

Compilation of course evaluation GEOM06 2016,
handed in by 7 of 7 students (field excursion 6 of 6 students)

Overall rating of the quality of the course: 4.6 (1 poor – 5 excellent)

Overall rating of the relevance of the course: 4.9 (1 irrelevant– 5 necessary)

General comments:

- #1: Loved the course! Learned a lot and enjoyed the opportunity to “research” and do several projects.
 - #2: V. good course – thin section work was especially beneficial. Combined theory + practical v. well, and seminars were great tools to learn deeper into the subject.
 - #4: The course was challenging and very interesting.
 - #5: High learning outcome after the course. However, I would like to have some quizzes similar to M05. Just so you start getting into the literature directly and not just before the exam.
 - #6: Really good, informative & interesting course. Teacher performances were excellent. Well planned and comprehensive lectures. I would personally appreciate some more “recap quizzes” throughout the course to make sure you are on the right track and picking up what is important etc.
-

3 days' field excursion in Halland, 1 day including contribution by SGU

Rating of the quality of this part of the course: 5.0 (1 poor – 5 excellent)

Rating of the relevance of this part of the course: 5.0 (1 irrelevant– 5 necessary)

General comments:

- 1: So much fun!
 - 2: V. important part of the course; I learned a lot. Just a thought, would it be worthwhile taking a look at metamorphosed ultramafics in the area, if there are any?
 - 4: A day or two of mapping would be nice to improve independence and real world recognition of the studied rocks.
 - 5: Wish it was a day longer. We didn't get to see all the localities in the area due to time restriction.
 - 6 Great excursion!
-

The course evaluation is in total 4 pages x 7 students, allowing for detailed comments on all lectures, labs, seminars, and field excursion of the course. If you want to see the entire evaluation please contact course leader CM.

General evaluation by course leader CM:

My impression from reading course evaluations and discussion with this year's as well as previous years' students, is that course participants are overall very pleased. The course structure and the opportunities to perform practical tasks are particularly appreciated (2 sets of lab linked with seminar group presentations + 1 individual case study linked with 2 seminar days). Likewise is the field excursion appreciated (new for 2015, including 1 day participation of State Geologist from the Geological Survey of Sweden on bedrock quality).

Throughout the 6 years that this course has been given, individual students have suggested to *add more time* for either difficult or favorite topics (e.g. P-T determination, the individual case study, the field excursion, structural geology, bedrock quality, geochronology), and to *add various new topics and tasks* (but never omit existing). Suggestions include e.g. add metasomatism, add ore deposits, add scheduled student opposition on oral presentations, etc. This is an expression of that the students are engaged in the discipline and want more. It is very positive and I wish we could offer this for our geologists-to-be. It is regrettably extremely difficult to add more material and scheduled teaching time into the (crammed) 9 weeks that are available for GEOM06.

Planned changes for 2017 (GEOM08) are 1) to add some homework exercises, 2) increase teacher guidance for the geochronology lab, and 3) *possibly* expand the field excursion with one day.