Virtual Fieldtrips Utilising Virtual Outcrop: Construction, Delivery, and Implications for the Future

Jessica H. Pugsley[1], John A. Howell[1], Adrian Hartley[1], Simon J. Buckley[2], Rachel Brackenridge[1], Nicholas Schofield[1], Gail Maxwell[1], Magda Chmielewska[1], Kari Ringdal[2], Nicole Naumann[2], Joris Vanbiervliet[2]

[1]School of Geosciences, University of Aberdeen, Kings College, Aberdeen AB24 3UE, UK
[2]NORCE Norwegian Research Centre, P.O. Box 22 Nygårdstangen, N-5838 Bergen, Norway

Correspondence to: jessica.pugsley@abdn.ac.uk

Abstract

The advent of photorealistic, 3D computer models of cliff sections (virtual outcrops) has significantly improved the immersive nature of virtual geological fieldtrips. As the COVID-19 pandemic led to widespread national and international travel restrictions, virtual fieldtrips (VFTs) became a practical, and essential substitutes for traditional fieldtrips and accelerated the development of VFTs based on virtual outcrop data. This contribution explores two such VFTs delivered to a master's level Petroleum Geoscience course at the University of Aberdeen. These VFTS are based up traditional fieldtrips that are normally run fieldtrips to the Spanish Pyrenees and Utah (USA). The paper summarizes the delivery mechanism for VFTs based on virtual outcrops and examines student perception, gauged primarily through questionnaires and learning outcomes. The VFTs were run in LIME, a software specifically designed for the interpretation of 3D models and the delivery of VFTs. Overall, the student perception was very positive and comparable to satisfaction with the conventional trips. Staff feedback and student assessments suggest that the learning outcomes were satisfied and highlights the value of this method of teaching for students who are unable to attend the field and as an additional component for those that can.

1 Introduction

Fieldtrips are a fundamental component of most geoscience degrees. Prior to COVID-19, in the UK, for a geology degree to be accredited by the Geological Society of London, there was a required 60-days of fieldwork. Similar requirements exist in other countries. Significant emphasis is placed on the skills that are acquired through time spent in the field, observing rocks and structures in their natural habitat. In recent years there has been increasing recognition that, for a variety of reasons, fieldwork is not equally accessible to all students (Giles et al., 2020) and there have been increased efforts to provide digital alternatives, termed Virtual Fieldtrips (VFTs).

The term VFT has a broad range of implications and interpretations. VFTs can range from a slide-show to a Google Earth tour of localities, to a full immersive experience using 3D virtual outcrop models. The form of immersive technology

Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Deleted: c
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Deleted: d
Deleted: i
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Deleted: f
Deleted: geological fieldtrips
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Deleted: ¶
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Deleted: V
Deleted: have become increasingly popular over the last decade, with the advent of remote piloted vehicles (RPVs; drones) leading to progressively sophisticated photorealistic virtual outcrops (VOs).
Deleted: necessary
Deleted: ,
Deleted: as traditional
Deleted: describes
Deleted: of these VFTs
Deleted: questionnaires
Deleted: reflect the satisfaction of group with the teaching method and feedback was more positive for the virtual fieldtrips than the equivalent real-world fieldtrips in earlier years. Concluding points… Our findings also highlight several notable advantages asso
Deleted: ciated with VFTs, including the ability to examine geology data at a range of scales, financial and access inclusivity, and reduced environmental impact. Several disadvantages with VFTs were also highlighted, including a reduction in social cohesion, and missing out on the experience of travelling and being outdoors. Our findings highlight implications for future application of VFTs and the opportunity to utilise both traditional fieldtrips and VFTs within a blended learning approach.
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Deleted: the relevant professional body (The
Deleted:) it
Deleted: had to contain
Deleted: here
Deleted: virtual reality (VR) experience

can vary from desktop to VR headsets (e.g. Kippel et al., 2020) with augmented reality also emerging (e.g. Gazcón et al., 2018). Virtual fieldtrips can also be subdivided into location based or thematic trips (figure 1a). Location based trips are the most comparable to traditional fieldtrips and are based around the geology of a specific geographic area. Thematic or geographically unconfined VFTs follow a specific topic and visit outcrop examples from several distinct locations. These are more similar to traditional classroom taught course but are augmented with outcrop examples from across the World .

Virtual fieldtrips can be further subdivided based upon the degree of tutor involvement at the time of delivery (figure 1 b). There is a spectrum of trip types which range from real-time tutor-led through to releasing students into an immersive space and allowing them to explore for themselves, in their own time. Different trip types may be more suited to specific topics, particular learning outcomes and the level of student experience.

A virtual outcrop (VO), sometimes called digital outcrop model or virtual outcrop model, is a photorealistic model of a geological outcrop. Virtual outcrops first appeared in the late 1990s (Xu et al., 2000) and became more popular with the advent of LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) (Bellian et al., 2005; Pringle et al., 2006; Buckley et al., 2008; 2013). Over the last eight years there has been a proliferation of virtual outcrops due to the dual emergence of remote piloted vehicles (RPVs, commonly termed drones) and structure from motion (SfM) photogrammetry (Buckley et al., 2016; Harrald et al., 2021; Howell et al., 2021). Together these two technologies have made virtual outcrops widely available across the geosciences.

Virtual outcrops have traditionally been used for research purposes (e.g. Enge et al., 2010; Rittersbacher et al., 2015, and many others). In recent years, virtual outcrops have started to be used in virtual fieldtrips (VFTs) (e.g. Argles et al., 2015; Tibaldi et al., 2020; Bond and Cawood, 2021; Gregory et al., 2021) although their acceptance has yet to become widespread, and they are typically used to provide supplementary material. Even during the COVID-19 pandemic the VFTs run by many groups did not contain VOs, instead others employed conventional teaching methods (slides, powerpoint etc) or Google Earth and/or GIS tools (e.g. Whitmeyer and Dordevic, 2020; Bosch, 2021; Barth et al., 2022).

To date there has been little systematic evaluation comparing virtual outcrop based VFTs and real-world fieldtrips with similar conditions, primarily because of the logistical challenges of running parallel trips under controlled experimental setups. The onset of the COVID-19 global pandemic and associated lockdowns from March 2020 forced the implementation of VFTs on a far broader scale and created the opportunity for such studies. Within this contribution we examine the outcomes of two VFTs that were run as replacements for traditional field courses on the Integrated Petroleum Geoscience (IPG) MSc classes of 2020 and 2021. The VFTs ran in real-time over eleven days (Utah) and five days (Pyrenees). They were based on well-established traditional trips to Utah and the Spanish Pyrenees. The Utah course has run for over 25 years and the Pyrenees trip has run in various forms since 2010. The VFTs were built on an extensive set of VOs and other data collected by the authors for research purposes over the last 15 years (e.g. Eide et al., 2015; Howell et al., 2014; Phillips et al., 2021). The Utah VFT was run twice (Sept 2020 and August 2021) and the Pyrenees VFT was run in October 2020.

The aim of this contribution is to summarise the learnings from these VFTs to help ensure that future VFTs are more effective at achieving the similar learning outcomes to traditional fieldtrip. The specific objectives are: (1) to present the

Deleted: also
Deleted: VFTs
Deleted: will visit a series of localities with a common theme such as a specific depositional environment. Thematic VFTs enable world-class examples to be visited across the globe without being limited by the logistics of travel
Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm
Deleted: Another classification is
Deleted: Again, t
Deleted: The use of VFTs also has significant advantages such as cost, safety and environmental impact; however, there has been significant reservation with regard to their use and value in teaching geosciences. To date there has been little systematic evaluation comparing virtual and real-world fieldtrips with similar conditions, primarily because of the logistical challenges of running parallel trips under controlled experimental setups. The onset of the COVID-19 global pandemic and associated lockdowns in March 2020 forced the implementation of VFTs. Lockdowns imposed stringent restrictions on travel and social interaction, which had an inevitable knock-on effect for geological fieldwork (Scerri et al., 2020; Arthurs, 2021; Rotzein et al., 2021). As traditional fieldtrips were unable to run, universities and companies sought to rapidly find virtual substitutes for courses at all levels from undergraduate to postgraduate and CPD (continued professional development).
Deleted: lidar
Deleted: (
Deleted: Eide et al., 2015 and
Deleted: often
Deleted: only
Deleted: habitually
Deleted: being run using traditional teaching methods or in some cases using
Deleted: Bosch, 2021;
Deleted:) for more regional scale VFTs
Deleted: The global pandemic and associated lockdowns forced the uptake of VFTs, in a range of different formats. However, there has been very limited research to examine their effectiveness or how they compare to each other or to traditional fieldtrips
Deleted: provide a detailed overview of the VFT creation ... [1]
Deleted: full
Deleted:
Deleted: , not including weekends,
Deleted: se VFTs
Deleted: traditional
Deleted: Enge et al., 2010; Rittersbacher et al., 2015;
Deleted: same
Deleted: objectives
Deleted: expected from a

workflow for building and running VFTs developed by our research group over the past 5 years; (2) assess the effectiveness of VFTs through student interaction; and (3) review student perception of VFT and how this compared to the traditional fieldtrips.

2 Previous work on VFTs

The concept of teaching geological field skills in a virtual environment is not new (Hurst, 1998; Stainfield et al., 2000), however, over the past decade VFTs have become increasingly popular reaching a pinnacle during the COVID-19 pandemic. The advantages and disadvantages of traditional VFTs are well established, with numerous studies discussing the benefits and challenges of their delivery and reception. However, the developments in virtual outcrops and associated platforms (e.g. LIME, Buckley et al. 20xx)) and cloud hosted web viewers (e.g. V3Geo, Buckley et al 2022), and the advent of immersive reality and VR headsets, illustrate that this field is advancing rapidly.

2.1 **Advantages of VFTs**

VFTs enable a larger volume of data to be presented at varying scales from the small (e.g. scanning electron microscope (SEM) images, thin sections and hand samples) to the large scale (e.g. virtual outcrops, DEMs and maps) (Arrowsmith et al., 2005; Atchison & Feig, 2011; Hurst, 1998; Çaliskan, 2011). This range of data is linked to enhancements in 3D understanding (Hurst, 1998; Bond and Cawood, 2021), a key skill within geoscience. VFTs also have the capacity to be geographically independent (based on a common theme) and permit a higher number of individuals to join (Stainfield et al., 2000). They are also financially inclusive as they reduce the financial burden associated with travel (Fletcher et al., 2002; Jacobson et al., 2009; Litherland et al., 2012; Stainfield et al., 2000; Ramasundaram et al. 2005). They are weather independent (Dolphin et al., 2019), resulting in them being logistically easier to plan, deliver and timetable (Hurst, 1998; Peat et al., 2005; Butler, 2008), as well as being associated with lower carbon emissions (Schott, 2017). Largely owing to the absence of travel time, VFTs are also typically time efficient (Ramasundaram, et al., 2005).

VFTs offer inclusivity not only to individuals with restricted physical access (Atchison & Feig, 2011; Atchison, 2011; Gilley et al., 2015; Stainfield et al., 2000; Çaliskan, 2011), but also for students who require increased time flexibility, owing to learning difficulties or mental health (Arrowsmith et al., 2005; Bentley, 2014; Fletcher et al., 2002; Li et al., 2003; Kingsbury et al., 2020). VFTs also cater for those with other time commitments such as part-time work or childcare, as well as allowing individuals to revisit localities (Hurst, 1998).

