Compilation of course evaluation GEOM08 2017, handed in by 9 of 10 students

Overall rating of the quality of the course: 4.3 (1 poor – 5 excellent)

Overall rating of the relevance of the course: 4.3 (1 irrelevant– 5 necessary)

General comments:

#1: I liked this course a lot. Have learned very much during this time.
#2: Really good and relevant! Has got me interested in the subject! I will continue to look into this. Lotta has been very enthusiastic and a great lecturer!
#3: I think the course content was relevant and useful. In general I think this course was very good and above my expectations.
#4: It is a very good course. Great course. Lots of knowledge.
#5: A very interesting and entertaining course. Feels that I’ve learned a lot. Relevant.
#6: Well arranged course. More seminars and lectures from industry professionals would be a great addition. The microscopy works is very useful as it gives practical knowledge of how things work.
#7: Would give it a 5 if the grade was more evenly distributed ex: seminars 30%, exam 60%, field course 10%.
#8: Often going into the nitty gritty and getting lost in its big picture of relevance. I have grown in my role as a geologist. Lottas mantra of treating the exercises as fun really made everything better.
#9: Missing protoliths – rock names and classification.

4 days’ field excursion in SW Sweden, 1 day including contribution by SGU

Rating of the quality of this part of the course: 4.4 (1 poor – 5 excellent)

Rating of the relevance of this part of the course: 4.9 (1 irrelevant– 5 necessary)

General comments:

#1: Really nice end of the course that was tying things together that we had learned. It was also inspiring in terms of what one can work with as a metamorphic petrologist.
#2: It was fun! Especially the third day (high PT rocks) and the last day with Jenny.
#3: It was a perfect way to conclude the course and use theoretical knowledge we have obtained in the field. The structure of the field course was very good.
#4: Jenny Andersson was great.
#5: It was an excellent way to connect the theory with the real world.
#6: Very informative, and an interesting contribution from the Geological Survey of Sweden.
#7: Some bad outcrops. Nature is to blame.
#9: It's better to have two field trips (in two days) 4 days being out is boring a bit. As the result we had less outcome and less learning at the last days.

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 lab 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 much appreciated (new version 2017) including 1 day participation of State Geologist from the Geological Survey of Sweden on bedrock quality.

In this year’s oral course evaluation (by tradition following the written evaluation) it was discussed whether the group seminars could be graded and included into the final grade. I would 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.

In this year’s course evaluation, one student complained that there was no lecture on rock names and classification. This material is available in the second short chapter in the course book by Winter, and it is not difficult to comprehend. Lecture time needs to focus on those parts that really need guidance.

Throughout the 7 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 regretfully extremely difficult to add more material and scheduled teaching time into the (crammed) 9 weeks that are available for GEOM08.

Changes that were made for 2017 include 1) added homework exercises, 2) increased teacher guidance for the geochronology lab, and 3) expanding of the field excursion from 3 to 4 days. These fell out well, and only minor changes are planned for 2018. This year a couple of students felt shortage of time and too much writing during the written examination. For 2018 the intention is to make the exam a bit shorter to write.
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