, significant portions of the Poudre trail were impacted as the river topped its floodplain and eroded its banks. The study site is adjacent to the Poudre Trail, with portions of the former trail eroded into the river and the current trail rerouted 168 around the 2013-developed river course. 169

170

Data for student use was collected from the Poudre River by a joint UNAVCO-UNC team in May 2020. The types of data included were:

- UAS-collected photographs for SfM point cloud generation (DJI Mavic 2 Pro)
- Point clouds collected using TLS (Riegl VZ400)
- Several hours of GNSS base station data (Septentrio Altus APS3G)
- GNSS-measured ground control points locations for georeferencing both SfM and TLS surveys (Septentrio Altus APS3G)
- Videos of field site and field methods

179 **3 Methods**

180 This course was developed and implemented in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the need for students to fulfil degree 181 requirements and not designed as an educational research study before implementation. Thus, there are inherent limitations to 182 the available data and conclusions that can be drawn from the project. Nonetheless, there is value in sharing this robust open-183 source curriculum, describing how the course was implemented, and outlining how student learning outcomes were assessed and achieved. This study went through the Institutional Review Board at University of Northern Colorado, which determined 184 185 this project to be exempt under 45 CFR 46.104(d)(704) for research, Category 4. Therefore, course artefacts and student 186 demographic data can be used in research so long as no identifying information is revealed. Student artefacts included submitted assignments, unit reports, posts from a daily Slack discussion forum and unsolicited feedback given directly to the 187 188 instructor. We extracted examples from artefacts and associated assessments to illustrate students' accomplishments and 189 evaluate whether the course, and to a lesser extent, NAGT capstone field learning outcomes were met. We describe Course

- 190 Implementation and Assessment Approach in Section 4, and alignment with course-specific (5.1) and other outcomes (5.2) in
- 191 Section 5. We finish with Lessons Learned and Implementation Recommendations in Section 6.

192 4 Course Implementation and Assessment Approach

193 This section gives a brief overview of each course activity (Table 1) and which Course-specific Learning Outcomes and NAGT 194 Outcomes are at least partially addressed. Table 2 is an example of the type of rubric used in grading simple student assignment 195 answers, such as in daily assignments, with discretion used to assign percentages within these ranges. Most questions also had points-possible indicated so that students could gauge their relative significance towards the grade. Multi-component rubrics 196 197 were used for more in-depth exercises, such as unit reports. In such cases, students were informed of the weighted percent for 198 each section (e.g., title, abstract, introduction, etc.) and also given a detailed description of what should be included in each 199 (https://d32ogoqmya1dw8.cloudfront.net/files/NAGTWorkshops/online_field/courses/sfm_feasibility_report.v2.docx). The 200 same simple rubric (Table 2) was used to assess each weighted section. For example, the Discussion section was weighted 20 201 % and students were instructed:

- "Here, you can discuss both pros and cons of the methods (What worked? Didn't work? What would improve the workflow?) as well as what you discovered about the Poudre River at the site. Return to the question of feasibility. Consider the overall goal of using SfM to assess geomorphic processes on the Poudre River at Sheep Draw. How could SfM be applied? What are the limitations?"
- 206 Similarly detailed instructions accompanied all components for the more in-depth exercises.

207 4.1 Day 1: Getting started with Structure from Motion (SfM) photogrammetry

208 Course Unit 1: SfM and GPS/GNSS started out on Day 1 with an introduction to the SfM method. The day's activities were 209 the first step in addressing Course Outcomes A (survey design) and C (point cloud data). After an overview presentation 210 students used smartphone cameras to take ~20 overlapping photos of an object of interest (ex. sofa, shed, berm). For simplicity 211 and to learn about local reference frames (rather than global ones from GNSS) they took compass bearing, inclination, and distance measurements and used trigonometry to calculate X-Y-Z coordinates for the ground control points (GCP). Students 212 213 used Agisoft MetaShape software to post-process their photos and create the 3D point clouds. The software was available on 214 their personal computers through a 30-day trial licence. Students then evaluated the performance of their model by considering 215 data quality in different model regions and what method changes might improve their product. They also made 216 recommendations for how SfM could be applied to different fields in the geosciences. The assessment of student learning was 217 based on successful production of a locally-referenced point cloud and the data quality analysis.

218 4.2 Day 2: Introduction to GPS/GNSS

219 In the Day 1 activity, students used a relative local coordinate system to produce an accurately-scaled model. However, for 220 real-world applications a global coordinate system is frequently preferable, which can be achieved with survey-grade 221 GPS/GNSS; so Day 2 was focused on Course Outcomes A (survey design), B (GNSS and geodetic survey), and E (justifying 222 techniques). Day 2 morning activities were adapted from the GETSI module High Precision Positioning with Static and 223 Kinematic GPS/GNSS. First students learned about the method through a lecture. Next they worked with data collected using 224 different types of receivers and resulting accuracy and precision. Assessment included a concept sketch of GPS/GNSS systems, 225 quantification and evaluation of accuracy and precision of different grades of GNSS, and recommendations for appropriate 226 applications of each.

227 In the afternoon of Day 2, students were introduced to the field site and methods used for data collection at the Cache 228 la Poudre field location (described above in Section 2). Students watched a video (Video 1; https://youtu.be/EZ518Ge8YjI) about the field site and a video introducing the GNSS methods (Video 2; https://youtu.be/Xpj1QJf8AkY). Then, using the pre-229 230 collected base-station data, students completed the assignment Post-Processing GPS/GNSS Base Station Position. Students 231 submitted the base station file to the Online Positioning User Service (OPUS), the National Geodetic Survey (NGS)-operated system for baseline processing of standardised RINEX files into fixed (static) positions. For the assessment, students wrote a 232 233 paragraph explaining their procedure, interpreting the results, describing the difference between ellipsoid height and 234 orthometric height, and highlighting anything that was surprising or confusing about the results.