2.2 Disadvantages of VFTs

Several disadvantages are routinely recited including a loss in social cohesion (Butler, 2008; Dunphy & Spellman, 2009), as individuals are typically unable to interact with peers and staff in an informal and flexible manner (Hurst, 1998). Within a virtual context the experience of travel, outdoors and nature is lost (Bellan & Scheurman, 1998; Hurst, 1998). Embodiment is key within fieldwork (Mogk & Goodwin, 2012), which may be difficult to achieve within a VFT as an

Deleted: ¶
Deleted: of varying types
Deleted: VFTs
Deleted: VFT platforms
Deleted: Google Earth
Deleted: the advent of drone based virtual outcrop
Deleted: Sketchfab
Deleted: advancing
Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold
Deleted: amount of
Deleted: and
Deleted: lower
Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm
Formatted: Font: Bold
Formatted: Font: Bold, Font colour: Auto
Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Formatted: Font colour: Auto

individual may not relate the scale of the landscape, however, this can be improved with 360 photos and immersive headsets (Klippel et al., 2019). Certain aspects of traditional field training are difficult to replicate (Arrowsmith et al., 2005; Hurst, 1998) such as use of a compass clinometer. As VFTs are typically computer based, IT issues can be a concern to many who may habe unequal access to computers and the internet (Cliffe, 2017). Furthermore, the increased cognitive load associated with learning new software during a VFT has the potential to detract from the desired learning outcomes (Patersen et al., 2020).

There are numerous reservations about the ability of VFTs to replicate the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills acquired during traditional fieldwork, (Bloom, 1965; Krathwohl et al., 1973; Simpson, 1972; Mogk & Goodwin, 2012 Arrowsmith et al., 2005).).

3 Learning Objectives and Planning

3.1 Initial Learning objectives

Prior to travel restrictions in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the two fieldtrips in this study were run to provide field experience covering a wide range of geological aspects required for a broad training in Petroleum Geoscience. The trips were designed to complement each other and "bookend" the one-year MSc programme. In a typical year the Pyrenees trip ran near the start of the academic year (October) and Utah came at the end of the taught component of the MSc course in April. The Pyrenees trip deals with compressional tectonics, foreland basins, carbonate sedimentology, and deep-water clastic depositional systems. The Utah trip covers extensional tectonics, rift basins, salt tectonics, fluvial, aeolian and shallow marine depositional systems and igneous rocks in a petroleum context. Both courses use a series of exercises that draw on the observations in the field to simulate petroleum exploration and production scenarios. Students typically work in groups (4-6 individuals) and present results back to the course tutors and the rest of the class. The goals of the VFTs were to recreate the format of the traditional trips and to achieve the same learning outcomes.

3.2 Student learning outcomes and assessment deliverables- Pyrenees Fieldtrip and VFT

The first trip in the academic year was based on data from the Spanish Pyrenees. The VFT was a direct, real-time replacement for the traditional trip, with the same student learning outcomes. On completion of the fieldtrip or VFT students should be able to understand

1. the fundamentals of compressional tectonics and how the relate to the formation of foreland basins.
2. the formation of traps.
3. depositional models for deep water slope turbidite systems and how they impact heterogeneity in reservoirs.
4. depositional models for carbonate systems within a tectonically active foreland basin.
5. the interaction of tectonics and sedimentation in a compressional setting.
6. the formation and fill of structurally controlled mini basins and the 3D variability of basin fill.

Deleted: presented to their own being
Deleted: T
Deleted: is
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Deleted: are also of
Deleted: as well as
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Deleted: computing capabilities
Deleted: used
Deleted: due to increased cognitive load compared to a traditional fieldtrip
Deleted: Traditional fieldwork engages c
Deleted: all key components to a learning experience
Deleted: Ultimately there has been reservation if VFTs can engage all the key components to learning, particularly when fully replacing traditional fieldtrips (Arrowsmith et al., 2005
Deleted: The term virtual fieldtrip has a broad range of implications and interpretations. VFTs can range from a slide-show to a Google Earth tour of localities, to a full immersive VR experience. The form of immersive technology can also vary from desktop to VR headsets (Kippel et al., 2020) with augmented reality also starting to appear. VFTs can also be subdivided into location based or thematic trip (figure 1a). Location based trips are the most comparable to traditional fieldtrips and are based around the geology of a specific geographic area. Thematic or geographically unconfined VFTs will visit a series of localities with a common theme such as a specific depositional environment. Thematic VFTs enable world-class examples to be visited across the globe without being limited by the logistic of travel. ¶
Another classification is based upon the degree of tutor involvement at the time of delivery (figure 1 b). Again, there is a spectrum ... [2]
Deleted: 2
Deleted: 2
Deleted: Prior to global lockdown
Deleted: (Utah and Pyrenees)
Deleted: the
Deleted: course in
Deleted:)
Deleted: ,
Deleted: ,
Deleted: systems
Deleted: The goal of the VFTs was to recreate the learning ... [3]
Formatted ... [4]
Formatted: Font: 10 pt
Deleted: 32.2 Pyrenees Fieldtrip and VFT Learning Obje ... [5]

7. petroleum system and play mapping.
8. the structural and stratigraphic evolution of the south Pyrenean foreland basin.

Deliverables:

- A group presentation detailing the petroleum perspectivity of the study area, including common risk segment maps for a variety of play types.
- A recommendation for future exploration activity.
- A compilation (Facies Atlas) of sedimentary geobodies that could form potential hydrocarbon reservoirs (for example mouthbar; channel fill; aeolian dune), that summarises their diagnostic criteria, sedimentary structures, dimensions, petrophysical properties and relationship to surrounding deposits.

3.3 Student learning outcomes - Utah Fieldtrip and VFT

The second trip of the academic year is Utah. The virtual version of the trip ran twice because lockdown occurred mid-way through the year learning outcomes and deliverables include , again, with the same student learning outcomes as the traditional trip. On completion of the VFT students will be proficiently in understand

1. depositional systems in rift basins with special reference to the key elements of petroleum systems.
2. sequence stratigraphy of shallow marine and paralic depositional systems, including understanding the importance of depositional process in controlling reservoir architecture and distribution.
3. field development planning in a shoreface/estuarine depositional system.
4. the DFS model as a predictive exploration tool in fluvial systems.
5. how to identify and the significance of large sandstone dominated meanderbelt systems.
6. how intrusive igneous can effect petreoleum systems, with analogues for the West of Shetland area and the Norwegian Atlantic margin.
7. salt related fluvial systems and the interplay of depositional systems and changes in accommodation creation.
8. extensional tectonics and relationships between zones of fault interaction and their reservoir impacts.
9. the geological evolution of central Utah from the Permian to the present day.

Deliverables:

- An exploration play summary exercise, including group presentations on the plays and perspectivity of the Salt Lake Basin.
- A field development plan for an estuarine and shoreface reservoir system.
- Prospect evaluation exercise for the salt related fluvial systems in the Chinle Formation.
- An evaluation of the key exploration plays in the Salt Valley Anticline area, including integrating seismic, well and outcrop data, in order to produce a full economic evaluation and recommendation for drilling wells.

- Continued work on the Facies Atlas of sedimentary geobodies started in the Pyrenees.

3.4 VFT Planning

After the cancellation of the Utah 2020 April fieldtrip, the members of staff responsible for the course met to discuss alternatives. Given the prior experience in virtual outcrop geology and the access to public (V3Geo.com; Buckley et al., 2022) and proprietary (www.safaridb.com) datasets of virtual outcrops, both of which link to the LIME software (LIME, Buckley et al., 2019) it was a natural decision to run a VFT using virtual outcrops.

The process of building a VFT is summarised in Figure 2 and can be broken down into the following stages:

1. VFT Scope – decide on desired learning outcomes of the fieldtrip. VFTs can be thematic, such as examining a specific geological phenomenon from outcrops across the world or, location based, visiting a specific geographic area. The VFTs described within this study are all based directly on previous fieldtrips and are therefore, location based.
2. Build a story board – decide on the narrative of the trip using the learning outcomes. Agree on the type and rough volume of data required. Data include virtual outcrops, sub-regional DEMs, figures, traditional field data, subsurface data, photos, satellite images, video clips, 360° photo spheres and links to external resources such as gigapans, videos and Google Street View. An example template of a storyboard is shown in Figure 3.
3. Compile Data – sort internal resources into folders or upload online to reduce file size, such as videos. Compile Uniform Resource Locators (URL) of external resources such as Google Earth Engine in a spreadsheet, or saved web browser, for future reference. Unify coordinate systems for the spatial/georeferenced data.
4. Build the VFT – in this case we used LIME (Buckley et al. 2019). Separate projects were compiled for each day. A summary of the data used is provided in Table 1.
5. Distribute the LIME files and supporting material. Supporting materials include field guide, work sheets and maps. In this case files were uploaded the day before each day of the trip within Blackboard Learn (blackboard.com).
6. Assess the effectiveness of VFT – Assess effectiveness throughout VFT with regular end-of-day discussions, perform after action review at end of VFT, run questionnaires for student feedback. Using the acquired assessment, student feedback and staff experience, improve the VFT.

Across both VFTs, there were two days were there was insufficient virtual outcrop data at a large enough regional scale, so Google Earth was used instead of LIME. Building the VFTs took a total amount of time of two months for the Utah trip and about a month for the Pyrenees VFT, four staff members divided the workload.

3.5 Demographic and setting

All students were enrolled on the GL5013 course, Professional Skills incorporating International Field Trip, of the Integrated Petroleum Geoscience (IPG) MSc. Table 1 outlines the demographic and setting of students that attended the VFTs. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic the 2019-20 class attended the Pyrenees as a traditional fieldtrip. However, as a direct result of the COVID-19 pandemic many students returned home and the whole class joined the VFT remotely in September 2020.

Deleted: 32.3 Utah Fieldtrip and VFTs Learning Objective
The second trip of the academic year is Utah. The virtual version of the trip ran twice because lockdown occurred mid-way through the year. Learning outcomes and deliverables include Like the Pyrenees, it ran in real-time and broadly followed the traditional trip. The trip was run by four members of staff and three demonstrators and lasted for 11 days. Unlike the traditional trip it did not run over the weekends. The main aims of the trip were as follows:
To study extensional tectonic and associated arid rift basins with a major rift basin exploration exercise ... [6]

Deleted: 2
Deleted: 3
Deleted: this volume, in review
Deleted: S
Deleted: D
Deleted: the scope and
Deleted: Trips
Deleted: topic based
Deleted:
Deleted:
Deleted: and what
Deleted: are
Deleted: panorama
Deleted: s
Deleted: The data were then compiled
Deleted: ,
Deleted: sorted
Deleted: ded
Deleted: The
Formatted ... [7]
Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Times New Roman)
Deleted: was added to a
Deleted: ed
Deleted: using the
Deleted: Ensure that c
Deleted: are unified
Deleted: almost
Deleted: longer
Deleted: .
Deleted: 2.5
Formatted: Heading 2
Deleted: A total of 53 individual students participated acros ... [8]
Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

By October 2020 and August 2021, the relaxations in COVID-19 related restrictions allowed students to attend the Pyrenees 2020 and Utah 2021 from on-campus computer rooms. Across the three VFT's a general trend of improved average WiFi speeds was observed. WiFi speeds were monitored by staff through blackboard learn, and students that had poor internet were offered a free wireless internet dongle for the duration of the VFT, however, no participants accepted the offer. Generally, there were few internet related issues.

Table 1: Demographic and setting information across the VFT's.

