

Compilation of course evaluation GEOM08 2018,
handed in by 9 of 9 students

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

Overall rating of the relevance of the course: 4.8 (1 irrelevant– 5 necessary)

General comments:

- #1: I found the course very interesting and challenging.
 - #2: Good balance between theoretic knowledge and hands on experience. Well structured course layout. Good teachers and exercises! No obvious weak point that I can recall at the moment.
 - #3: Very interesting course.
 - #4 In my opinion, the quality of this course was high. This course contained some moments/parts that were a little difficult to understand but they were interesting. The microscopy part was instructive.
 - #5: -
 - #6: Really good course, it's learnt a lot during the course. The microscopy component is really good and illustrative.
 - #7 -
 - #8 A bit heavy on the lecture part but of course necessary.
 - #9 I have no specific comments other than that I think the balance between practicals o theory has been very good. The course has also given the students a sense of what metamorphic petrology can be applied to outside of academia.
-

Field excursion in SW Sweden

Rating of the quality of this part of the course: 4.1 (1 poor – 5 excellent)

Rating of the relevance of this part of the course: 4.4 (1 irrelevant– 5 necessary)

General comments:

- #1: Fun and interesting, however a lecture to summarise before or after the trip would be good to tie it all together.
- #2: I liked that it was after the exam.
- #3 I think it's good the field trip is last and after the exam.
- #4 Very interesting field excursion. The only problem was the weather conditions.
- #5 -
- #6 Unfortunately the weather didn't help too much. Would be nice to carry out a cross-section or some sort of task to be evaluated from the field, likewise include this in the final mark of the course.
- #7 -
- #8 Good excursion where we got to see most relevant things. Put our knowledge into perspective.
- #9 The field trip tied together the contents of the course while placing it in a specific context, making the theory more understandable and easier to grasp. This part of the course is essential.

The course evaluation is in total 4 pages x 9 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 (several microscopy labs + 2 sets of labs linked with seminar group presentations + 1 individual case study linked with 2 seminar days). Most students find the course challenging but rewarding. They generally express high appreciation for most of the lectures and labs. The field excursion is also appreciated. During 2018, the weather conditions were unusual (difficult) with several 10's of cm of snow inland which meant we had to keep at the coast.

During this year's oral course evaluation (by tradition following the written evaluation), it was suggested that the SEM work be followed by a second session at the SEM. This is a very good suggestion, indeed, but I fear it is unlikely that time permits.

In last year's (2017's) oral course evaluation, it was discussed whether the group seminars could be graded and included into the final grade. I find this difficult for two reasons: one is that it is hard to distinguish individual performances in group presentations, the other – which is my firm opinion - is that **the basic theoretical knowledge** in metamorphic petrology, as tested in the written examination, **must** be fundamental for passing the course.

Throughout the 8 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 GEOM08.

Small changes are planned for 2019, one of them a bit extended introduction to the P-T lab. Another is to set aside in the schedule one day more for individual study before the written exam.

Lund 21 June 2018



Charlotte Möller (course leader)



Erik Aldenius (course representative)