235 **4.3 Day 3: SfM of Poudre River at Sheep Draw Reach**

236 On Day 3 students combined skills learned in the previous two days in order to create a georeferenced point cloud from the 237 field site (Course Outcomes A-C) and started to consider relevant geomorphic analyses (Outcome D). The morning exercise 238 was Ground Control Points and SfM at Cache la Poudre Site. This began with a group discussion on where ground control 239 points at the site should be placed within the field area (Figure 1). Students were then given a text file of the x, y, z coordinates 240 (UTM) collected by the UNAVCO-UNC team, and had to import them into ArcGIS to create a ground control point map. In 241 a follow-up discussion, students compared the ground control point locations actually used in the prepared data with the 242 locations they discussed for placement in the initial discussion. They were asked to summarise the strengths and weaknesses 243 of the implemented ground control point plan at the site, which helped to assess learning related to both survey design outcomes. 244

The afternoon exercise was *Structure from Motion for Analysis of River Characteristics*. Students picked either Area of Interest 1 or 2 for their SfM workflow (Figure 1). Students with adequate computing power could choose to do the entire study region. Using resolution and height information about the UAS-collect photographs, students first calculated the expected resolution of the final point cloud. They were then asked to assess what types of features or processes at the Cache la Poudre study area they expected could be resolved; from there, they discussed the types of geomorphic questions they could 250 feasibly expect to answer with the dataset of that resolution. Next students followed a more detailed Agisoft MetaShape Guide 251 to construct a georeferenced point cloud of their Area of Interest. As they were familiar with MetaShape from Day 1, students 252 were able to work through the procedure independently. Once their model was complete, students were asked to answer a 253 series of questions related to error analysis of their model and to reassess appropriate geomorphic applications and design of 254 the ground control point network used. Finally, students were asked to formulate a testable hypothesis related to processes on 255 the Cache la Poudre River that they could answer with their dataset. For example, students could investigate cutbank stable 256 bank heights and angles. The completed exercise was the summative assessment and particularly revealed student 257 accomplishment of SfM point cloud creation and geomorphic analysis.

4.4 Day 4: Using CloudCompare and Classifying with CANUPO

259 On Day 4, students used the open-source software CloudCompare (http://www.danielgm.net/cc/), which allows for viewing and manipulation of point clouds. This was a continuation of the same learning outcomes as Day 3 afternoon (Outcomes C 260 261 and D) and continued on to some justification of methods (Outcome E). Students learned the basic operations used in 262 CloudCompare, such as importing point clouds, classifying the points, and taking measurements that allow for hypothesis testing. They also incorporated an open-source plugin called CANUPO (http://nicolas.brodu.net/en/recherche/canupo/) that 263 264 facilitates additional point cloud classification (Brodu and Lague, 2012), such as distinguishing between vegetation and ground. Students create a digital elevation model (DEM) from ground points and export it for use in ESRI ArcGIS Map. In 265 ArcGIS, students familiarized themselves with viewing 3D data in 2.5D and created hillshade and slope maps. Then they were 266 267 asked to retest their hypothesis with tools available in ArcGIS and 2.5D (e.g. measure tool, raster values). Students compared 268 and contrasted applications with the three-dimensional point cloud versus 2.5D raster and summarised the appropriate uses 269 and applications of each in the day's assignment.

270 4.5 Day 5: SfM Feasibility Report Assignment

The summative assessment for Course Unit 1 was the *SfM Feasibility Report*, which included assessment of all five Course Outcomes. Students were to imagine themselves as natural resource managers and assigned the task of investigating the feasibility of using SfM to study geomorphic processes on the Cache la Poudre River. They were asked to summarize the SfM workflow and present the outcomes, limitations, and suggested applications of their SfM model of their Poudre Area of Interest. On Day 5, students were given a work day to complete the report.

276 **4.6 Day 6: Optional Field Trip**

Day 6 consisted of an optional field demonstration during which students completed a GNSS ground control survey and
Bywater-Reyes and colleagues collected UAS images at the Poudre Learning Center (https://youtu.be/s5CGhk8GIOU;
Bywater-Reyes, Sharon: Poudre Learning Center Project. https://doi.org/10.5446/54388).

4.7 Day 7: Introduction to Terrestrial Laser Scanning (TLS)

281 Day 7 was the start of Course Unit 2: TLS, Topographic Differencing, and Method Comparison and began with an introduction to TLS methodology through a video and lecture. The exercise used pre-collected TLS data that the students were asked to 282 283 compare and contrast with the SfM point cloud they had developed in Unit 1, which was collected from the same geographic location (Cache la Poudre River) on the same day (Figure 3). The learning outcomes primarily focused on Outcome C (point 284 285 clouds) but also laid the groundwork for more advanced method comparison to come (Outcome E). Students visually inspected 286 the datasets for similarities and differences; then they measured geomorphic features in the scene and compared their 287 measurements for the two methods. Using skills gained in previous class activities, students classified the TLS cloud into vegetation and ground, exported the ground cloud as a text file, and created a raster that matched the specifications of the one 288 made in the SfM activity. This prepared for 3D (cloud-to-cloud differencing) and raster differencing in Day 8. Assessment 289 290 (mostly formative) was based on their completion of measurements and a discussion of methods comparison, including a group 291 discussion.

292 **4.8 Day 8: Point Cloud/Raster Differencing and Change Detection**

293 On the morning of Day 8 students used the concepts of point cloud and raster differencing to further compare their SfM and TLS results and interpret differences between the methods (Outcomes C and E). After a lecture on point cloud differencing, 294 295 students proceeded with differencing of the SfM and TLS data for their area of interest using CloudCompare with the M3C2 296 Plugin (Lague et al., 2012). Since these datasets were collected at the same place on the same day, differences between the 297 datasets were due to errors or uncertainties in one or both of the models. Students were asked to interpret the 3D differences 298 between the datasets. The second lecture, on raster differencing, discussed best practices in preparing rasters for differencing 299 (Wheaton et al., 2010). Students then used ArcGIS Raster Calculator tool to subtract one raster from the other. Students 300 interpreted the results and compared the differences between 3D (point cloud), and 2.5D (raster) differencing. The summative 301 assessment was the assignment in which students interpreted their results as an error analysis and discussed which dataset they 302 think is more accurate (and why) and which method provided the most robust error analysis.