	Class 2019 -20	Class 2020/21	
	Utah 2020	*Pyrenees 2020*	*Utah 2021*
Student Participants	30	23	
Female Students	37.5%	43%	
Male Students	62.5%	57%	
Working remotely*	100%	64.8%	42.1%
Working on Campus*: Using University PC	0%	35.2%	57.9%
Remote working: Using VDI	56.5%	33.4%	26%
Remote working: Using students PC/laptop	43.5%	31.4%	15.8%
Poor WiFi (≤5Mbps)	4.5%	0%	15.8%
Adequate WiFi (6-35Mbps)	45.5	24%	2.6%
Good WiFi (≥ 36Mbps)	50%	76%	81.6%

4 Fieldtrip Software and Applications Overview

4.1 3D Software: LIME

The main software that was used for building and delivering virtual fieldtrips was LIME (Buckley et al. 2019). LIME is a high performance, lightweight 3D software for visualising, interpreting, and presenting 3D models and associated data (Buckley *et al.*,2019). The LIME 2.2.2 version of the software was used for all VFTs, it was the newest version at the time of VFTs. LIME was originally created as a simple-to use software for geoscience application primarily for navigating, measuring and interpretating large LiDAR derived virtual outcrops (Buckley et al., 2019). The rapid expansion of virtual outcrop geology amplified demand for 3D software tailored to geoscience (Buckley et al., 2019), and over the past decade LIME has advanced

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: Gill Sans MT

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Left, Indent: First line: 0 cm, Line spacing: Double

Formatted: Centred, Indent: First line: 0 cm, Line spacing: single

Deleted: 3.1 Class 2019-20, Utah 2020 VFT
Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic this class attended the Pyrenees as a traditional field trip. However, as a direct result of the COVID-19 pandemic many students returned home. By the time of the Utah 2020 VFT most students were still based in the UK, however, a small proportion were located globally in countries including Malaysia and Tanzania. Gender distribution across the trip was 62.5% identifying as male and 37.5% as female.
Due to COVID-19 related restrictions during September 2020 students attended the VFT remotely off-campus, as a result, all participant (staff and student) interactions were conducted in the online environment. The University of Aberdeen provided a Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI) for each student, to allow those with limited computing capabilities to run the required software. 56.5% of students utilised the VDI, and the remaining 43.5% used their personal laptops/PC with LIME installed locally. WIFI/ethernet download speeds varied from as low as 5Mbps to as high as 200Mbps. WIFI/ethernet speed quality was classified based on download speeds required to access the material within the VFT, 4.5% of student had poor download speeds of ≤5Mbps and were unable to access the material; 45.5% had adequate download speeds of 6-25Mbps and 50% had good download speeds of ≥ 36Mbps. Students that had poor internet were offered a free wireless internet dongle for the duration of the VFT, however, no participants accepted the offer.

Deleted:
Table 1. Material displaying the breakdown of individual components for all 3 VFTs 2020 ... [9]

Formatted: Font colour: Auto

Deleted: chosen as

Deleted: LIME is a high performance, lightweight 3D software for visualising, interpreting, and presenting 3D models and associated data (Buckley *et al.*,2019).

Deleted: l

Deleted: d

Deleted: ar

to facilitate co-visualization of a wide range of data types in addition to virtual outcrop. Such supplementary spatial and non-spatial data include:

- *3D Models:* these include virtual outcrops and other 3D models such as DEMs, hand samples and models commonly used as scales (e.g. Car, Human or 10 m Measuring Pole).
- *Lines:* for interpretation lines, mapping contacts and measuring distances.
- *Planes:* for correlation and extrapolation of surfaces away from the virtual outcrops and for measuring strike and dip
- *Panels:* Panels are 2D planes in 3D space onto which image files can be draped. They serve as “billboards” in the virtual space. They can be used for maps, cross sections, subsurface data, satellite images, explanatory figures, and a host of other uses in the VFT.
- *Points:* are 1D pins in 3D space. They can be used as place markers, and they can also be used as hotlinks to launch other material. That material can be internal data such as photos, figures, videos, audio that are stored locally within the project, and external data such as Gigapan, 360º photos, Google Earth Engine, Google Street View, YouTube etc. that are accessed via weblinks from the internet.

LIME allows users to store “custom views” and compile them into a storyline, which allows the course leader to build a narrative through the VFT. The VFT Storyline functionality, used extensively in this contribution, enabled pre-assigned views and animation paths. The views enabled the display of chosen material (models, lines, panels, points and planes) to be stored and accessed in order. The VFT Storyline works as a guide for both staff and students when presenting or exploring within LIME. Students navigate between views, ensuring a consistent and streamlined learning experience, through the display of specified material. Each view is created prior to the VFT with chosen models and supplementary material, providing participants a virtual replacement of locality stops, as well as regional context of those stops.

A typical virtual outcrop will contain around 0.5 – 1 GB of data and a typical one-day virtual fieldtrip may contain 5 or more virtual outcrops and could easily require 10GB of diskspace. This is prohibitively large for downloading and storing for most students (and users in general). To reduce file- and transfer size all virtual outcrops were first converted to multi-resolution tiled models and stored in the cloud. When building the virtual fieldtrip they are imported into LIME via the ‘Import From Cloud Source’ function. This ensures that only the data that are required for a specific view are downloaded and this happens in real time, whilst viewing (Buckley et al. 2019; Buckley et al., 2022). The cloud storage solutions include V3Geo (V3Geo.com), a public repository of virtual outcrops (Buckley et al., 2022) and Safari (safaridb.com) a proprietary database using a similar application programming interface (API). Students were given access to both databases of outcrop analogue data (Howell et al., 2014). The result is that the LIME project folder that is distributed to the students only contains the “other data” (points, lines and images) and is typically a few tens of megabits in size which is manageable for the students to download and store.

Deleted: objects

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.63 cm, Hanging: 0.63 cm, Space After: 12 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27 cm

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: with

Deleted: displayed

Deleted: 10 – 15

Deleted: this volume

Deleted:

Deleted: this volume

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman)

4.2 Additional Software: Google Earth Pro

Since the launch of Google Earth in 2005, it has been regarded as a powerful geological resource for teaching and research (Lisle, 2006) and has been used within the curriculum of many universities (e.g Whitmeyer et al., 2009; Monet and Greene, 2012; Giorgis, 2015; Rotzien et al., 2021). Google Earth Pro, the desktop version, allows users to run the application from their own computer, provided they have the minimum system requirement of 2GB (RAM). Given the integral role Google Earth and Google Earth Pro play within many Geoscience degrees, the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic led many universities to partially or fully replace their field trips with Google Earth-based alternatives (e.g. Evelpidou et al, 2021; Bosch, 2021).

The VFTs presented here included virtual field days run within Google Earth. On virtual field days where large regional areas were studied, including the first day of Utah, provides a regional overview and task set around Salt Lake (covering an area of >20,000km^2), Google Earth Pro was implemented. As Google Earth provides high-resolution satellite imagery draped onto a digital elevation model (DEM) it was particularly useful for regional geology days. Additionally, certain tools within Google Earth Pro were used, including the 'Show Elevation Profile' on a delineated path, offering a cross sectional profile of the topography. This tool provided an immediate foundation to cross-section construction or discussion.

A limitation of Google Earth is that most of the imagery is nadir (taken from overhead looking vertically down) and is draped onto a DEM of varying resolution. This results in cliff lines and outcrops being poorly rendered and smeared (Yu and Gong, 2012). This is partially mitigated where Google has integrated additional data in the form of "3D buildings". This data layer has been gradually implemented since 2012 and uses data from low angle aerial photogrammetry to provide additional detail of vertical features. It is primarily applied to cities but is increasingly being implemented in areas of "public interest" such as national parks (Google,2021), therefore, coverage of geological interest areas is typically limited. The image quality and 3D rendering are very good and the layer provides an excellent alternative to virtual outcrops if they are not available.

4.3 Delivery Platform: Blackboard Learn

For the past 12 years, Blackboard has been employed as the digital learning platform at the University of Aberdeen. Pre-COVID-19, Blackboard Learn was primarily used for file sharing and assessment submission; however, in March 2020 it became the primary platform to run live lectures and practical's within the 'Virtual Classroom'. The virtual classroom also provided a record function, which enabled all days to be recorded for inclusivity of students. Blackboard Learn offers a host of teaching tools including Breakout Groups for participant interaction, polling to enhance engagement (see Figure 4), file sharing, and a whiteboard for annotated sketches and discussions. Blackboard also rates the WiFi quality of attendees, providing a visual and numerical indication of individuals who may be experiencing poor connection. All students and staff had access and familiarity with Blackboard Learn and therefore it was selected as a platform to run the VFTs.

Deleted: ,

Deleted: ; Bond et al., this volume, in review

Deleted: , either as a stand-alone or as a supplement to a LIME project…

Deleted: which

Deleted: these

Deleted: , which must be manually toggled on,

Deleted: however

Deleted: practicals

Deleted: with poor internet, or temporary absence

Deleted: l

Deleted: For these reasons in addition to

Deleted: a

4.4 Virtual Desktop Infrastructure

LIME, and to a lesser extent Google Earth, require PCs with a moderate to good processing power and moderate graphics capabilities. Whilst these are typically available for industrial/commercial consumers of VFTs, this is often not the case for all students. The University of Aberdeen runs a Virtual Desk Infrastructure (VDI) which allows students and staff to remotely log-in to a virtual computer in the University. That way the processing is handled on the virtual machine and the student's computer acts as a terminal. This allows students with low grade computers or Macs to run all the required software. With a reasonable internet speed (>6 Mbps) there is only a short lag time and the system worked well.

Table 2. Material displaying the breakdown of individual components for all 3 VFTs 2020

Deleted: it is not possible to assume that all the

Deleted: will have access to such

(a)

VFT Day Utah 2020	LIME or Google Earth	Models	DEMs	Photos	360° photos /Gigapan	Logs/ Wells	Satellite Images	Maps	Cross-sections	Other Figures	VFT Storyline Views
1-2. Rift basins & Exploration	GE	0	-	34	1	0	-	13	0	3	-
3. Northern Book Cliffs	LIME	3	0	43	3	13	1	1	1	7	50
4. Woodside	LIME	4	1	37	1	6	1	2	4	2	34
5. Southern Book Cliffs	LIME	5	4	28	4	12	1	3	7	2	49
6. Transgressive systems	LIME	4	1	38	2	14	4	3	2	4	28
7. Fluvial systems	LIME	5	2	45	10	14	2	2	0	2	19
8. Igneous Systems	Both	3	2	19	0	2	0	6	1	6	30
9. Canyonlands	LIME	1	-	15	3	4	-	3	1	2	-
10. Salt related systems	Both	1	2	16	2	26	0	6	8	2	-
11. Structure	Both	4	4	47	3	2	1	1	3	7	43
Total in VFT	-	30	16	322	29	93	10	40	9	37	253

(b)

Utah 2021: Days changed from 2020.	LIME or Google Earth	Models	DEMs	Photos	360° photos /Gigapan	Logs/ Wells	Satellite Images	Maps	Cross-sections	Other Figures	VFT Storyline Views
8. Salt Related systems	LIME	1	7	15	2	26	1	6	5	6	23
10. Exploration in the Salt Valley	LIME	1	0	12	10	8	3	7	0	16	74
Total in VFT	-	30	23	313	45	112	15	44	27	37	297

(c)

VFT Day Pyrenees 2020	LIME or Google Earth	Models	DEMs	Photos	360° photos /Gigapan	Logs/ Wells	Satellite Images	Maps	Cross-sections	Other Figures	VFT Storyline Views
1. Structural Transect	GE	0	-	13	5	1	-	7	1	3	-
2. Thrusts & Syn-sedimentation	LIME	3	3	32	11	9	3	9	5	3	43
3. Ebro Basin	LIME	3	4	26	2	9	2	3	1	7	39
4. Deep Water Systems	LIME	4	4	21	4	10	1	1	2	7	18
Total in VFT	-	9	11	92	22	29	6	20	9	20	100

Formatted: Font: Bold

5 Fieldtrip Design and Delivery

Formatted: Font colour: Auto

Prior to the running of each trip a document detailing how to operate the software used within the VFTs was digitally distributed to the participants (Supplement 1) along with a digital version of the field guide. Material for each day of the trip was typically made available around 6pm the evening before. Students were advised to download the files prior to the start of the VFT to prevent Blackboard connection issues and to ensure they wouldn't be negatively affected by slow download speeds. At the start of each day a poll was conducted to gauge whether all students had been able to download and open the material of that day. Any software issues were addressed with the aim to resolve by a staff member. Ahead of assessments, which were all groupwork-based, students were allocated groups with group list uploaded to Blackboard Learn. Groups were allocated by the same process as traditional fieldtrips, at random with some minor modifications to ensure equal ability and diversity.

Deleted: of staff.

Deleted: and

5.1 Utah VFT: Outline

Direct replacement of a traditional trip lasted eleven days (2020) and ten days (2021). A separate LIME project was built for most of the days. The Utah 2020 data is outlined in Table 2 (a), with minor improvements made to most days on the Utah 2021 VFT based on the after-action review and student feedback. The days that changed significantly between 2020 and 2021 are outlined in Table 2 (b). Over the Utah VFTs, an average of 30 virtual outcrops, 16 DEMs, 318 photos, 101 logs/wells and many other data were used (see table 2). The volume of material provided to the students was well received and staff were confident that most students utilised the material to emulate the practices undertaken on traditional fieldwork. Supplement 2 provides a list of publicly accessible V3Geo virtual outcrops used during both VFTs.

