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1. Öppnande

Ordförande förklarade mötet öppnat

2. Justeringsperson

Joachim Schnadt valdes att tillsammans med ordföranden justera protokollet

3. Dagordningens godkännande

Dagordningen fastställdes enligt utskickat förslag.

4. Föregående mötes protokoll

Protokollet från 2017-03-13 genomlästes och lägges till handlingarna.

5. Nya kursplaner

– se hemsida/utskick: http://www.fysik.lu.se/utbildning/naturvetenskap/igu/kursplaner/

Tomas höll i presentationen. Nya kursplaner eller justeringar tas upp på första mötet för hösten.

6. Kursvärderingar

– se hemsida/utskick: http://www.fysik.lu.se/utbildning/naturvetenskap/igu/kursutvaerderinger

Ett påtalande om att det fattas någon kursutvärdering. Input från studentrepresentant att det önskas ett förtydligande om kursbok. Förslag på att undersöka hur det kan vara möjligt att ha kursutvärderingarna i LiveatLund.

7. Beslutspunkter

8. Informations- och Diskussionspunkter


9. Övriga frågor

Inga övriga frågor

10. Nästa möte

Nästa möte: Huvudstudierektorerna återkommer med mötestider inför höstterminen.

Forslag på punkter till dagordningen skickas senast två veckor innan respektive möte till Tomas.

11. Mötet avslutas

Ordförande förklarade mötet avslutat.

---
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Yvonne Kedström  
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Joachim Schnadt
Course evaluation FYSC13 & 14 VT17

The numbers in brackets represent the number of people sharing the same opinion on the preceding statement. These numbers should be taken with a grain of salt, as not all responses included the number of participants, and were taken to be 1. This gave a total number of 14 respondents for FYSC13 and 23 for FYSC14. In the evaluation, students were asked to answer the question “what was good, bad and what could be improved about the course?”.

Solid state physics, FYSC13

- The lectures were considered generally good (7), though some of the lectures were not as good (1). The lecturers were helpful (1). The derivations done during lectures were helpful, especially their level of detail (1), though some of the seemed unnecessary (3). The lectures could have been better scheduled, as the last ones too close to the exam (7). The order of topics covered during the lecture felt disorganized (1).
- The labs were mostly interesting and well suited to the material (5). The number of labs was too high (2), and they could have been scheduled earlier during the course (6). Some of the lab supervisors were hard to get help from after the lab, leading to difficulties with the reports (1). The STM and LEED lab did not feel useful, and could either be restructured (1) or replaced with a lecture on the topic with some exercises and a lab tour (1). The computer labs were good (1).
- The exam was too long and contained questions that were irrelevant to the material that had been studied (3).
- The course gives good examples of applications (1) and interesting info on subjects relevant to the lectures (3). The mix of theory and usage of said theory was good (3). The course tries to grasp too many topics (1).
- The course book was very good and useful (1).

Particle physics, FYSC14

- The course was overall very good (12), with some highlights being the DESY-trip (17) and the structure of the course with hand-ins and an oral exam (8).
- The lectures given by Caterina and Peter were good (8), the material covered was basically the same as what was needed for the exam (5). The examples given of what is done in particle physics were appreciated (3), though they could have talked more about their own research (1). Some of the material was not explained in enough detail, and then mostly forgotten about (3), the structure of some lectures made them hard to follow (5), and there could have been more references to the course book (2). The availability of the lectures on liveatlund was appreciated (2). The lectures used power point too much and could have used the boards more often (5). Overall the lectures covered a good amount of general particle physics material (5).
- The assignments were good, they were of suitable difficulty and two of them was a good fit for the course (8). The offered office hours and reviews of the assignments were useful (7). The addition of exercise classes would have been useful (3).
- The method of examination, where an oral exam was used instead of a written one, was good (6). There could have been more information on which topics were required for the exam (1).
• The guest lectures on accelerators were bad (8) and these could either be improved (1) or have their number reduced (2).
• The muon lab was more divisive. It was considered relevant to the course (2), and the fact that it was the only lab was appreciated (1). On the other it was bad (5), and there could have been more labs (2). The lab instructions could have been more clear (3). The analysis session held after the lab was appreciated (4), though the analysis of the data itself was not good (2). The assistance with the error calculations from the supervisor could have been better (4). The fact that the lab report had to be written in groups was bad (1).
• Leif’s notes were useful and good (2).