303 So that the students could gain experience with airborne lidar data and with actual geomorphic change detection, 304 during Day 8 afternoon they were given two lidar-derived raster datasets collected before and after the 2013 floods of the 305 Colorado Front Range on a river (South St. Vrain Creek) that experienced substantial geomorphic change. In the exercise *DEM* 306 *of Difference* students practised raster differencing skills in the context of geomorphic change detection and also characterised 307 their detection limit with a simple thresholding approach. This helped to further address Outcomes C and D as students 308 answered questions in the assignment about the differencing method and made a series of calculations that pertained to 309 geomorphic change.

310 4.9 Day 9: OpenTopography Data Sources and Topographic Differencing

- 311 To broaden student knowledge of data availability, Day 9 focused on additional high resolution (usually lidar) data sources.
- 312 After a lecture, students conducted an assignment using existing high-resolution datasets housed within OpenTopography (OT;
- 313 https://opentopography.org/). First, students practised downloading and viewing data from OT; second students conducted a
- topographic differencing exercise (Crosby et al., 2011), complementing the point cloud and raster differencing students
- 315 conducted in Day 8. As with Day 8 afternoon, the learning outcomes primarily focused on point clouds and geomorphic
- analysis (C and D). The learning assessment was done via the student assignment, in which students determine erosion and
- 317 deposition in a dune field and analyse error and detection thresholds.

318 4.10 Days 10 and 11: Methods Comparison Report and Presentation

The summative assessment for Course Unit 2 and the course as a whole was the final *Methods Comparison Report* and presentations in the last two days of the course. Students picked from a variety of options including: improving methods from Unit 1 (SfM and TLS methods), adding new elements to Unit 1, choosing an additional exploration with the datasets collected on the optional field day, or using a different dataset such as airborne lidar. As the course summative assessment the report pulled together student learning on all five course outcomes. The presentation (Day 11) additionally gave students practice in oral presentation of scientific findings.

325 **5 Results**

326 5.1 Course-specific learning outcomes

This section provides a variety of examples of how students met the different course-specific learning outcomes. It is not intended to be exhaustive but to provide general illustrations of student learning drawn from both assignments and Slack daily reflections and discussions.

5.1.1 A) Make necessary calculations to determine the optimal survey parameters and survey design based on site conditions and available time

In the GNSS/GPS accuracy and precision activity (Day 2), students showed their ability to evaluate appropriate GPS/GNSS techniques in different contexts with the GPS/GNSS error analysis activity (Day 2). Students calculated and compared accuracy and precision of different GNSS/GPS methods and (Day 2) explained which types of surveys or research applications are appropriate for each. Students received an average of an 89 % of this assignment (exemplary), evidence of their ability to link calculations to applications. Students also completed a concept sketch of GNSS systems (Figure 4) describing what factors can interfere with GNSS performance. 339 In the SfM activity (Day 3), students calculated the pixel resolution resulting from the flight parameters used in the pre-collected UAS images and assessed the appropriateness of this resolution to resolve features within the flight. One student 340 341 wrote in their assignment, "Obviously the larger scale features will be resolved, like the eroded bank, point bar, and the sidewalk panels in the river, as well as most sizes of vegetation. If the sampling is 0.3-0.5 centimetres per pixel, then it should 342 343 be able to resolve grasses, and just about any size of gravel. The difference between the water surface and adjacent should be 344 pretty well resolved as well." They were also given the UAS flight time for the survey. Thus, students could easily adapt this 345 approach to calculate the time it would take to accomplish a flight reaching the desired resolution for a given application. The 346 discussion of implementation of ground control at the field site (Day 3) allowed students to compare the actual implementation 347 with literature-recommended protocols to discuss strengths and weaknesses given the site conditions (Figure 5). Students also 348 showed the ability to discern improvements to the survey plan given the site condition. For example, one student wrote: "I 349 think the GCPs [Ground Control Points] are very well placed in area-1 and area-2. But the adjoining area of both the areas 350 only got two GCPs- GC4 and GC10 which is too [few]. It may reduce the accuracy of map while joining area-1 and area-2. 351 In addition, area-2 has only one GCP in North direction which may become an issue during georeferencing. To be on safer side we may include one more GCP near GC9 to ensure the coverage of area-2. If only 9 GCPs are available to me then I 352 353 think the current arrangement of GCP is best." Students received an average of 98 % (exemplary) on this discussion, 354 highlighting their ability to evaluate appropriate methods given site conditions.

338

355 5.1.2 B) Integrate GNSS targets with ground-based lidar and SfM workflows to conduct a geodetic survey

Students used pre-collected GNSS-measured ground control points to georeference the resulting SfM point cloud in the Day 356 357 3 SfM activity. As described in the previous section (5.1.1), students integrated the GNSS data into the SfM projects and also discussed the overall survey design and resulting model errors. The suite of activities that used pre-collected GNSS data was 358 359 successful as indicated by assessment data and student discussions (5.1.1). Whereas students did integrate GNSS targets with an SfM workflow to conduct a geodetic survey, they did not actively integrate GNSS targets for the TLS workflow. The lack 360 361 of TLS-target integration stemmed from the remote nature of the course and pre-collected nature of the field campaign whereas 362 an in-person implementation would have allowed students to be actively involved with TLS target GNSS data collection and integration. Future remote implementations would need an activity that involves students in TLS GNSS targets data collection 363 364 and post-processing to meet this learning outcome. However, given the complicated nature of TLS data post-processing, the 365 authors recommend a simple activity such as a discussion of recommended scan locations and a comparison of actual GNSS target locations compared to the recommendation (e.g., similar to that conducted for the SfM field project). In a virtual course 366 367 format, this learning outcome would need to be edited in the future.

