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The evaluation committee has evaluated the course Discrete optimization of business processes by sending an online questionnaire to 85 students. 13 students filled in the questionnaire, which gives a response of 15%.

This course scores an average of 4.0 which is good for a master course. Students were also satisfied with all the other items of the evaluation. However there are points for improvement. The digital reader still looks a bit messy and you cannot use search tools. Moreover, some students say that the exam was too long and the scheduled time for this course was not sufficient. A final remark is that the questions that were given to prepare the exam did not match well with the real exam. Generally though, this is a good course.

These are the main conclusions of the evaluation. The interpretation is based on the remarks of the respondents. For an overview of the results, see the graph at the end of this report.

Recommendations of last evaluation
The last evaluation was in 2009-2010
- Improve the reader. Students complain about the quality of the reader. Its content is chaotic and it contains Dutch text which makes it difficult to read for foreign students.

Recommendations by the committee:
The quality of the course can be improved. Based on the results of the questionnaire, some recommendations for improvement are provided. The most important recommendations are:

- Make the questions that are given to prepare the exam more like the real exam questions.
- Make the digital reader more organized; students say it is difficult to find a specific term. It would have been helpful if you could use search tools (ctrl-f)

Remarkable Facts:
- 2 students say that the exam required too much time.
Overview:

- All marks are given on a Likert-scale from 1-5. For master courses, a mark of 3.5 or higher is sufficient.
- The height of the bars in the graph represents the mark. The thin line at the top of the bars gives the standard deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marks</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First impression rating</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to study</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of education</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination / planning</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination / Assignments</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of marks:

- Total ‘first impression rating’ is the mark given to the question: Overall appreciation.
- Ability to study is the average point of the marks given to the part of study material.
- Relevancy is the mark given to the question: Relevancy of the course.
- Quality of education is the average point of the marks given to the parts “lectures” and “practices”.
- Coordination / Planning is the average point of the marks of “Adequate Information on Blackboard” and “Teacher available for questions”.
- Examination / Assignments is the average point of the marks given to the Examination /Final Assignment part.
- Average is the mean of all given marks.
The learning outcome of the course is relevant for my academic development
The contents of the course are interesting
The information about the course was adequate
The teacher was available for questions
The organization of the lectures was good
During the lectures, the subject became clear to me
The use of black-or whiteboard, sheets or powerpoint was good
The study material (written and electronic) covered the subjects sufficiently
The course was suitable for self study
The quality of the study material (e.g. layout, accessibility, level, index on paper was good)
The requirements for the exam were clear
The exam / the assignment(s) was / were well related to the major subjects in the course
The questions / assignments were clear