Cognitive Robotics

Results from 07-02-2018 till 21-02-2018

Respondents (n) 27 of the 145

Total average

Below are the total averages of all evaluations of this program. These averages are composed of all results on all questions. Except if a question meets one of the following constraints:

- It is a "Yes / No" question

- It's an "Open question"

- The question is part of a set of questions where is explicitly stated that they may not be included in the average.

TOTAL	SUBJECT	TEACHER	EXAM
6.6	6.5	7.6	5.9
Deviation (σ) 2.1	Deviation (σ) 2.1	Deviation (σ) 2.0	Deviation (σ) 2.2
Questions 15	Questions 13	Questions 2	Questions 4

Total average per question

Below are the total averages per question of this evaluation.

The practical meetings were worthwhile. Disagree to agree | 1.1σ | n 27	Neutral (3.4)
The learning objectives (what you should know and be able to do by the end) of the course were clear to me. Disagree to agree | 1.2σ | n 27	Agree (3.5)
De samenwerking met mijn medestudenten heeft bijgedragen aan verdieping van de leerstof Disagree to agree | 1.1σ | n 27	Agree (3.5)
The coherence between the different components of the course is Very little to very much | 0.9σ | n 27	Neutral (3.3)
Studying the course materials was necessary to successfully complete the course. Disagree to agree | 1.1σ | n 27	Neutral (3.3)
The organisation (e.g. the planning, scheduling, method of information provision) of the course was good. Disagree to agree | 1.0σ | n 27	Neutral (3.4)
The information provided before and during the course was sufficient. Disagree to agree | 0.8σ | n 27	Agree (3.5)
The time that I spent on this course was less/more/equal to the number of course credits (EC). Less to more | 0.9σ | n 27	Average (3.3)
My general opinion of the course is Bad to good | 0.9σ | n 27	Neutral (3.0)
My general opinion of the lecturer(s) is Bad to good | 0.9σ | n 31	Neutral (3.2)
The lecturer had a good command of English. Disagree to agree | 0.8σ | n 31	Agree (4.4)
The difficulty level of the exam was appropriate. Disagree to agree | 1.2σ | n 25	Neutral (3.0)
The sample questions provided beforehand gave me a good impression of what the exam would be like.	Disagree (2.4)

Disagree to agree | 1.3σ | n 23

The assessments reflected the learning objectives of the course well. Disagree to agree | 1.0σ | n 27	Neutral (3.1)
The assessment criteria were sufficiently clear beforehand. Disagree to agree | 0.9σ | n 27	Neutral (3.2)

Open questions

Below are the results of each open question of this evaluation.

What do you think are the strong points of the course?

n 27

1. The topics are very interesting, and the TA's are amazing for building the simulations. I know some people were disappointed we didn't get to work with the actual robots, but the simulations were so much smoother than all the struggles last year

2. I liked the practicals, in the sense that through simulation we were able to test our code so much more efficiently. Also through this course I finally got a good idea of what a report should include.

3. I learned Javascript

4. None

5. The practical exercises were nice, the simulations worked well and were a nice environment to work in.

6. Lots of hands-on experience

7. Provides solid theoretical foundation. Some experience with simulations acquired.

8. The practicals were in so far useful as they made us replicate a paper and experiments. This experience is quite valuable.

9. The practical part. Experiments, replication of a paper, writing a report.

10. Practicals

11. The practicals and the lectures and the enthusiasm of the lecturer

12. interesting and gave a different point of view on robotics.

13. It teaches you how to program certain types of robots which is useful.

14. Fun topics!

15. practical assignments and the enivronment

16. The experience one can gather.

17. The simulations were fun when they would run correctly (which we sadly could not manage for the sorter). It was a joy to see the Didabots and the Hebbian Learner do what they did and analyse how changing certain variables affected their behaviour.

18. Random assignments of the group members

19. Nice weather.

20. The theory.

21. The practical meetings where you get to work with the information you have to learn, and if you don't get it you eventually learn it because of your teammates explaining it to you

22. .

23. Different programming kanguages

24. the simulations and the separation of theory and practical sessions

25. Robots are fun. That's the saving grace of this course.

26. Practical compared to last year's course have been improved significantly. Simulations are a pragmatic yet worthwhile pursuit.

27. Simulations in the practical assignments.

Other comments and/or explanations regarding the answers you gave to specific questions.

n 27

1. Props to James and Johannes for making the simulations, and props to George for giving them the opportunity, and significantly changing the course for the better from last year!

2. No

3. -

4. I was really excited for this course, but I ended up dissapointed. It had too little 'robotics'

5. -

6. .

7. -

8. I do not think that the AI study is needing this course.

9. Johannes is an amazing TA :D

10. no

11. -

12. also, the planning of the time given for the assignments could be improved. some had enough time, other, where very much underestimanted. additionally, working with the simulations was very hard. It would be nice if we would get a basic tutorial on Java Script because almost everyone didn't know how to program in Java Script and that actually took most of the time when working on the assigments'

13. -

14. .