5.1.3 C) Process raw point cloud data and transform a point cloud into a digital elevation model (DEM)

369 Students practised and successfully converted raw point clouds to DEM's several times (Day 4 and Day 7), and also learned how to use the native MetaShape point cloud classification (Day 3) as well as the open-source CANUPO (Day 4) version. 370 371 When comparing point cloud versus raster elevation products, a student wrote: "It was hypothesized that SfM methodologies 372 would be best at providing measurements of large-scale elevation changes, however the clear decrease in point cloud density 373 decreased our confidence in these large-scale elevation change measurements along the bank. Small-scale elevation changes 374 along the point bar were best represented by the ArcMap generated hillshade map and DEM while large-scale elevation 375 changes were best represented by the ArcMap generated slope map and DEM. The slope map also had the unique feature of 376 highlighting areas of constant slope and could be used to distinguish between manmade structures and natural vegetation areas in a site of flood damage." Here, the student showed their ability to recognize pros and cons of point cloud versus raster 377 378 (DEM) products. Students received an average of 84 % (exemplary) on the raster derivation and manipulation assignment and did even better when they repeated this process. Students received an average of 89 % (exemplary) on the TLS assignment, 379 380 where they were asked to repeat the process of conducting a quantitative analysis on the cloud, classify the point cloud, extract 381 ground points, and create a DEM, showing their ability to repeat a workflow originally implemented over several days in one 382 step independently to produce a DEM.

5.1.4 D) Conduct an appropriate geomorphic analysis, such as geomorphic change detection

With the SfM and TLS field datasets, students recognized the limitation of having only one time snap. A student reported: *"Structure from Motion to assess geomorphic processes on the Poudre River at Sheep Draw is useful and easy to operate. In this project we used SfM to create a model that can measure bank erosion and deposition. However, we did not have enough information to analyse the rate at which the river was eroding the bank. To conduct this study we would need to conduct several SfM surveys over a length of time to acquire enough variance in data to calculate a rate.*" This statement illustrates the student's recognition of the utility of repeat topographic data needed to conduct a geomorphic change analysis that would be appropriate to answer a geomorphic question they had posed.

391 In the context of comparing SfM and TLS data collected at the field site at the same time, students conducted point 392 cloud and raster differencing (Day 8). Students received an average score of 78 % (low-end of exemplary) on this 393 assignment and extrapolated how one could apply these methods to geomorphic change detection. A student noted in their 394 daily Slack discussion, "Learning about DoD [DEM of Difference] was a little confusing to me and some of the assignment 395 parts threw me off but other than that I felt like I learned good things today!" Another that: "Today's work was a lot more 396 confusing than the last couple days, but it's much more satisfying." Students illustrated their enthusiasm for manipulated point clouds. A student wrote in their daily discussion, "Today I enjoyed getting visible products using ArcMap and Cloud 397 398 Compare." In comparing the SfM and TLS datasets, a student demonstrated their understanding of how the differencing 399 would be used in the context of geomorphic change by stating: "During geomorphological analysis, magnitude and

400 direction are both important. Areas that are positive show deposition, while negative areas show erosion."

401 Students conducted lidar geomorphic change detection with the Day 8 afternoon activity using regional LiDAR from Colorado 2013 floods and Day 9 (OpenTopography change detection). Students received the lowest assignment scores 402 403 on these, with 50 % and 75 %, respectively (basic to minimal performance level). This may indicate a combination of confusion and burnout two-thirds of the way through the intensive two-week course. 35 % and 17 % of assignments, 404 405 respectively, were assigned a 0 % because submissions were missing. If only submitted assignments are considered, average 406 scores are much higher (76 % and 92 %, respectively), indicating those who were able to stay on top of the dense course 407 format were able to perform geomorphic change detection to an exemplary level. Students' scores on the Unit 2 report, 408 which combined elements from the entire course, support the notion that students may have been fatigued and prioritising 409 assignments worth more points. Average Report 2 scores were the same as Report 1 scores (76 %). One student even went so 410 far as to download airborne lidar for the Cache la Poudre River and compare SfM, TLS, and airborne lidar for the same area, 411 showing their ability to combine skill taught in the course and use DEM differencing analysis for either error or geomorphic 412 change detection, depending on the context.

413 5.1.5 E) Justify which survey tools and techniques are most appropriate for a scientific question

The progression from the introductory SfM project (Day 1) to a field-scale SfM and TLS comparison (Report 2) allowed students to assess limitations and justify appropriateness of survey techniques to different applications and scientific questions. Students highlighted where their intro SfM projects (Day 1) produced accurate point clouds and under which conditions the point clouds had missing data or high error (Figure 6). They were asked to reflect on field applications appropriate for a model of a similar quality. In the field SfM (Day 3) and TLS (Day 7) activities, students explained where the three dimensional models had adequate coverage for different applications.

For the SfM field assignment (Day 3), students considered model errors (Figure 7) and classification performance in their assessment of appropriateness for scientific questions. Students received an average of 88 % on the SfM field assignment (exemplary work), which asked them to think about the questions they set out to answer and discuss whether this would be possible given the errors and limitations of the model. A student noted:

- 424 "Given the limitations of the model, I'm not sure if I'll be able to answer the question about the vegetation, and I may be able
 425 to work on the erosion, but I'm not sure. There are three questions I would like to answer:
- 426 *1. Can we identify a flood plain in the area?*
- 427 2. Is the erosion on the bank from normal flow, or the 2013 flooding?
- 428 *3. Can we determine the erosion rate on the banks?*

429 I believe at least the third question can be quantifiable, but the other two might also be quantifiable. The flood plain may be
430 calculated, but a larger image may be needed. The erosion may also be quantifiable. Erosion rate is most likely measurable

because we can use the sand bar on the other side of the river as a measure of erosion. Some larger images, and some more
up-close images of the bank may be needed to answer these questions."

433 Several students observed the limitations of SfM in the presence of vegetation: A student observed: "Pros of using 434 SFM method is that it can create high resolution data sets at relatively low costs. A negative aspect about this method is that 435 it cannot generate any data through vegetation and so the environment this method can be used in is limited." Another 436 student noted: "Unlike LiDAR technology which is able to image past vegetation and "see" the ground, SfM images cannot 437 see through foliage. While multiple angles of a site can help create ground points beneath vegetation, thick foliage will 438 always have to be removed from the dataset if one is trying to use SfM to create a Digital Elevation Model rather than a 439 Digital Surface Model. Erroneous points below the surface of the water also were prevalent in the 3D point cloud and 440 needed to be removed." An additional student observation was: "It would be useful to conduct a study in the summer and 441 winter every year to analyze the change in bank height and distance from the river to the walking path. This method can be 442 done with SfM, but it would be best to use several types of surveying methods to create an accurate set of data because SfM 443 lacks the ability to see beneath trees, vegetation, and the undercut bank due to the drone being 40 to 50 meters in the air. 444 Therefore, terrestrial and airborne lidar should be used to image the areas where SfM lacks." When comparing SfM and 445 TLS (Day 7) a student noted in their daily Slack discussion post, "I was surprised at the difference in quality between the SfM and TLS. I would think TLS would have much higher quality data but perhaps this site was not a prime example of its 446 447 capabilities." These observations show students understood the limitations and appropriateness of SfM and TLS surveying 448 and also show the ability to improve upon future acquisitions through editing the data collection protocol.