Deleted: This d

Deleted: 11

Deleted: 10

Deleted: data used for

Deleted: 1(

Deleted: which

Deleted: 1

Deleted: trip

Deleted: total

Deleted: 10

The first two days of the Utah VFT examined modern basin and range tectonics around the Great Salt Lake, which were run from Google Earth Pro and culminated in an exploration play mapping exercise. Day three centred around the northern Book Cliffs and focused on shallow marine sedimentology (shorefaces and river-dominated deltas) and sequence stratigraphy (Howell and Flint, 2003; Enge et al., 2010; Enge and Howell, 2010). Day four was focused further south in the Book Cliffs, in Woodside Canyon and examined a tidal estuarine package interpreted as an incised valley complex (Howell and Flint, 2003; Somme et al., 2008; Howell et al., 2018). The VFT continued south in the Book Cliffs for day five, focussing on sequence stratigraphy and correlation in shoreface parasequences within the section directly north of the town of Green River in the morning (Pattison, 1995; Eide et al., 2015; Jackson et al., 2009). The afternoon of Day 5 was spent at Thompson Canyon (Van Wagoner 1995) where the students completed a field development exercise. All Book Cliffs days used a series of large scale (kms) virtual outcrops and were run within LIME.

For day six, the field trip looked at older Cretaceous stratigraphy along the western side of the San Rafael Swell, including the transgressive deposits of the Dakota/Naturita system (Phillips et al., 2020) and the growth faulted, fluvial dominated deltas of the Ferron Sandstone (Bhattachraya and Davies, 2001; Enge et al., 2010; Braathen et al., 2017). Day seven compared the fluvial architecture of the incised Shinarump Sandstone at Capitol Reef with the distributive fluvial deposits of the Salt Wash Member of the Morrison (Owen et al., 2015). Special reference was made to the recognition of sand dominated meandering systems, such as the large meander belt exposed at Caineville Wash and the Notom Road localities (Hartley et al., 2015).

Day eight discussed igneous-sedimentary interactions of the Caineville and Henry Mountain area (Horsman et al., 2005). Day nine included a traverse through Canyonlands, reviewing the stratigraphy and comparing different types of arid continental reservoirs. Day ten was a detailed study of the interaction between the Paradox salt and sedimentation within the Chinle Formation fluvial deposits (Mathews et al., 2004; Hartley and Evenstar, 2018). Day ten culminated in a major student exercise dealing with exploration in salt basins. The final day, day eleven, focused on extensional tectonics around Moab and within Arches National Park. The students visited a series of localities along the Moab Fault (Foxford et al., 1998) and at the Delicate Arch Relay Ramp (Rotevatn et al., 2009)

Utah 2021 followed a similar outline with minor changes to most days and slight changes to the running order. Three days changed considerably. Days one and two, the Rift Basins and Exploration around Salt Lake, were combined into a single day, covering the same volume of material. The Salt related systems day, was moved into LIME rather than using Google Earth Pro because LIME enabled better presentation of the additional data such as the sedimentary logs. The final day was a new assessed exploration exercise, which combined outcrops with seismic and well data from the Salt Valley anticline. This replaced the Canyonlands day. This exercise used LIME to combine the subsurface data with the outcrops.

5.2 Pyrenees VFT: Outline

This five-day long VFT included 30 virtual outcrops, 20 DEMs, 92 photos, 20 logs/wells and other data (see table 2c). Again, the amount of material provided to the students was well received, the extensive dataset allowed students to explore the area and apply their geological understanding to a similar extent as a traditional fieldtrip. Day one provided a regional geological overview and introduction to the structure of the Pyrenees with a transect from the axial zone to the Jaca Basin along the Hecho Valley. Google Earth Pro was implemented due to the large geographical scale of the day. Day two continued the transect south, crossing from the Jaca Basin, through the External Sierras to the Ebro Basin, along the Gallego Gorge. Here, thrust tectonics were combined with an examination of the syntectonic alluvial fans in Riglos and Aguero (Nichols, 1987). The afternoon of day two, moved to Arguis and Pico de Aguillar, where lateral changes along the thrust front and the role of salt with the detachment were discussed.

Day three considered the distributive fluvial deposits of the Huesca DFS (Nichols and Hirst, 1988) of the Ebro Basin. Day four studied in deep water deposits of the Ainsa Basin incorporating behind outcrop wells and cores (Corrigedor and Pickering 2005; Falivene et al., 2006). The final day of this VFT, day five, was an assessed group exercise, reviewing the perspectivity of the south Pyrenean Foreland Basin and required the students to revisit all the stops we had visited previously. A summary of the VFT was presented to the students within LIME after the student group presentations on basin evaluation.

Deleted: This exercise
Deleted: (Day 11)
Deleted: R
Deleted: ning
Deleted: some
Deleted: 10
Formatted: Font colour: Auto
Deleted: In t
Deleted: D
Deleted: we
Deleted: laterally
Deleted: discussing
Deleted: On
Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm
Deleted: D
Deleted: we moved into the Ebro Basin and studied
Deleted:). After day three we headed east into the Ainsa Basin for the last two days
Deleted: b
Deleted: the
Deleted: that have been collected over the years
Deleted: ,
Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt
Deleted: ¶ ¶

6 Methodology for Evaluation

6.1 Student Experience

Student experience was evaluated through two different questionnaires, ethics approval was granted for all questionnaires by the University of Aberdeen. The university provides a standard form (Course Evaluation Form) that is filled in after every course. These were used as they provide a benchmark to compare the VFT with the physical course over the previous five years. In addition, a specific questionnaire was conducted to provide a more detailed, day-by-day insight into the VFTs. In these, questionnaire participation was voluntary and anonymised, under university guidelines. Individuals were asked to answer a series of questions rating their experience between 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree) and provided with the opportunity to give qualitative statements to provide further information to their answers within an open text box. Supplement 3 is an example of one of these, the same format was used for all three VFTs. On trip Utah 2020 VFT, there was a questionnaire response of 88% (24 out of 27), Pyrenees 2020 it was 100% (23 out of 23) and Utah2021, it was 90% (19 out of 21). Students were requested to fill out the questionnaire on the final day of each VFT, with extra time allocated to a break, individuals who wished to respond after the VFT were asked to do so within 2 weeks. Individuals that were unable to attend the full field trip due to other commitments did not answer the questionnaire; this included five in Utah 202 and two in Pyrenees 2020. A total of 66 questionnaire responses were collected.

Standardised course evaluations and questionnaires are routinely used across the academic curriculum to gauge student perception. Nonetheless, the authors acknowledge there is an issue of self-reporting (Boring, et al. 2016; Esaarey & Valdes, 2020; Spooren et al., 2013). Students can only draw on their own experience and are unable to truly compare between a traditional fieldtrip and a VFT if they do not attend both. Furthermore, the notion of understanding is not a true measure of understanding, as an individual cannot evaluate the true extent of what they understand (Kuorikoski & Ylikoski, 2015). However, all students had attended a traditional fieldtrip as some point in their education, therefore each had field experience to base their opinions on. As there is not a way to truly standardise the data, the questionnaires presented are used to gauge general opinions and suggested improvements.

6.2 Activity/Attendance

Within Blackboard Learn, auto-generated reports are accessible through the *Evaluation* and *Course Reports* function. These reports provide insights into usage and student activity across Blackboard Learn. This data includes the overall time an individual spent within the course as well as information about their activity within the content area, from time to number of accesses. Each day of the VFT was also allocated its own virtual classroom, allowing reports to be run for every day assessing student attendance across the VFT. These reports were accessible to staff as an excel file or exported to CSV and the relevant data extracted.

Deleted:
Deleted:
Deleted: 1
Deleted: trip 2
Deleted: trip
Deleted: 3
Deleted: Student
Deleted: trip 1
Deleted: trip 2
Deleted: of this form
Formatted: Font: Italic
Formatted: Font: Italic

6.3 Duration Analysis

Over the Utah 2021 VFT, activities in each day were divided into categories and timed using a digital stopwatch. The total active time within nine days was 43 hours, 40 minutes, and 8 seconds, with an additional 14 hours, 22 minutes and 11 seconds of allocated breaks (e.g. lunch), day ten was not timed due to change in plans related to COVID-19 precautions.

Deleted: to a

Deleted: incident in the classroom

6.4 After Action Review

On completion of a VFT, the staff and demonstrators discussed what they felt had worked and what could be improved across the VFTs. After action reviews took place at the end of most days and at the end of each fieldtrip. Suggestions from this after-action review and free text were noted for the Utah 2020 VFT, and where appropriate, enhancements were implemented prior to Utah 2021.

7 Evaluation Results

Formatted: Font colour: Auto

Questionnaires were compiled, free text comments were added to a master word document and numerical answers summed in a master excel spreadsheets, later trips were added to the same master documents facilitating direct comparisons to be made. Numerical responses across the 3 trips were plotted and compared through box and whisker plots giving the range in responses for each trip. Blackboard Learn evaluations and course reports were compiled selecting relevant information. Duration analysis was evaluated, and averaged.

Deleted: info

7.1 Course Evaluation Form

The course evaluation forms provided a valuable comparison between student feedback for before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. The two course evaluation forms from 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 are when both trips were traditional fieldtrips. The 2018-2019 results were unfortunately not available for analysis due to controls outside this study. The 2019-20 form evaluates the year when the Pyrenees trip ran as a traditional fieldtrip, whereas Utah ran as a VFT due to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. The form from 2020-21 represents the year which both trips ran as VFTs due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Deleted: pre-

Deleted: syn-

Deleted: the result of

Across the three questions within the course evaluation forms, a notable improvement in results is observed between the oldest (2016-17) and most recent (2020-21). With 100% of 2020-21 students totally agreeing that they enjoyed (Figure 7 b) the course, and it improved their graduate attributes/employability (Figure 7 c). 2020-21 students also all agreed that the teaching was effective with 87.5% (Figure 7a, the highest of all 4 years) totally agreeing and the remaining 12.5% agreeing. Again, while standardised course evaluations can be regarded as unreliable (Boring, et al. 2016; Esaarey & Valdes, 2020; Spooren et al., 2013), this does not undermine the overwhelming positive perceptions of the students attending the VFTs. Although no precise comparisons can be made between the traditional fieldtrips and VFTs due to a change in student cohorts, the data illustrates students appear satisfied with the VFTs.

7.2 General Learning Outcomes

The questionnaire results for general learning outcomes are presented in Figure 8 (a-b). Across all three field trips an average of 94.3% of students agreed that they *had learnt new things during the VFTs*, with the remaining 5.7% scoring neutral, no student disagreed, and interquartile ranges (IQRs) all plotted between 4-5. The overarching learning outcome statement of *I have a better understanding of exploration processes* was rated mostly positive for the Utah VFTs with IQRs between 4 and 5, for Utah 2020 91.7% of students agreed and for Utah 2021 it was 89.5%. The Pyrenees IQR had a wider range from 3-5, with an average of 73.9% of students agreeing.

7.2 Trip Timing and Delivery

The statement *I liked having the fieldtrip at a fixed time* (figure 8d) scored positively across all three trips, with the Pyrenees VFT participants responding particularly positively (95.7%), with an IQR of 5. For the Pyrenees 2020 VFT there was one individual who responded negatively and the Utah 2021 VFT had two individuals who disagreed. Students across all three VFTs mostly agreed that *working in groups was better than independent working* (figure 8e*)*. Both the Utah VFTs received particularly positive responses, with the 2020 VFT scoring 83.3% and the 2021 VFT scoring 94.7%, and remaining scores on both VFTs were neutral. The Pyrenees 2020 VFT, in contrast, exhibits a broader IQR between 3 and 5, with 4.3% disagreeing, 26.1% scoring neutral, and 69.6% positive.

