2020-03-06

Evaluation and suggestions for improvement of MO8011

Annica Ekman

The course continues to work well; 8 students wrote the scheduled exam and all 8 passed. 5 students filled in the course evaluation and 6 students attended the discussion about the course after the return of the exams.

In general, the students were very happy with the course. They thought it was well-structured and that the mixture between the different forms of education (lectures, labs, calculation exercises, seminars) was good. The lab programs and instructions had been updated from last year and all in all the labs went much smoother compared to previous years. But the instructions for lab 3 could still be improved. A bit different from previous years was that the students were not so happy with the course literature, they thought it was difficult to quickly get an overview of the contents as the textbook contains a lot of detail.

Some things that could be improved for next year based on course evaluation and discussion:

- Instruction for lab 3. Provide a better background and overview of the topic in the lab instructions (and not only during the lab introduction hour).
- Provide clearer/more detailed literature instructions (which sub-chapters are the most important). Perhaps also refer to chapters in a "simpler" textbook, for those who want to get a quick overview of the concepts?
- Put some keywords in the slides. (keep equation numbers)
- Introduce some discussion exercises in addition to calculations.
- Merge parcel theory lecture parts? (a bit tricky though since we cannot wait with all of the parcel theory until convection lecture to explain the concept).
- Ice nucleation lecture needs a bit of restructuring.
- More feedback in lab reports (be more clear with saying if something is wrong)

My own thoughts on what could be improved:

- Work more on the macroscale part (move 11c to sth like "large-scale…").
- Add sth about cirrus?
- Improve modelling lecture