449

450 **5.2 Other course outcomes**

451 **5.2.1 NAGT outcomes**

This course operated under difficult conditions (e.g., global pandemic), but allowed students to meet degree requirements and accomplish course-specific learning outcomes in addition to meeting many of the capstone field experience student learning outcomes developed by the field teaching community in collaboration with NAGT (Section 2.3; Table 1). Assessing whether each NAGT outcome was met is beyond the scope of this manuscript, however, a few that were especially well addressed, and also those that were not, are highlighted here.

457 NAGT Outcomes 1-5 were practised in many assignments and were highly aligned with course-specific outcomes 458 (Table 1). Students did not specifically design a field strategy in its entirety (NAGT Outcome 1), but they did assess the 459 strengths and weaknesses of field strategies and recommend improvements in order to answer a geologic question. This was, 460 for example, met along with course-specific Outcomes A and B (see Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2). They additionally collected 461 data that allowed them to assess field relationships and record those with both 2D conventional maps (NAGT Outcome 2) as

well as with 3D representations, well-represented by course-specific Outcome C (see Section 5.1.3). A related outcome (NAGT 462 463 Outcome 6), communicating these products through written products was accomplished through all daily assignments in addition to the two written reports. Verbal communication was accomplished through group discussions as well as group oral 464 465 presentations at the end of the course, which also aligned with NAGT Outcome 7 (working in a collaborative team). Students 466 synthesised data, integrating information spatially and temporally, to test hypotheses concerning the past/current/future 467 conditions of an earth system using multiple lines of spatially distributed evidence (NAGT Outcomes 3 and 4). In particular, 468 Course-specific Outcome D can be referenced for examples (see Section 5.1.4). Finally, students developed arguments 469 consistent with available evidence and uncertainty (NAGT Outcomes 5) aligns with Course-specific Outcome E (see Section 470 5.1.5).

The NAGT outcomes that received less intentional attention were the last two: "NAGT Outcome 8: Reflect on personal strengths and challenges (e.g., in study design, safety, time management, independent and collaborative work)" and "NAGT Outcome 9: Demonstrate behaviors expected of professional geoscientists (e.g., time management, work preparation, collegiality, health and safety, ethics)." Students reflected on personal strengths and challenges (NAGT Outcome 8) and discussed time-management strategies in an informal way in their daily Slack discussion posts. Students wrote:

476 "I also struggled with the excel worksheet today. It started making more sense towards the end, I will definitely have
477 to go back and rewatch the meetings to grasp everything that is going on. For the GNSS sketch assignment, I'm not exactly
478 sure what exactly this questions is asking if anyone could help, thank you!"

479 "Today's work was not as confusing as the past few days. Having background knowledge on ArcMap definitely
480 helped, but Cloud Compare took a while to maneuver. Just trying to keep up with the assignments and get the readings done.
481 I'm trying to make it out on Sunday, though! I think the in-person field component will be really cool, and seeing other human
482 beings would be awesome haha. As [student name] mentioned, interpreting the models can be tricky and applying them back
483 to what we've been learning takes time, but really helps! Those connections do a great job to solidify the lessons."

484 "I think my biggest challenge today is interpreting all the models (DEM, hillshade, slope, etc) and what each one can
485 be used for. I used USGS satellite images and classified them years ago in ArcMap for a project but I feel like I remember
486 almost nothing from that so I'm a little lost!"

I'm still catching up from yesterday as well, but I feel significantly better than I did 24 hours ago! I remember just
enough about ArcMap for it to be fun to figure out new challenges rather than frustrating, and I think that that was a nice
boost after previous frustrations.

490 **5.2.2 Demographic outcomes**

491 The cancellation of many field courses and change to remote instruction culminated in a more diverse course than UNC Earth 492 Science majors typical demographic makeup. Students came from a wider variety of geographic regions, including six US 493 states, one US territory, and one international location. Twenty-four percent of students (out of class of 23) were from 494 historically marginalized groups (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or LatinX, 495 and Multiracial) and 56 % were female compared to the 2011-2020 UNC Earth Science majors' averages of 17 % and 39 %, 496 respectively. Remote instruction may therefore aid in increasing representation in marginalized groups. At least 40 % of 497 students needed the course to meet degree requirements and most of the seven graduate students needed the expertise for their

498 graduate research.

499 6 Lessons Learned and Implementation Recommendations

Despite the challenging conditions under which this course was implemented, the course was highly successful overall by a 500 501 number of metrics, including frequently exemplary-level accomplishment on assessments and nearly all students passing the 502 course. When course-specific learning outcomes are considered, the vast majority were met, as indicated by assignment-503 specific outcomes (section 5.1) as well as by their self reflection from the Slack daily discussion. In particular, students were 504 able to achieve Course-specific Outcomes A, C, D, and E (Section 2.3; Table 1) particularly well. Learning Outcome A (make 505 necessary calculations to determine the optimal survey parameters and survey design based on site conditions and available 506 time) was well-realised in terms of students' ability to understand the time it takes for post-processing and interpreting data of 507 a variety of types, and how one might improve upon the workflow. However, students did not receive the hands-on experience they would have in the field. For example, they are not able to evaluate the time to set-up an RTK GNSS system, lay out 508 509 ground control points, survey them in and fly a UAS over the area with an appropriate team. This allows one to know the 510 spatial extent one can realistically cover in a given time. Students did learn the time it takes to post-process the imagery into 511 an SfM model as well as derivative products (e.g., rasters). Students also did not accomplish a sense of the time required to 512 conduct a TLS survey. We realised in retrospect that Course Outcome B (Integrate GNSS targets with ground-based lidar and 513 SfM workflows to conduct a geodetic survey) was not fully accomplishable in the remote setting. Students were able to propose 514 and evaluate the design for ground control points in an SfM survey, but they were not able to actually "conduct" the survey. 515 Nor was the course able to provide an opportunity for similar experience in a lidar survey. If the course is taught remotely in 516 the future, this outcome should be rewritten to something more along the lines of "Recommend locations for a set of ground 517 control points for an SfM and/or TLS survey and critique surveys designed by others." The current Outcome B would be 518 appropriate for an in-person field course in its presented form.