The daily average time students spent within the virtual classroom across the Utah 2020 VFT was 5 hours and 49 minutes, for the Pyrenees it was 6 hours and 22 minutes for Utah 2021 it was 6 hours and 48 minutes. A breakdown of average time spent doing activities is illustrated in figure 9. With groupwork tasks (23%), LIME guided VFT (21%), independent work in LIME exploring the virtual outcrop and supplementary data (8%), and discussions (7%) forming a large portion of the work activities during the VFT and emulated similar activities of traditional fieldwork. A very small portion of the VFT was spent providing technical instruction of software, outlining assessment and presentation of external material, such as Google Earth Engine. Time spent waiting, which includes waiting for students to re-join after lunch, share screen and resolve technical issue also formed a very small proportion of the trip at an average of 3% of each day.

7.3 Software, Content, and IT

IT solutions worked for most participants across all VFTs (figure 8f). The Utah 2020 VFT had a 75% positive response (IQR between 3.25 and 5), Pyrenees 2020 69.6% were positive (IQR between 3 and 5), and Utah 2021 a higher 84.2% responded positively (IQR between 4 and 5). There were occasions where IT solutions did not work for individuals, such as for Utah 2021, an individual scored 1, however, their WiFi was negatively impacted by unexpected local issues and beyond the control of staff.

The statement *Training in Lime and /or Google Earth pro should be given before to the VFT (would require an extra day)* (figure 8g) was met with a full range of responses and wide variations in IQRs. The two VFTs (Utah 2020 and Pyrenees

Deleted: were

Deleted: work in

Deleted: .

Deleted: d

Deleted: with

2020) where most students had the highest agreeing response, with 37.5% of Utah 2020 and a high 65.2% of Pyrenees 2020 participants indicating they would have preferred a day of software training prior to the VFT. Whereas the Utah 2021 VFT, individuals had already attended the Pyrenees 2020 VFT, and 52.6% of individuals disagreed with the statement. Scores were consistent for the statement *I understand how to use Google Earth Pro for geology* (figure 8h), with over 80% agreeing across all VFTs.

LIME was scored positively as *a good tool for VFTs* across all three VFTs (figure 8i). 100% of the Utah 2020 VFT agreed, as did 78.3% of the Pyrenees 2020 VFT and 94.7% of the Utah 2021 VFT. Two individuals across the three VFTs disagreed, in both cases they were individuals who reported lower WiFi speeds, that were unable to be resolved in the VFT timeframe. The same year group who joined the Pyrenees 2020 and Utah 2021 VFT displayed a positive shift in perceptions between the two VFTs in the view of LIME as a VFT tool. The statement regarding individuals who enjoyed LIME after they became more familiar with the platform (polled as "*Once they got the hang of it*"), was also met with a mostly positive and markedly consistent response across all three VFTs. Interquartile ranges (IQRs) were consistent falling between 4 and 5, with an average of 86.5% agreeing, 5.8% neutral and 3.2% disagreeing. As a *platform to run the VFT* most agreed *Blackboard worked well* and with a consistent response across all VFTs which presented IQRs spanning 4-5 (figure 8k).

7.4 Virtual Fieldtrips vs Traditional Fieldtrips

Responses for the statement "*I learnt things during the VFT that I would not have learnt on a normal fieldtrip"* were diverse. The Utah 2020 VFT perceptions were predominately positive with 66.7% of students scoring between 4 and 5, and 33.3% were neutral, with no students disagreeing. The Pyrenees 2020 VFT presented a larger IQR range of 2-5, 34.8% of students agreed, 30.4% were neutral, and 34.8% of students disagreed. The Utah 2021 VFT also offered a large IQR range of 2.5 to 5, 57.9% of students agreed, 15.8% were neutral, and 26.3% of students disagreed.

With the statement "*I think VFTs are better than normal fieldtrips"* (figure 8l) there was a broad, predominately negative response with IQRs spanning 2-3 and 1-3, most did not agree that VFTs were better. When asked if they would rather be in Utah/Pyrenees all IQRs fell at 5 (figure 8m), with medians falling between 4.6-4.8. An average of 92.4% of students would rather be in the field, although there were some outliers. Within the free text individuals who preferred the VFT stated cost of fieldwork and accessibility as the main reasons for their scores.

7.5 Individual Days

Each VFT day was listed across all three VFTs and students were asked to score the statements *I learnt a lot from this day,* and *I enjoyed this day*, for assessed days they were asked if the *exercise worked well.*

Deleted: therefore predominately disagreed, with
Deleted: ing
Deleted: As a *tool*
Deleted: Two individuals across the three VFTs disagreed, in both cases they were individuals with known Wifi issues
Deleted: .
Deleted: VFTs were broadly
Deleted: diverse when scoring if they
Formatted: Font: Italic
Deleted: *had*
Deleted: *they*
Deleted: ¶
Deleted: as well as
Deleted:

7.5.1 Results for Utah 2020 VFT

Both for learning and enjoyment this VFT was scored positively and consistently by participants (figure 10 a and b). Ten of the days IQRs fell between 4-5 for learning, with day 11 as the exception with an IQR between 4-4.75. Enjoyment IQRs were a consistent 4-5. The average positive response across all days of this VFT was a 94.6% for learning and 90.3% for enjoyment.

7.5.2 Results for Pyrenees 2020 VFT

This VFT presented a higher range and day-to-day variation. Days 1-2 IQRs sit between 3-5 for learning, with the full range of scores represented (figure 10c). For enjoyment, day 1 scored higher than learning (figure 10d) with an IQR of 3.75-5, whereas day 2 was consistent with the learning IQR. Students were more positive about day 3-4 with IQRs for both increasing to 4-5 for learning. Enjoyment peaked on day 3 with an IQR of 4.5-5. Overall, the average positive response for the Pyrenees VFT for learning was 79.35% and 80.29 for enjoyment.

7.5.3 Results for Utah 2021 VFT

This VFT scored remarkably consistent for both enjoyment and learning presenting IQR of 4-5 for all days (figure 10 e and f). The average positive response for the Utah 2021 VFT for learning was 90.2% and 87.9% for enjoyment, a notable increase from the previous Pyrenees VFT the class attended.

8 Discussion and Conclusions

8.1 Interpretation of Evaluation

8.1.1 Student Course Evaluation

Within the student course evaluation improvements in the student perceptions are observed from pre-covid to during, this is attributed to a couple variables. Firstly, the VFTs ran during or around COVID-19 lockdowns, this was a time were everything was run online. Student moral was lower than a traditional year, and the students verbally expressed low expectations ahead of the VFTs. The free text comments reflect how the students felt the VFT was better than they had anticipated, with individuals stating, "overall I thought It was much better than expected", "above my expectations" and "it was far more engaging than I thought it would be, and I am surprised by how interactive it was". The students also acknowledge the quality and extent of the VFTs, with free text comments including "on the whole the class felt very positive about the trip, we were all really impressed of the example that has been set for VTF's", and "I think as a replacement the VFT was fantastic, very engaging and an exemplary substitute for the field trip". Students were clearly satisfied with the content of the VFTs and felt they provided an effective teaching experience, which they enjoyed with comments including: "I actually thought I learnt more on the virtual fieldtrip as it was easier to understand the context and get my bearings" and "very enjoyable and well organized trip".

Deleted: The improved results in course evaluation forms from pre- to syn COVID-19 ar

Formatted: Highlight

Deleted: e at

Deleted: tributed to t

Deleted: students'

Deleted: of

Deleted: relative

Deleted: .

Deleted: Based on the free text it was clear students were impressed with the VFT quality and appreciated the effort involved in constructing such VFTs.

Deleted: .

However, it is noted that while the students were positive about their VFT experience, the majority still stated they would have preferred a traditional trip physically travelling to Utah and the Spanish Pyrenees. Many free text comments reflected this including: “although I would have preferred to have been in the Pyrenees, the virtual fieldtrip was still very beneficial”; “I think everyone would much rather be in Utah for the scenery and culture but I found it easier to focus and understand on the VFT than normal”, and “I think the field trip had many benefits and I did feel like I learned a lot, but I would probably preferred being in Utah”. Again, this highlights the issue with standardising the course evaluation forms, as the improvements in the VFT years compared to pre-COVID traditional fieldtrip, does not appear to relate directly to the VFT, instead context of COVID and low expectations of VFT.

8.1.2 Questionnaire

Utah Questionnaire results for general learning outcomes illustrate that student attitude was largely positive, students broadly agreed that they had learnt during the VFT and developed a better understanding of exploration processes. Staff were also largely satisfied that the more specific learning outcomes had been achieved.

The structure and duration of the course was specifically designed to emulate that of a traditional fieldtrip, which worked for most participants. Students agreed having a fixed time for the VFT worked, and for those who were absent for short sections, recordings were made available. The students also agreed working in groups was particularly helpful during online learning and eased the negative impact of those with IT issues due to the screenshare function. The importance of groupwork noted within this study is in line with others (e.g. Arrowsmith *et al.*, 2005; Stumpf et al., 2008; Atchison & Feig, 2011; Lukes, 2014).

Time spent during the VFTs was used efficiently, there was little wasted time on travel etc. In the previous, real-world Pyrenees trip, a diary of time spent illustrated that an average of 3.50 hours (max 5.1 and Min 2.2) was spent travelling by coach or walking to the outcrop. There is clearly a significant time saving and this time was used on study and exercises.

IT solutions worked for most students, with only a few, mainly related WiFi, issues encountered. An average of 44.8% of students felt there was need for some training within the VFT software prior to the running of the VFTs, indicating this may be a useful addition going forward. Students were largely positive about LIME as a tool for VFTs, with the Utah 2021 VFT being particularly positive, attributed to their developed skills in using LIME over two VFTs. The use of Google Earth and Blackboard Learn were also met with a positive response by the students, but neither showed the improved metrics of LIME.

The Utah days of the fieldtrips were rated particularly consistent across the two years of delivery. Pyrenees days showed a higher level of variation, however a general increase in metrics is observed over the duration of the VFT. The Pyrenees VFT ran during the first term of the programme. Due to COVID-19 the students had little peer-to-peer social interaction prior to the VFT and most had never used LIME before, both possible influences on the lower scoring of days 1-2 of Pyrenees.

Deleted:
Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm
Deleted: ¶
Formatted: Normal
Deleted: As the VFTs were a direct replacement of traditional trips, the learning outcomes remained the same as previous years.
Deleted: towards the learning outcomes
Deleted: agreeing
Deleted: a
Deleted: Analysis of the individual learning outcomes of both VFTs was beyond the scope of this contribution, however, again they were largely positive, providing satisfaction
Deleted: that the students had learnt the desired material.
Formatted: Font: Italic
Deleted:
Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm
Deleted: In informal discussion students the majority of students would state that they would have preferred a traditional fieldtrip, a viewpoint not as strongly represented in the student course evaluation forms. This is attributed to the simple fact the majority of people like travelling to new places and enjoy being outdoors.
Deleted: , and
Deleted: d
Deleted: likely
Deleted: . Two

8.2 Implications for Future Geological Fieldtrips

The COVID-19 global pandemic has significantly increased the demand and interest in VFTs, leading to rapid developments within the field and the creation of virtual trips to numerous locations globally by a myriad of authors. While traditional fieldtrips remain the foundation of many geology degrees, we argue there is a key role for VFTs beyond COVID-19 for several reasons. Firstly, students self-reported an increased 3D and geospatial understanding within the VFT, compared to their experience of traditional fieldwork. Secondly, it is noted that many of the negative aspects of VFTs have the potential to be significantly mitigated by running VFTs in person within a classroom environment. This is illustrated by the positive increase in learning and enjoyment expressed by the students of the Utah 2021 VFT, where over half the class was able to join on-campus from the course's designated computer room. With the whole class and staff located on-campus we would anticipate further improvement in perceptions, facilitated by peer-to-peer and staff-student interactions taking place in person. Additional benefits would include an equal distribution of IT equipment and WiFi speeds, and easier detection of students who require further assistance.

Ultimately, a blend of traditional fieldwork with VFTs, specifically virtual outcrop, would further reduce the disadvantages of VFTs. Other studies have reported similar findings with VFTs implemented as a supplement to traditional fieldwork (Litherland and Stott, 2012; Peat and Taylor, 2005), including a preview or preparation to fieldwork, or a post fieldwork overview (Hesthammer et al., 2002; Çaliskan, 2011). Within this contribution an average of 53.1% of students agreed they learnt material during the VFT that they would likely have not during a traditional trip. This further illustrates the potential scope for future implementation of VFTs, particularly during the likely digital alteration in the global working structure, with the many corporations and businesses encouraging at-home working into the future.

