

Evaluation report: Structural Health of Condition Monitoring – 2013/2014

Course code: 201300039
Contact: dr.ir. R. Loendersloot

The evaluation committee has evaluated the course Structural Health of Condition Monitoring by giving a paper questionnaire to 15 students. 15 students filled in the questionnaire, which gives a response of 100%.

Structural Health and Condition Monitoring is marked 3.7 out of 5, which is sufficient for a master course. Most aspects, e.g. about the lectures and the organisation, score around 4 out of 5. The questions about the study material are marked between 3.0 and 3.6. One special question is added in request of the lecturers, about the coherence between the lectures of the 4 different lecturers. Respondents marked this question with a 3.2.

Three trends are visible in the comments. First of all, respondents remarked that there is a lot of good information. However, some critical basics were missing, which made the course harder than necessary. Secondly, Berkhoff's lectures were considered enlightening and important for the assignments, but too late and too fast. The third remark is that the requirements to pass the course were not clear in the beginning, especially the number of assignments.

It is the first time this course has been given. Therefore: compliments for the results.

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 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 sure basic knowledge is provided. Ideally, there should be a reader, containing all information of this course. If this is not possible, refer to information in other courses, books and papers.
- Schedule more time for Berkhoff's lectures. This will make the topic of signal processing more understandable.
- Communicate the number of assignments and the examination information in the first lecture.

Reactie docent:

Ik ben tevreden met dit resultaat. De kritiek punten die de studenten aangegeven hebben, komen voor een groot deel overeen met mijn eigen beleving. Het belangrijkste is het schrijven van een reader. Ik ben het op dat punt eens met de studenten en heb me al voorgenomen een reader te gaan maken.

Belangrijk is dat de score op academische ontwikkeling hoog is én weinig spreiding vertoont. En ik ben ook blij dat het deel over het directe onderwijzen ook positief beoordeeld wordt. Ondanks dat er vier verschillende docenten waren en dat punt wel weer een klein puntje van zorg is.

Remarkable Facts:

- Some respondents asked for more practical examples in the lectures or more smaller assignments. This would help for the overall understanding of the topics. Others commented that the demonstration could be more in depth.

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.

Marks	
First impression rating	3.6
Ability to study	3.3
Relevancy	4.1
Quality of education	3.8
Coordination / planning	4.0
Average	3.7

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".
- Average is the mean of all given marks.