The lowest level of accomplishment in the course came during the Day 8-9 assignments (5.1.4). As described, this is likely because of a combination of difficulty and burnout. This course was moved to virtual because of safety concerns surrounding COVID-19. However, the time commitment was kept the same as originally scheduled for in-person. As such, the course was about two weeks (for three credits) fulltime (all day plus homework), similar to what would be expected for a traditional in-person field-camp style course. This schedule proved exhausting with the online (Zoom lecture and office hours) commitments for the course (morning and afternoon) combined with the computer-intensive nature of the assignments. In particular, challenges in this format included 1) computational access (e.g., a good enough computer) and 2) access to the time

526 and space needed to complete the course. Several students dropped the course when they realised these constraints because of 527 work and family obligations. However, of the 23 students who stayed enrolled in the course, 48 % received an A, 17 % a B, and 26 % a C, with A, B, or C marks comprising 91 % of the course. This demonstrates a high level of competence and 528 529 performance for the vast majority of students. One student earned a D (corresponding to 60.0 % - 69.9 %) by completing 70 % of the assignments. This student expressed difficulty focusing for the length of time required for the course's pace. There 530 531 was one student who earned an F which reflected participating and turning in only one day's worth of assignments. These 532 students, while the minority (2 out of 23), should not be ignored. Studies suggest COVID exacerbated the ongoing mental 533 health crisis among college students, increasing depression and anxiety (Son et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020). The combination 534 of COVID-19-related stress, virtual nature of the course, and intensity of workload likely contributed to feelings of anxiety in this course. We recommend, if this course is taught virtually in the future, to implement it as a longer interim session (minimum 535 four weeks), quarter-, or semester-long course. Additionally, having computers available in a lab or on loan with the 536 537 appropriate computational and software needs would be helpful. Students wrote in Slack reflections:

538

"The only struggle I am having is my computing capabilities and it always crashing."

539 "I had to keep my computer running last night to generate the dense point cloud, but am glad to see that this

540 morning it has finally finished so that I can finish up the assignment.

541 *"To improve the workflow when using this method in the future, a better computing device that can handle large*

542 files would be better"

If implemented as an intensive workshop, we recommend using at most four days' worth of material as presented here (eg., most of Unit 1). Any individual activity could be adapted as an assignment in an upper-division geomorphology or quantitative geoscience methods course. We are fairly certain that increasing the available time and support to complete the later assignments would mitigate the majority of the problem with lower student success, but we also suggest re-evaluating the later assignments for instructional clarity and supporting resources.

Lastly, student feedback and requests for additional offerings of the course indicate student appreciation of the course. One student wrote the instructor, "I just wanted to thank you for the class. I have had an incredible journey during my university experience. Without this class being offered I truly do not know what I would have done. This has been a very trying time in my life and completing this course was the push I needed to continue through. I can't thank you enough for doing this. Not only offering the class but how flexible you were and understanding. Hands down one of the best professors I have had to date. You are an incredible teacher and I am very grateful that I took this class with you. Once again, from the bottom of my heart, thank you!"

555	Code/Data	availability
-----	-----------	--------------

556 Not applicable

557 Data availability

558 Not applicable

559 **Competing interests**

560 The authors have no competing interests

561 Author contributions

562 Sharon Bywater-Reyes and Beth Pratt-Sitaula both contributed to field dataset collection used in the course. Both authors 563 contributed to the development of the curriculum presented. Both authors substantially wrote sections of the manuscript and 564 contributed to the revision process. Bywater-Reyes compiled the student evidence presented.

565 Acknowledgments

566 We thank Keith Williams and Erika Schreiber (UNAVCO), Ara Metz, Chelsie Romulo, and James Doerner for field data 567 collection support and the City of Greeley and the Poudre Learning Center for field site access. Special thanks to Melissa 568 Weinrich for insightful review and recommendations for revisions on this manuscript.