9. Conclusions

The VFTs presented here provided students the opportunity to observe, interpret and apply their geological understanding to a series of localities using virtual outcrop. The VFTs delivered were a direct replacement to traditional fieldtrips that ran prior to COVID-19. This contribution illustrates experience gained and the value of VFTs as a total replacement for traditional fieldtrips and excursions during a time when travel and social integration was restricted due to the COVID-19 pandemic. A cohesive dataset consisting of multiple virtual outcrops, DEMs, field photos, 360º photo spheres, maps, cross sections and schematic diagrams enabled students to implement many of the same skills utilised during traditional fieldtrips. Through the interrogation of student quantitative questionnaire responses, as well as their qualitive free text comments, we demonstrate that the benefits of VFTs are far reaching, with many highlighted advantages mirroring other researchers' findings. Course evaluation *improvements* were observed during the VFT years, compared to pre-COVID traditional fieldtrips, albeit within the prism of COVID and lower expectations of the VFT. Students nevertheless enjoyed the VFT, and staff were satisfied that the learning outcomes were achieved.

Deleted: 8.2 Advantages of VFT

Deleted:
The VFTs presented within this contribution illustrate some clear advantages compared to the traditional fieldtrip, which are applicable to VFTs in general. (1) VFTs enable more data to be examined at a greater range of scales, from thin sections to global tectonics (pore to plate). (2) VFTs are logistically easier to plan and deliver. There are many factors which must be assessed when planning a traditional fieldtrip such as weather, accommodation and safety which are not part of VFT planning. (3) VFTs are typically significantly cheaper than traditional fieldtrips, making them financially inclusive. (4) The lack of travel also saves time, VFTs are time effective, covering more material than a traditional fieldtrip in a shorter space of time. (5) Moreover, without the need to fly or drive VFTs also have less environment impact. (6) VFTs are more inclusive for those who are unable or restricted to attend traditional fieldtrips due to mobility issues. (7) VFTs also provide flexibility, recordings enable those with other time commitments (e.g. caring responsibilities) to participate, (8) VFTs allow individuals to work at their own pace, inclusive of all learning speeds. (9) VFT can serve to prepare/orientate a class for a physical fieldtrip. (10) VFTs can be geographically independent, thematic VFT can visit world-class geological features from across the world.
8.3 Disadvantages of VFT
While there are many advantages to VFTs there are also disadvantages that were documented during the VFTs within this contribution. (1) Students expressed a loss in social cohesion, which improved for those who were able to access on campus facilities. The split of class between on-campus and off-campus led to unforeseen issues in minor social divides between the two working locations, which was partially mitigated by some groupwork being split into groups based on working location (on- vs. off-campus). (2) Students also stated they would have preferred a traditional trip, mainly for loss in experience of travel and outdoors, as well as loss of traditional field training. (3) IT issues are an expected part of online VFTs, particularly those using a virtual platform to operate, such as Blackboard Learn, Teams and Zoom. Questionnaire feedback illustrates IT issues were not a significant problem within the VFTs presented here.

Deleted: 4

Deleted: .

Deleted: This demand has led to rapid

Deleted: trips

Deleted: to a host of locations globally by various authors

Deleted: It is noted that many of the negative aspects of VFTs have the potential to be significantly lessened by running VFTs in person within a classroom environment, with the whole class and staff located on-campus. Integration with some traditional fieldwork, would potentially further reduce the disadvantages of VFTs. An assessment of blended learning was out of the scope of this contribution, however, an average of 53.1% of students agreed they learnt material during the VFT that they would likely have not during a traditional trip. This illustrates the potential scope for future implementation of VFTs particularly during the potential digital alteration in the global working structure, with the many corporations and businesses encouraging at-home working into the future.

This study ultimately demonstrates it is possible to fully replace a traditional fieldtrip with a VFT addressing the same learning outcomes. However, true emersion within the landscape, culture, and physical outdoor environment cannot be fully recreated. We therefore argue that VFTs, with a strong virtual outcrop component, can be integrated with traditional fieldwork to deliver a best-of-both-worlds approach for geological curricula, beyond COVID-19.

Data Availability

Many virtual outcrop models presented in this paper are available on V3Geo (V3Geo.com), linked within Supplement 2.

Deleted: This contribution illustrates experience gained and the value of VFTs as a replacement for traditional fieldtrips and excursions during a time when travel and social integration was restricted due to the COVID-19 pandemic. We argue VFTs have a key role in the geological curriculum beyond COVID-19 for the following reasons:
VFTs enable a larger volume of data at varying scales to be intergrated and developed.
VFTs are logistically easier to plan and deliver.
VFTs are financially inclusive
VFTs are time efficient
VFTs have a lower carbon emission
VFTs are inclusive to those with restricted physical access
VFTs are flexible, inclusive to those with other time commitments
VFTs allow individuals to work at their own speed
VFT can serve to prepare/orientate a class for a real excursion
VFTs can be geographically independent
While we establish some disadvantages to VFTs it is suggested many would be mitigated through blended learning.

Author contributions

JAH, AH, NS and JHP developed the virtual fieldtrips. JAH and JHP designed and distributed the questionnaires. JHP and JAH wrote the main manuscript draft. GM and RB aided in the running of the VFTs. MC was responsible for processing most of the model data used across the VFTs. JAH, SJB, and NN conceptualised the VFT tools available in LIME, which were implemented by KR, JV and the LIME team. All authors read and gave input through multiple iterations of the manuscript draft.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all IPG Masters participants for contributing their perceptions and thoughts on the VFTs. The VOG group is acknowledged for their extensive work on virtual outcrop, as is the LIME team for developing the software and providing support through all VFTs. V3Geo is also acknowledged as a useful cloud-based platform to host many of the 3D models used within the VFTs, and the SAFARI consortium (https://safaridb.com) for hosting the remaining virtual outcrops and the support. Finally, Harry Johnson, a demonstrator on the first Utah VFT is thanked for his participation in the course and assistance in questionnaire design.

References

Argles, T., Minocha, S. and Burden, D.: Virtual field teaching has evolved: Benefits of a 3D gaming environment. Geology Today, 31, 222-226, doi:10.1111/gto.12116, 2015.

Arthurs, L.A.: Bringing the Field to Students during COVID-19 and Beyond. GSA Today. 31, 28-29, doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3001100, 2021.

Atchison, C.L. and Feig, A.D.: Theoretical perspectives on constructing experience through alternative field-based learning environments for students with mobility impairments. Qualitative inquiry in geoscience education research, 44, 11-21, doi: 10.1130/SPE474, 2011.

Bailey, J., Whitmeyer, S., & DePoar, D. Introduction: The application of google geo tools to geoscience education and research. 492, 7-19, doi: 10.1130/2012.2492(00), In: S. J. Whitmeyer, J.E. Bailey, D. G. De Paor & T. Ornduff (Eds.), Google earth and virtual visualizations in geoscience education and research. Geological Society of America. doi: 10.1130/SPE492, 2012

Barth, N.C., Stock, G.M. and Atit, K., From a virtual field trip to geologically reasoned decisions in Yosemite Valley. *Geoscience Communication*, *5*, 17-28 doi: 10.5194/gc-5-17-2022, 2022.

Bellan, J.M. and Scheurman, G., Actual and virtual reality: Making the most of field trips. *Social Education*, *62*, 35-40 1998.

Bellian, J.A., Kerans, C. and Jennette, D.C.: Digital outcrop models: applications of terrestrial scanning lidar technology in stratigraphic modeling. Journal of sedimentary research, 75, 166-176, doi:10.2110/jsr.2005.013, 2005.

Bhattacharya, J.P. and Davies, R.K.: Growth faults at the prodelta to delta-front transition, Cretaceous Ferron sandstone, Utah. Marine and Petroleum Geology, 18, 525-534, doi:10.1016/S0264-8172(01)00015-0, 2001.

Blackboard Learn: https://abdn.blackboard.com, last accessed: 05 September, 2021.

Bloom, B. S. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals. 1, 6-12, 1965

Bond, C. E. and Cawood, A. J.: A role for virtual outcrop models in blended learning - improved 3D thinking, positive perceptions of learning and the potential for greater equality, diversity and inclusivity in geoscience, Geoscience Communication, 4, 233–244, doi:10.5194/gc-4-233-2021, 2021.

Bond, C. E., Pugsley, J.H., Kedar, L., Ledingham, S.R., Skupinska, M.Z., Gluzinski, T.K., Boath, M.: Learning outcomes, learning support and cohort cohesion of a virtual field trip: an analysis of student and staff perceptions. Geoscience Communication, doi:10.5194/gc-2021-36, in review.

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. ScienceOpen Research, doi: 10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AETBZC.v1, 2016.

Bosch, R., From Field to Phone: A Karst Camp Chronicle. *Geoscience Communication Discussions*, *2021*,1-38, doi: 10.5194/gc-2021-2, 2021.

Bosch, R.: Development and implementation of virtual field teaching resources: two karst geomorphology modules and three virtual capstone pathways. Geoscience Communication, 4, 329-349, doi:10.5194/gc-4-329-2021, 2021.

Braathen, A., Midtkandal, I., Mulrooney, M.J., Appleyard, T.R., Haile, B.G. and Van Yperen, A.E.: Growth-faults from delta collapse–structural and sedimentological investigation of the Last Chance delta, Ferron Sandstone, Utah. Basin Research, 30, 688-707. doi:10.1111/bre.12271, 2018.

Buckley S.J., Howell J.A., Naumann N., Lewis C., Chmielewska M, Ringdal K., Vanbiervliet J., Tong B, Mulelid-Tynes O. S., Foster D., Maxwell G., Pugsley J.H.: V3Geo: a cloud-based repository for virtual 3D models in geoscience. Geoscience Communication, doi:10.5194/gc-2021-30, 2022.

Buckley, S.J., Howell, J.A., Enge, H.D., and Kurz, T.H.: Terrestrial laser scanning in geology: Data acquisition, processing and accuracy considerations: Journal of the Geological Society, 165, 625–638, doi:10.1144/0016-76492007-100, 2008.

Buckley, S.J., Kurz, T.H., Howell, J.A., and Schneider, D.: Terrestrial lidar and hyperspectral data fusion products for geological outcrop analysis: Computers & Geosciences, 54, 249–258, doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2013.01.018, 2013.

Buckley, S.J., Kurz, T.H., Jaboyedoff, M., Derron, M.-H., and Chandler, J.H., 2017, Virtual Geoscience Conference 2016: Where geomatics meets geoscience: The Photogrammetric Record, 32, 346–349, doi:10.1111/phor.12220, 2016.

Buckley, S.J., Ringdal, K., Naumann, N., Dolva, B., Kurz, T.H., Howell, J.A. and Dewez, T.J.: LIME: Software for 3-D visualization, interpretation, and communication of virtual geoscience models. Geosphere, 15, 222-235, doi:10.1130/GES02002, 2019.

Butler, R., *Teaching geoscience through fieldwork*. Higher Education Academy Subject Centre for Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences. 2008.

Çaliskan, O., Virtual field trips in education of earth and environmental sciences. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 3239-3243, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.278, 2011.

Cliffe, A. D. A review of the benefits and drawbacks to virtual field guides in today's Geoscience higher education environment. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *14*, 1-14. doi: 10.1186/s41239-017-0066-x, 2017.

Dolphin, G., Dutchak, A., Karchewski, B. and Cooper, J., Virtual field experiences in introductory geology: Addressing a capacity problem, but finding a pedagogical one. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, *67*, 114-130, doi: 10.1080/10899995.2018.1547034, 2019.

Dunphy, A. and Spellman, G., Geography fieldwork, fieldwork value and learning styles. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, *18*, 19-28, doi: 10.1080/10382040802591522, 2009.

