Compilation of course evaluation GEOM08 2019, handed in by 8 of 8 students

**Overall rating of the quality of the course: 4.7**  (1 poor – 5 excellent)

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

**General comments:**

#1: It was a very complete course. It was well distributed and covered efficiently lots of topics in a short period of time. Maybe some things were very condensed since the lack of time, but in general I feel happy with what I have learned. I think the labs and the last lecture (industry-related) are also an excellent complement to the course.

#2: The topics covered went to a good level of depth for my prior knowledge and the course covered a good range of subjects.

#3: In the beginning, my knowledge in metamorphic petrology was limited, however after this course my interest for the topic grew. I liked the construction and build up of topics within it, especially quality wise.

#4: We learned a lot from this course. We were able to go into details, as well as learning the big picture. I especially enjoyed learning petrography and its relation to theory. I think that a good addition would be mandatory exercises, like in the igneous petrology course. Those forced us to keep up, and really think about what we had learned.

#5: Overall very good although at some points there were too much information and I felt a bit lost.

#6: Some of the seminars would be good if they count for a small percentage in the final grade. Very interesting things and facts about metamorphic petrology/ petrography/ mineralogy.

#7: I liked the course. I think in general it was complete, but I would like to see more of understanding tectonic/structural context

#8: Great course overall. Some confusion regarding the schedule (layout issues resulting in that something I thought was half a day was actually a full day). Great labs/exercises.

---

4-day field excursion in SW Sweden, incl. 1 day with J. Andersson from SGU.

**Rating of the quality of this part of the course: 4.9**  (1 poor – 5 excellent)

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

**General comments:**

#1: The excursion was very interesting. We got to see different kinds of rocks formed under different settings and also understood how deformation took place. Also, the last day in the quarries gave me a new perspective of how to apply the “academic knowledge” to real life. The localities were well chosen and the didactic material very useful.

#2: I found it really good that the end of the field trip covered the applications to what we have learnt. I find it much more motivating to learn about something which has an application to something important.

#3: The field excursion was excellent, and good to be able to take out what you have seen in lectures and find it in nature, being able to use previous based knowledge.

#4: I really enjoyed the excursion. The hostel was great, and we were able to stay for a long time at each location, so that all of our questions could be answered. The only
downside was the range of rocks, but that will always be a problem (logistical), or a matter where you go.

#5: Include more practical information and/or some meetings with the industries. A presentation from a geologist from a company would be very interesting.

#6: It would be good if there was a recap of each day, a typical one just to revise/remember the localities (a little unusual names) and their petrographic composition.

#7: The field trip was great, but I think it would benefit from a recap at the end of the day, talking about how the outcrops and how they relate to each other.

#8: The excursion was fun. It was a lot of stuff cramped into few days, but I understand that the university shouldn’t pay for us having free time, and that we should use the time we have as much as possible.

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 2019, the excursion route covered fewer stops than previous years, but with more time at each locality, which fell out well. Every year, the students have expressed much appreciation for the applied science presentations (bedrock quality and concrete microstructures, respectively) by Jenny Andersson (SGU, Uppsala) and Birgit Fredrich (RISE, Lund).

During this year’s oral course evaluation (by tradition following the written evaluation), it was suggested that the SEM session be increased to 2.5 hrs. This wish might be possible to fulfill, depending on the number of students.

In last year’s (2017’s) and this year’s oral course evaluations, 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 a group presentation, 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 9 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, tectonics, 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.
Changes planned for 2020:

1) to shift one day from the P-T calculation lab to the individual case study, in accordance with the suggestion by this year’s students.
2) to round off with a recap at the end of each day of the field excursion, around 20.30, in a warm place at the hostel, also suggested by this year’s student group.
3) It will be considered if possible to increase slightly the relative weight of the Individual case study in terms of the total grade.

Lund 14 June 2019

Charlotte Möller (course leader)  Stylianos Karastergios (course representative)