569

- 571 Abbott, D.: Disrupting the "whiteness" of fieldwork in geography, Singap. J. Trop. Geogr., 27(3), 326–341, 572 doi:10.1111/j.1467-9493.2006.00265.x, 2006.
- 573 Abeyta, A., Fernandes, A. M., Mahon, R. C. and Swanson, T.: The true cost of field education is a barrier to diversifying
- 574 geosciences, Earth ArXiv, 12 [online] Available from: https://eartharxiv.org/repository/view/2091/ (Accessed 13 August 575 2021), 2020.
- Ali, W.: Online and Remote Learning in Higher Education Institutes: A Necessity in light of COVID-19 Pandemic, High.
 Educ. Stud., 10(3), 16, doi:10.5539/hes.v10n3p16, 2020.
- Anderson, S. W., Anderson, S. P. and Anderson, R. S.: Exhumation by debris flows in the 2013 Colorado Front Range storm,
 Geology, 43(5), 391–394, doi:10.1130/G36507.1, 2015.
- 580 Bemis, S. P., Micklethwaite, S., Turner, D., James, M. R., Akciz, S., Thiele, S. T. and Bangash, H. A.: Ground-based and
- 581 UAV-Based photogrammetry: A multi-scale, high-resolution mapping tool for structural geology and paleoseismology, J.
- 582 Struct. Geol., 69(PA), 163–178, doi:10.1016/j.jsg.2014.10.007, 2014.
- 583 Brodu, N. and Lague, D.: 3D terrestrial lidar data classification of complex natural scenes using a multi-scale dimensionality
- criterion: Applications in geomorphology, ISPRS J. Photogramm. Remote Sens., 68, 121–134,
 doi:10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2012.01.006, 2012.
- Carabajal, I. G. and Atchison, C. L.: An investigation of accessible and inclusive instructional field practices in US geoscience
 departments, Adv. Geosci., 53, 53–63, doi:10.5194/adgeo-53-53-2020, 2020.
- 588 Crosby, C. J., Arrowsmith, J. R., Nandigam, V. and Baru, C.: Online access and processing of LiDAR topography data, in
- 589 Geoinformatics, vol. 9780521897150, edited by G. R. Keller and C. Baru, pp. 251–265, Cambridge University Press, 590 Cambridge., 2011.
- Egger, A., Atchison, C., Burmeister, K. C., Rademacher, L., Ryker, K. and Tikoff, B.: Teaching with online field experiences:
 New resources by the community, for the community, In The Trenches, 11 [online] Available from:
- 593 https://nagt.org/nagt/publications/trenches/v11-n1/online field experiences.html (Accessed 21 February 2022), 2021.
- 594 Elkins, J. T. and Elkins, N. M. L.: Teaching geology in the field: Significant geoscience concept gains in entirely field-based
- 595 introductory geology courses, J. Geosci. Educ., 55(2), 126–132, doi:10.5408/1089-9995-55.2.126, 2007.
- Fairchild, E., Newman, H., Sexton, J., Pugh, K. and Riggs, E.: 'Not to be stereotypical, but.'. Exclusive and inclusive gendered
 discourses about geology field experiences, J. Gend. Stud., 1–13, doi:10.1080/09589236.2021.1924644, 2021.
- 598 Gochis, D., Schumacher, R., Friedrich, K., Doesken, N., Kelsch, M., Sun, J., Ikeda, K., Lindsey, D., Wood, A., Dolan, B.,
- 599 Matrosov, S., Newman, A., Mahoney, K., Rutledge, S., Johnson, R., Kucera, P., Kennedy, P., Sempere-Torres, D., Steiner,
- 600 M., Roberts, R., Wilson, J., Yu, W., Chandrasekar, V., Rasmussen, R., Anderson, A. and Brown, B.: The great Colorado flood
- 601 of September 2013, Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 96(9), 1461–1487, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00241.1, 2015.
- 602 Hughes, R.: An investigation into the longitudinal identity trajectories of women in science, technology, engineering, and
 - 21

- 603 mathematics, J. Women Minor. Sci. Eng., 21(3), 181–213, doi:10.1615/JWomenMinorScienEng.2015013035, 2015.
- James, M. R., Chandler, J. H., Eltner, A., Fraser, C., Miller, P. E., Mills, J. P., Noble, T., Robson, S. and Lane, S. N.: Guidelines
- on the use of structure-from-motion photogrammetry in geomorphic research, Earth Surf. Process. Landforms, 44(10), 2081–
 2084, doi:10.1002/esp.4637, 2019.
- Kober, N.: Reaching students: What research says about effective instruction in undergraduate science and engineering,
 National Academies Press., 2015.
- 609 Lague, D., Brodu, N., Leroux, J., Rennes, G., Rennes, U. and Beaulieu, C. De: A new method for high precision 3D
- 610 deformation measurement of complex topography with terrestrial laser scanner : application to the Rangitikei canyon (N-Z),
- 611 , 1–30, 2012.
- 612 Mosher, S., Harrison, W., Huntoon, J., Keane, C., McConnell, D., Miller, K., Ryan, J., Summa, L., Villalobos, J. and White,
- 613 L.: Vision and Change in the Geosciences: The Future of Undergraduate Geoscience Education, edited by S. Mosher and C.
- 614 Keane, American Geosciences Institute. [online] Available from: https://www.americangeosciences.org/change/, 2021.
- 615 O'Connell, S. and Holmes, M. A.: Obstacles to the recruitment of minorities into the geosciences: A call to action, GSA Today,
- 616 21(6), 52–54, doi:10.1130/G105GW.1, 2011.
- 617 Passalacqua, P., Belmont, P., Staley, D. M., Simley, J. D., Arrowsmith, J. R., Bode, C. A., Crosby, C., DeLong, S. B., Glenn,
- 618 N. F., Kelly, S. A., Lague, D., Sangireddy, H., Schaffrath, K., Tarboton, D. G., Wasklewicz, T. and Wheaton, J. M.: Analyzing
- 619 high resolution topography for advancing the understanding of mass and energy transfer through landscapes: A review, Earth-
- 620 Science Rev., 148, 174–193, doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2015.05.012, 2015.
- Pratt-Sitaula, B., Crosby, B. and Crosby, C.: Integrating topographic imaging into geoscience field courses, in Eos (United
 States), vol. 98, p. 14, American Geophysical Union., 2017.
- 623 Robinson, S. E., Bohon, W., Kleber, E. J., Arrowsmith, J. R. and Crosby, C. J.: Applications of high-resolution topography in
- 624 Earth science education, Geosphere, 13(6), 1887–1900, doi:10.1130/GES01236.1, 2017.
- 625 Son, C., Hegde, S., Smith, A., Wang, X. and Sasangohar, F.: Effects of COVID-19 on College Students' Mental Health in the
- United States: Interview Survey Study, J Med Internet Res 2020;22(9)e21279 https://www.jmir.org/2020/9/e21279, 22(9),
- 627 e21279, doi:10.2196/21279, 2020.
- Tarolli, P.: High-resolution topography for understanding Earth surface processes: Opportunities and challenges,
 Geomorphology, 216, 295–312, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2014.03.008, 2014.
- 630 Wang, X., Hegde, S., Son, C., Keller, B., Smith, A. and Sasangohar, F.: Investigating Mental Health of US College Students
- 631 During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Cross-Sectional Survey Study, J Med Internet Res 2020;22(9)e22817
 632 https://www.jmir.org/2020/9/e22817, 22(9), e22817, doi:10.2196/22817, 2020.
- 633 Westoby, M. J., Brasington, J., Glasser, N. F., Hambrey, M. J. and Reynolds, J. M.: 'Structure-from-Motion' photogrammetry:
- A low-cost, effective tool for geoscience applications, Geomorphology, 179, 300–314, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2012.08.021,
- 635 2012.
- 636 Wheaton, J. M., Brasington, J., Darby, S. E. and Sear, D. a.: Accounting for uncertainty in DEMs from repeat topographic
 - 22