Eide, C.H., Howell, J.A. and Buckley, S.J.: Sedimentology and reservoir properties of tabular and erosive offshore transition deposits in wave-dominated, shallow-marine strata: Book Cliffs, USA. Petroleum Geoscience, 21, 55-73. doi:10.1144/petgeo2014-015, 2015.

Enge, H.D. and Howell, J.A.: Impact of deltaic clinothems on reservoir performance: Dynamic studies of reservoir analogs from the Ferron Sandstone Member and Panther Tongue, Utah. AAPG bulletin, 94, 139-161.doi:10.1306/07060908112, 2010.

Enge, H.D., Howell, J.A. and Buckley, S.J.: The geometry and internal architecture of stream mouth bars in the Panther Tongue and the Ferron Sandstone Members, Utah, USA. Journal of Sedimentary Research, 80, 1018-1031, doi:10.2110/jsr.2010.088, 2010.

Esarey, J., & Valdes, N., Unbiased, reliable, and valid student evaluations can still be unfair. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *45*, 1106-1120, doi: 10.1080/02602938.2020.1724875, 2020.

Evelpidou, N., Karkani, A., Saitis, G. and Spyrou, E.: Virtual field trips as a tool for indirect geomorphological experience: a case study from the southeastern part of the Gulf of Corinth, Greece. Geoscience Communication, 4, 351-360. doi:10.5194/gc-4-351-2021, 2021.

Falivene, O., Arbués, P., Howell, J., Muñoz, J.A., Fernández, O. and Marzo, M.: Hierarchical geocellular facies modelling of a turbidite reservoir analogue from the Eocene of the Ainsa Basin, NE Spain. Marine and Petroleum Geology, 23, 679-701, doi:10.1016/j.marpetgeo.2006.05.004, 2006.

Fletcher, S., France, D., Moore, K., & Robinson, G., Fieldwork education and technology: A GEES perspective. *Planet*, *7*, 17-19, doi: 10.11120/plan.2002.00070017, 2002.

Foxford, K.A., Walsh, J.J., Watterson, J., Garden, I.R., Guscott, S.C. and Burley, S.D.: Structure and content of the Moab Fault Zone, Utah, USA, and its implications for fault seal prediction. Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 147, 87-103, doi:10.1144/GSL.SP.1998.147.01.06, 1998.

Gazcón, N.F., Nagel, J.M.T., Bjerg, E.A. and Castro, S.M., Fieldwork in Geosciences assisted by ARGeo: A mobile Augmented Reality system. *Computers & Geosciences*, *121*, 30-38, doi: 10.1016/j.cageo.2018.09.004, 2018

Giles, S., Jackson, C. & Stephen, N.: Barriers to fieldwork in undergraduate geoscience degrees. Nat Rev Earth Environ, 1, 77–78, doi:10.1038/s43017-020-0022-5, 2020.

Giorgis, S.: Google Earth mapping exercises for structural geology students—A promising intervention for improving penetrative visualization ability. Journal of Geoscience Education, 63(2), 140-146, doi:10.5408/13-108.1, 2015.

Google, Explore the World in 3D: https://earth.google.com/web/@13.33890973,-67.80216453,-2626.54264152a,23691900.2768d,35y,0h,0t,0r/data=CjkSNxIgZDY1OGRjYWIzNjlhMTFlOGFjNmU2OWJjN2I2ZDI2Y2EiE2xheWVyXzNkY292ZXJfcGFuZWw last accessed: Sept 2021.

Gregory, D.D., Tomes, H.E., Panasiuk, S.L. and Andersen, A.J.: Building an online field course using digital and physical tools including VR field sites and virtual core logging. Journal of Geoscience Education, 1-16. doi:10.1080/10899995.2021.1946361, 2021.

Harrald, J.E., Coe, A.L., Thomas, R.M. and Hoggett, M., 2021. Use of drones to analyse sedimentary successions exposed in the foreshore. Proceedings of the Geologists' Association. doi:10.1016/j.pgeola.2021.02.001

Hartley, A. and Evenstar, L.: Fluvial architecture in actively deforming salt basins: Chinle Formation, Paradox Basin, Utah. Basin Research, 30, 48-166, doi:10.1111/bre.12247, 2018.

Hartley, A.J., Owen, A., Swan, A., Weissmann, G.S., Holzweber, B.I., Howell, J., Nichols, G. and Scuderi, L.: Recognition and importance of amalgamated sandy meander belts in the continental rock record. Geology, 43, 679-682. doi:10.1130/G36743.1, 2015.

Hesthammer, J., Fossen, H., Sautter, M., Sæther, B. and Johansen, S.E., The use of information technology to enhance learning in geological field trips. Journal of Geoscience Education, 50, 528-538, doi: 10.5408/1089-9995-50.5.528, 2002.

Horsman, E., Tikoff, B. and Morgan, S.: Emplacement-related fabric and multiple sheets in the Maiden Creek sill, Henry Mountains, Utah, USA. Journal of Structural Geology, 27, 1426-1444, doi:10.1016/j.jsg.2005.03.003, 2005.

Howell J. and Flint S.: Sequence stratigraphy of the Book Cliffs Succession. In Coe A: The sedimentary record of sea-level change. Cambridge University Press, 287, 2003.

Howell, J. A., Martinius, A. W., and Good, T. R.: The application of outcrop analogues in geological modelling: A review, present status and future outlook, in: Sediment-Body Geometry and Heterogeneity: Analogue Studies for Modelling the Subsurface, Geological Society, London, Special Publication 387, 1–25, doi:10.1144/SP387.12, 2014.

Howell, J.A. Eide, C. H.E., Hartley, A.J.: No evidence for sea level fall in the Cretaceous strata of the Book Cliffs of Eastern Utah, EarthArXiv, doi:10.31223/osf.io/2ju3d, 2018.

Howell, J.A., Chmielewska, M., Lewis, C., Buckley, S., Naumann, N. and Pugsley, J.: Acquisition of Data for Building Photogrammetric Virtual Outcrop Models for the Geosciences using Remotely Piloted Vehicles (RPVs). EarthArXiv, doi:10.31223/X54914, 2021

Hurst, S.D., Use of “virtual” field trips in teaching introductory geology. *Computers & Geosciences*, *24*, 653-658, 1998.

Jackson, M.D., Hampson, G.J. and Sech, R.P.: Three-dimensional modeling of a shoreface-shelf parasequence reservoir analog: Part 2. Geologic controls on fluid flow and hydrocarbon recovery. AAPG bulletin, 93, 1183-1208, doi:10.1306/05110908145, 2009.

Jacobson, A. R., Militello, R., & Baveye, P. C., Development of computer-assisted virtual field trips to support multidisciplinary learning. *Computers & Education*, *52*, 571-580, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2008.11.007, 2009.

Kingsbury, C. G., Sibert, E. C., Killingback, Z., & Atchison, C. L., “Nothing about us without us:” The perspectives of autistic geoscientists on inclusive instructional practices in geoscience education. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, *68*, 302-310, doi: 10.1080/10899995.2020.1768017, 2020.

Klippel, A., Zhao, J., Oprean, D. Wallfrün, J. O., Stubbs, C., La Famina, P., Jackson, J. L.: The value of being there: toward a science of immersive virtual field trips. Virtual Reality, 24, 753-770, doi:10.1007/s10055-019-00418-5, 2020.

Kuorikoski, J., & Ylikoski, P. External representations and scientific understanding. *Synthese*, *192*, 3817–3837, http://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-014-0591-2, 2015.

Lisle, R.J.: Google Earth: a new geological resource. Geology Today, 22, 29-32, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2451.2006.00546.x, 2006.

Litherland, K., & Stott, T. A., Virtual field sites: Losses and gains in authenticity with semantic technologies. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, *21*, 213-230, doi: 10.1080/1475939X.2012.697773, 2012.

Lukes, L., A new take on the field trip: A low-tech, inquiry-based virtual field experience. *The Science Teacher*, *8*, 24, 2014.

Matthews, W., Hampson, G., Trudgill, B., Underhill, J. and Post, P.J.: Impact of salt movement on fluvio-lacustrine stratigraphy and facies architecture: Late Triassic Chinle Formation, northern Paradox Basin, SE Utah, USA. In: Salt-sediment interactions and hydrocarbon prospectivity: Proceedings of 24th Annual Gulf Coast Section SEPM Foundation Bob F. Perkins Research Conference, 931-964, 2004.

Mogk, D. W., & Goodwin, C., Learning in the field: Synthesis of research on thinking and learning in the geosciences. In K. A. Kastens & C. A. Manduca (Eds.), *Earth and Mind II: A Synthesis of Research on Thinking and Learning in the Geosciences, 2,* 131-164, doi: 10.1130/2012.2486(24), 2012.

Monet, J., & Greene, T.: Using Google Earth and satellite imagery to foster place-based teaching in an introductory physical Geology course. Journal of Geoscience Education, 60, 10–20, doi:10.5408/10-203.1, 2012.

Nichols, G.J. and Hirst, J.P.: Alluvial fans and fluvial distributary systems, Oligo-Miocene, northern Spain; contrasting processes and products. Journal of Sedimentary Research, 68, 879-889, doi:10.2110/jsr.68.879, 1998.

Nichols, G.J.: The structure and stratigraphy of the western external sierras of the Pyrenees, northern Spain. Geological Journal, 22, 245-259 doi:10.1002/gj.3350220307, 1987.

Owen, A., Nichols, G. J., Hartley, A. J., Weissmann, G. S. and Scuderi, L. A.: Quantification of a distributive fluvial system: the salt wash DFS of the Morrison Formation, SW U.S.A. Journal of Sedimentary Research, 85, 544-561. doi: 10.2110/jsr.2015.35, 2015.

Pattison, S.A.: Sequence stratigraphic significance of sharp-based lowstand shoreface deposits, Kenilworth Member, Book Cliffs, Utah. AAPG bulletin, 79, 444-462, doi:10.1306/8D2B155C-171E-11D7-8645000102C1865D, 1995.

Peat, M., & Taylor, C.,Virtual biology: How well can it replace authentic activities. *CAL-Laborate*, *13*, 21-24. 2005

Petersen, G. B., Klingenberg, S., Mayer, R. E., & Makransky, G., The virtual field trip: Investigating how to optimize immersive virtual learning in climate change education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *51*, 2099-2115, doi: 10.1111/bjet.12991, 2020.

Phillips, S.P., Howell, J.A., Hartley, A.J. and Chmielewska, M.: Tidal estuarine deposits of the transgressive Naturita Formation (Dakota Sandstone): San Rafael Swell, Utah, USA. Journal of Sedimentary Research, 90, 777-795, doi:10.2110/jsr.2020.51, 2020.

Phillips, S.P., Howell, J.A., Hartley, A.J., Chmielewska, M. and Hudson, S.M.: Evolution of foreland basin fluvial systems in the mid-Cretaceous of Utah, USA (upper Cedar Mountain and Naturita formations). Sedimentology, 5, 2097-2124, doi:10.1111/sed.12845, 2021.

Pickering, K.T. and Corregidor, J., 2005. Mass-transport complexes (MTCs) and tectonic control on basin-floor submarine fans, middle Eocene, south Spanish Pyrenees. *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, *75*, 761-783, doi: 10.2110/jsr.2005.062, 2005.

Pringle, J.K., Howell, J.A., Hodgetts, D., Westerman, A.R. and Hodgson, D.M.: Virtual outcrop models of petroleum reservoir analogues: a review of the current state-of-the-art. First break, 24, 33-42, doi:10.3997/1365-2397.2006005, 2006.

Ramasundaram, V., Grunwald, S., Mangeot, A., Comerford, N. B., & Bliss, C., Development of an environmental virtual field laboratory. Computers & Education, 45, 21-34, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2004.03.002, 2005.

Rittersbacher, A., Buckley, S.J., Howell, J.A., Hampson, G.J. and Vallet, J.: Helicopter-based laser scanning: a method for quantitative analysis of large-scale sedimentary architecture. Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 387(1), pp.185-202. doi:10.1144/SP387.3, 2015

Rotevatn, A., Tveranger, J., Howell, J.A. and Fossen, H.: Dynamic investigation of the effect of a relay ramp on simulated fluid flow: geocellular modelling of the Delicate Arch Ramp, Utah. Petroleum Geoscience, 15, 45-58, doi:10.1144/1354-079309-779, 2009.

Rotzien, J.R., Sincavage, R., Pellowski, C., Gavillot, Y., Filkorn, H., Cooper, S., Shannon, J., Yildiz, U., Sawyer, F. and Uzunlar, N.: Field-Based Geoscience Education during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Planning, Execution, Outcomes, and Forecasts. GSA Today, 31, 4-10, doi:10.1130/GSATG483A.1, 2021.

Safaridb: https://safaridb.com/ last access: 04 September, 2021.

Scerri, E.M., Kühnert, D., Blinkhorn, J., Groucutt, H.S., Roberts, P., Nicoll, K., Zerboni, A., Orijemie, E.A., Barton, H., Candy, I. and Goldstein, S.T.: Field-based sciences must transform in response to COVID-19. Nature Ecology & Evolution, 4, 1571-1574, doi:10.1038/s41559-020-01317-8 , 2020.

Schott, C., Virtual fieldtrips and climate change education for tourism students. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, *21*, 13-22, doi: 10.1016/j.jhlste.2017.05.002, 2017.

Sømme, T. O., Howell, J. H., Hampson, G. J.: Architecture and genesis of intra-parasequence discontinuity surfaces in wave-dominated deltaic deposits: Upper Cretaceous Sunnyside Member, Book Cliffs, Utah, U.S.A In Hampson G.J., Steel R.J., Burgess P.M., Dalrymple R.W.: Recent Advances in Models of Siliciclastic Shallow-Marine Stratigraphy. SEPM (Society for Sedimentary Geology) Special Publication, 90, 437-456, 2008.

Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D., On the Validity of Student Evaluation of Teaching: The State of the Art. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*, 598-642. doi: 10.3102/0034654313496870, 2013.

Stainfield, J., Fisher, P., Ford, B. and Solem, M., International virtual field trips: a new direction?. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, *24*, 255-262, doi: 10.1080/713677387, 2000.

Stumpf, R. J., Douglass, J., & Dorn, R. I., Learning desert geomorphology virtually versus in the field. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, *32*, 378-399, doi: 10.1080/03098260802221140, 2008.

Tibaldi, A., Bonali, F.L., Vitello, F., Delage, E., Nomikou, P., Antoniou, V., Becciani, U., de Vries, B.V.W., Krokos, M. and Whitworth, M.: Real world–based immersive Virtual Reality for research, teaching and communication in volcanology. Bulletin of Volcanology, 82(5), 1-12, doi:10.1007/s00445-020-01376-6, 2020.

V3Geo: https://v3geo.com last accessed: 04 September, 2021.

Van Wagoner, J.C.: Sequence Stratigraphy and Marine to Nonmarine Facies Architecture of Foreland Basin Strata, Book Cliffs, Utah, U.S.A. AAPG, 64, doi:10.1306/M64594, 1995.

Whitmeyer, S.J. and Dordevic, M., 2021. Creating virtual geologic mapping exercises in a changing world. Geosphere, 17(1), pp.226-243. doi:10.1130/GES02308.1, 2021.

Whitmeyer, S.J., Feely, M., De Paor, D.G., Hennessy, R., Whitmeyer, S., Nicoletti, J., Santangelo, B., Daniels, J., and Rivera, M.: Visu- alization techniques in field geology education: A case study from Western Ireland, 2009, in Whitmeyer, S.J., Mogk, D.W., and Pyle, E.J., eds., Field Geology Education: Historical Perspectives and Modern Approaches: Geological Society of America Special Paper 461, 105–115.

Yu, L., Gong, P., Google Earth as a virtual globe tool for Earth science applications at the global scale: progress and perspectives. International Journal of Remote Sensing, 33, 3966-3986, doi: 10.1080/01431161.2011.636081, 2011.

Xu, X., Aiken, C.L., Bhattacharya, J.P., Corbeanu, R.M., Nielsen, K.C., McMechan, G.A. and Abdelsalam, M.G.: Creating virtual 3-D outcrop. The Leading Edge, 19, 197-202, doi:10.1190/1.1438576, 2000.

Deleted: Argles, T., Minocha, S. and Burden, D.: Virtual field teaching has evolved: Benefits of a 3D gaming environment. Geology Today, 31, 222-226, doi:10.1111/gto.12116, 2015.¶
Arthurs, L.A.: Bringing the Field to Students during COVID-19 and Beyond. GSA Today. 31, 28-29, doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3001100, 2021.¶
Bellian, J.A., Kerans, C. and Jennette, D.C.: Digital outcrop models: applications of terrestrial scanning lidar technology in stratigraphic modeling. Journal of sedimentary research, 75, 166-176, doi:10.2110/jsr.2005.013, 2005.¶
Bhattacharya, J.P. and Davies, R.K.: Growth faults at the prodelta to delta-front transition, Cretaceous Ferron sandstone, Utah. Marine and Petroleum Geology, 18, 525-534, doi:10.1016/S0264-8172(01)00015-0, 2001.¶
Blackboard Learn: https://abdn.blackboard.com, last accessed: 05 September, 2021.¶
Bond, C. E. and Cawood, A. J.: A role for virtual outcrop models in blended learning - improved 3D thinking, positive perceptions of learning and the potential for greater equality, diversity and inclusivity in geoscience, Geoscience Communication, 4, 233–244, doi:10.5194/gc-4-233-2021, 2021.¶
Bond, C. E., Pugsley, J.H., Kedar, L., Ledingham, S.R., Skupinska, M.Z., Gluzinski, T.K., Boath, M.: Learning outcomes, learning support and cohort cohesion of a virtual field trip: an analysis of student and staff perceptions. Geoscience Communication, doi:10.5194/gc-2021-36, in review.¶
Bosch, R.: Development and implementation of virtual field teaching resources: two karst geomorphology modules and three virtual capstone pathways. Geoscience Communication, 4, 329-349, doi:10.5194/gc-4-329-2021, 2021.¶
Braathen, A., Midtkandal, I., Mulrooney, M.J., Appleyard, T.R., Haile, B.G. and Van Yperen, A.E.: Growth-faults from delta collapse–structural and sedimentological investigation of the Last Chance delta, Ferron Sandstone, Utah. Basin Research, 30, 688-707. doi:10.1111/bre.12271, 2018.¶
Buckley, S.J., Howell, J.A., Enge, H.D., and Kurz, T.H.: Terrestrial laser scanning in geology: Data acquisition, processing and accuracy considerations: Journal of the Geological Society, 165, 625–638, doi:10.1144/0016-76492007-100, 2008.¶
Buckley, S.J., Kurz, T.H., Howell, J.A., and Schneider, D.: Terrestrial lidar and hyperspectral data fusion products for geological outcrop analysis: Computers & Geosciences, 54, 249–258, doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2013.01.018, 2013.¶
Buckley, S.J., Kurz, T.H., Jaboyedoff, M., Derron, M.-H., and Chandler, J.H., 2017, Virtual Geoscience Conference 2016: Where geomatics meets geoscience: The Photogrammetric Record, v. 32, p. 346–349, doi:10.1111/phor.12220, 2016.¶
Buckley, S.J., Ringdal, K., Naumann, N., Dolva, B., Kurz, T.H., Howell, J.A. and Dewez, T.J.: LIME: Software for 3-D visualization, interpretation, and communication of virtual geoscience models. Geosphere, 15, 222-235, doi:10.1130/GES02002, 2019.¶
Buckley S.J., Howell J.A., Naumann N., Lewis C., Chmielewska M, Ringdal K., Vanbiervliet J., Tong B, Mulelid-Tynes O. S., Foster D., Maxwell G., Pugsley J.H.: V3Geo: a cloud-based repository for virtual 3D models in geoscience. Geoscience Communication, doi:10.5194/gc-2021-30 *in review.*¶
Eide, C.H., Howell, J.A. and Buckley, S.J.: Sedimentology and reservoir properties of tabular and erosive offshore transition deposits in wave-dominated, shallow-marine strata: Book Cliffs, USA. Petroleum Geoscience, 21, 55-73. doi:10.1144/petgeo2014-015, 2015.¶
Enge, H.D. and Howell, J.A.: Impact of deltaic clinothems on reservoir performance: Dynamic studies of reservoir analogs ... [10]



Figure 1. Outline of types and delivery methods of VFT. (a) Types of VFT separated between location-based trips to a specific locality, and thematic trips spanning global localities with a common theme. Examples given. (b) Delivery method of VFT divided between tutor-led VFTs and student-led VFTs and the blended spectrum between. Examples given.



Deleted:



Figure 2. Proposed workflow for building and running VFTs, this workflow was followed for every VFT within this contribution.



Figure 3. Template storyboard for designing a VFT. Data input within LIME indicated. Locations varied across each day of each trip, from as few as three locations to as many as eight depending on the days aims. Typically, a new location was created for each new virtual outcrop.



Figure 4. Bolea, Aragon, Spain, example Poll within Blackboard Learn Virtual Classroom, students asked to identify the depositional setting of locality. Virtual outcrop: Bolea, VOG Group, https://v3geo.com/model/22; Aerial Photography on DEM, USGS EROS Archive; DEM, USGS 3D Elevation Program.



Figure 5. Bartlett Wash, Utah, USA, model available on SarafiDB. Locality task to calculate the impact of fractures on reservoir quality. Virtual outcrop from Safari and viewed in LIME with additional material including logs, photos, and 360 panorama images (in this example from ©Google Maps). Aerial Photography on DEM, USGS EROS Archive; DEM, USGS 3D Elevation Program.



Figure 6. Ainsa Quarry, Spain, a view within the Pyrenees 2020 virtual fieldtrip. Virtual outcrop available at: Ainsa Quarry, VOG Group, https://v3geo.com/model/1, supplemented with additional material including well logs and core photos within LIME.



Figure 7. Course elaluation reports for the IPG course including two fieldtrips. 2016-2018 data collected prior to COVID-19; trips were traditional fieldtrips. 2019-2020 Pyrenees was a traditional fieldtrip, whereas Utah was a VFT. 2020-21 both trips were run as VFTs.



1490 **Figure 8. Quantitative responses to questionnaires for all three VFTs presented as Box and whisker plots. a) and b) summarises learning outcomes, e) to j) summaries software, content and IT, and k) to m) summaries comparative statements between VFTs and traditional fieldtrips. Responses are collated for each trip presented for comparison.**



Figure 9. Duration analysis of activities across the Utah 2021 VFT, average of time spent each day on identified activities listed in the key.



1495 **Figure 10. Quantitative responses to day learning and enjoyment for all three VFTs presented as Box and whisker plots. a) and b) The responses to the 11 days of fieldtrip, c) and d) summarises software, content and IT, and k) to m) summaries comparative statements between VFTs and traditional fieldtrips.**

Page 2: [1] Deleted **PUGSLEY, JESSICA HELEN (PGR)** **17/02/2022 13:53:00**

Page 4: [2] Deleted **PUGSLEY, JESSICA HELEN (PGR)** **17/02/2022 13:41:00**

Page 4: [3] Deleted **Pugsley, Jessica** **14/03/2022 12:12:00**

Page 4: [4] Formatted **Pugsley, Jessica** **14/03/2022 12:13:00**

Font: (Default) +Body (Times New Roman), 10 pt

Page 4: [5] Deleted **PUGSLEY, JESSICA HELEN (PGR)** **24/03/2022 14:47:00**

Page 6: [6] Deleted **PUGSLEY, JESSICA HELEN (PGR)** **24/03/2022 14:36:00**

Page 6: [7] Formatted **Pugsley, Jessica** **14/03/2022 12:29:00**

Font: (Default) +Headings (Times New Roman), 10 pt

Page 6: [8] Deleted **PUGSLEY, JESSICA HELEN (PGR)** **22/02/2022 09:48:00**

Page 7: [9] Deleted **PUGSLEY, JESSICA HELEN (PGR)** **22/02/2022 14:29:00**

Page 28: [10] Deleted **PUGSLEY, JESSICA HELEN (PGR)** **24/03/2022 14:37:00**