- 637 surveys: improved sediment budgets, Earth Surf. Process. Landforms, 156(December 2009), n/a-n/a, doi:10.1002/esp.1886,
- 638 2010.
- 639 Wilson, C.: Status of the Geoscience Workforce 2016, American Geosciences Institute, Alexandria, Virginia. [online]
- 640 Available from: https://store.americangeosciences.org/status-of-the-geoscience-workforce-2016.html, 2016.
- 641

642

643

644 Tables

645 Table 1. Activities by day and alignment with course-specific and NAGT learning outcomes.

Activity	Course-specific learning outcomes	NAGT capstone field learning outcomes
Course Unit 1: SfM and GPS/GNSS Day 1 - Getting started with Structure from Motion (SfM) photogrammetry (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_fi eld/activities/238996.html)	A. Survey design C. Point cloud and DEM	1, 2, 7
Day 2a - GPS/GNSS Fundamentals (https://serc.carleton.edu/getsi/teaching_materials/hi gh-precision/unit1.html)	A. Survey designB. GNSS and geodetic surveyE. Justify tools/techniques	1
Day 2b - Post-processing GPS/GNSS Base Station Position (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_fi eld/activities/239147.html)	B. GNSS and geodetic survey	1
Day 3a - Ground Control Points for Structure from Motion Activity (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_fi eld/activities/239349.html)	A. Survey design B. GNSS and geodetic survey	1-5, 7, 9
Day 3b - Structure from Motion for Analysis of River Characteristics Activity (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_fi eld/activities/239350.html)	C. Point cloud and DEM D. Geomorphic analysis	1-5
Day 4 - Working with Point Clouds in CloudCompare and Classifying with CANUPO (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_fi eld/activities/240357.html)	C. Point cloud and DEMD. Geomorphic analysisE. Justify tools and techniques	3-5
Day 5 - SfM Feasibility Report assignment (https://d32ogoqmya1dw8.cloudfront.net/files/NAG TWorkshops/online_field/courses/sfm_feasibility_re port.v2.docx)	 A. Survey design B. GNSS and geodetic survey C. Point cloud and DEM D. Geomorphic analysis E. Justify tools/techniques 	3-6
Day 6 - Optional field day	B. GNSS and geodetic survey	1, 7, 9

Course Unit 2: TLS, Topographic Differencing, and Method Comparison Day 7 - Introduction to Terrestrial Laser Scanning (TLS) (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_fi eld/activities/241028.html)	C. Point cloud and DEM (E. Justify tools/techniques)	3-7, 9
Day 8a - Point Cloud and Raster Change Detection (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_fi eld/activities/241083.html)	C. Point cloud and DEM E. Justify tools/techniques	3-7, 9
Day 8b - DEM of Difference (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_fi eld/activities/241138.html)	C. Point cloud and DEM D. Geomorphic analysis	3-7, 9
Day 9 - OpenTopography Data Sources and Topographic Differencing (https://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/online_fi eld/activities/241410.html)	C. Point cloud and DEM D. Geomorphic analysis	3-6, 9
Day 10 - Methods Comparison Report (https://d32ogoqmya1dw8.cloudfront.net/files/NAG TWorkshops/online_field/courses/methods_comparis on_report.docx)	A. Survey designC. Point cloud and DEMD. Geomorphic analysisE. Justify tools/techniques	3-6
Day 11 - Presentations	D. Geomorphic analysis6-7, 9E. Justify tools/techniques	

649 Table 2 - Example rubric showing percentage scoring used to assess course activities.

	Exemplary (75- 100% points)	Basic (50-75% points)	Minimal effort (25- 50%)	Nonperformance (0-25%)
General	Exemplary work	Basic work may	Minimal	Nonperformance
Considerations	will not just answer	answer all	performance occurs	occurs when
	all components of	components of the	when student	students are missing
	the given question	given question, but	answers simply do	large portions of the
	but also answer	answers are	not make sense and	assignment.
	correctly,	incorrect, ill-	are incorrect.	
	completely, and	considered, or		
	thoughtfully.	difficult to interpret		
	Attention to detail,	given the context of		
	as well as answers	the question. Basic		
	that are logical and	work may also be		
	make sense, is an	missing		
	important piece of	components of a		
	this.	given question.		
				1

652 Figures



654 Figure 1. Inset: Map (© Google Earth) of the Cache la Poudre River Watershed, located in northern Colorado, US. The study site

at Sheep Draw has two areas of interest, Area of Interest 1 on an eroded bank and Area of Interest 2, a cutbank and point bar.



- Figure 2. Base and Kinematic GNSS methods (left) and example of ground control (right) surveyed for use in GNSS and SfM
 activities.



Figure 3. The top shows the Terrestrial Laser Scanner (TLS) photograph from a scan location whereas the bottom shows the
 associated point cloud at the Cache la Poudre River site. Courtesy UNAVCO.



Figure 4: Student sketch of how GNSS works, including disruptions and applications thereof demonstrating theoretical
understanding of GNSS (created by student in course for Day 2 activity; student not disclosed to comply with Institutional Review
Board).

Sheep Draw Ground Control Points



- 676 Figure 5. Student map of ground control points (GCPs) used in SfM activity (created by student in course; student not disclosed to
- 677 comply with Institutional Review Board). Through a group discussion on Day 2, students discussed whether GCPs were adequately

30

- 678 placed and suggested implementation improvements. Imagery source: ArcGIS® software by Esri.
- 679



Figure 6: Student SfM product from Day 1 exercise (created by student in course; student not disclosed to comply with Institutional
 Review Board). Student successfully assessed relative data quality as indicated by student's markup, and where data was missing

- 683 or of low quality.





690 Figure 7. Student-generated colored SfM point cloud of their area of interest showing GCP error ellipsoids used by the student in

691 their SfM error analysis (created by student in course; student not disclosed to comply with Institutional Review Board).

692

693