15. none

16. No

17. We had never learned javascript before, so a quick guide on how it is different from Java (the language we mostly use in the AI programme) would have been nice. Moreover, there were some bugs in the simulation template and the file was so long that it was hard to figure out what was relevant and what was not, while I do not think this was part of the learning goals at all (but those were unclear, anyway). These points did not completely ruin the practicals (they were still mostly fun), but they did cause unnecessary frustrations.

18. -

19. I think the grading of the practical is garbage. I feel like you can have a non-functional robot, but still pass the course based on your report. Which is absurd.

20. No

21. -

22. .

23. Ni

24. The student assistants usually only came around 10:30 whereas the practical sessions started at 08:45. It was announced on Blackboard, but still it wasn't very convenient. We used to be there early and we'd have to write down our questions and wait for them to arrive and when they did they were hardly available

25. None

26. -

27. -

If you see areas that could be improved in the course, what are your suggestions?

n 27

1. Improve on the simulations, it could use a little tweaking on how much the student has to program and what hints they get(I felt like it wasn't that much of a challenge most assignments). And add maybe a clear example of what a report should look like, so people know what is expected of them.

2. - The TAs were very rarely available, if it all present. - The sessions of two hours were cut short to one, and then later the deadline got postponed multiple times. - We never encountered Javascript before during the Bachelor, and there was no introduction whatsoever, in contrast to the lengthy Python tutorials we get for every single course working with Python. Learning how to handle Javascript took up a lot of the time. - Nearing the end of a deadline, we'd sometimes get a large part of the solution presented to us. If you started late, the assignments would be much less time consuming. - The sensor placement on the robots was very buggy. In general we spent a lot of time not on writing the code, but on making sure the sensors were where we intended for them to be. - The material we had to study often seemed a little like guesswork: These are the four principles of such and such. If you phrased them differently they might as well have been three principles, but they are four.

3. The divide between practice and theory was huge. It's also very difficult to see what practical application the theory would have

4. The lectures were very boring with unclear slides. I stopped attending them, because I honestly could better go through all the material myself than go to the lectures. Also the course is called 'Cognitive robotics', but aside from the first assignment, we had to do all the assignments in simulation. Instead of spending time on understanding the assignment, we often spent/wasted a lot of time on understanding the simulation code. There were not enough TA's and the exam was way too easy to pass, even if you didn't study that well. So my suggestions: Make the lectures more interesting, clear up the slides, do the assignments with real robots, or with a better understandable simulation, more TA's and make the exam a bit harder.

5. The lecture were straight up useless. People stopped going there, because the lecturer was just learning slides. The rest felt like simply learning trivia for a multiple choice test. It would’ve been nice to have a little crash course in JavaScript or at least some document with the basics of JavaScript, since no one learned JavaScript before.

6. Exam was extremely easy and barely required studying. Simulations required working in an unfamiliar programming language, without any introduction. No example exam provided, after a lot of pushing from students, one question was provided, which was not entirely representative.

7. The simulation code was a bit cluttered. It took quite some time to dig through the code and find the necessary parts. Provide an (succinct) introduction to JavaScript to get everyone at least at the same level.

8. I still cannot see how the whole emergentist approach has any scientific merit. I cannot see how I can use to make any predictions. For me, the theory part of this course was quite useless. The connection to the practicals was existing a tiny bit. In general, I hoped more from "Cognitive" robotics. Not much cognition to be honest.

9. Leave out the lectures. They seemed not useful as there were many repetitions. Or use them to replace the first year for the "Intro to Robotics" course. The course in the current form would be a good "Intro to Robotics course". We could only use this one and get rid of the other. Like it is now, it is very redundant and seems to waste the resources of the credit points a bit. If it would replace the "Intro to Robotics course", I would see it as a huge improvement for this Bachelor program!

10. Hoorcolleges

11. Too little teaching assistants, unnecessary changing of deadlines

12. make the lectures more comprehensible. a lot of the time i felt the same thing was said 10 times but then still in a very vague manner

13. A lot of the exercises we got had some parts that were way too difficult. We then struggled with this for hours and hours and in the end (usually a couple days before the deadline) they gave us new code, which I do really appreciate, however it was very frustrating for us as it took us so long and then we basically did all the work for nothing. For next year it would be better if the exercises are thought trough some more.

14. None.

15. more vigorious lectures

16. Use real robots instead of simulations. Maybe consider using a language known by the students, that would lead to more creative programming.

17. Make sure the teacher knows in advance that he or she is going to teach the course, and that this teacher is passionate about the subject. Half of the time our lecturer was reading from the slides, and he seemed a little awkward. I heard he only knew about a week before the lecture that he was going to teach this course. I also have suggestions for the practical, but I figured those don't belong here.

18. There were no lectures when we had to work on the last assignments, which were sometimes a bit hard/unclear. So a general lecture to clear things up would have been nice.

19. It seems that the structure of the report was more important then the robot itself, which is unfortunate, since I choose this course to learn about robots and not about reports. Most if not all of the feedback was about the report as well and not the robot.

20. The clearness of the assignments.

21. The speed at which exams are graded and the grades are uploaded most definitely. Secondly: the slides are chaotic and do not help studying. It would be really nice if there was some more attention to what kind of questions can be expected on the exam during the 'hoorcolleges', related to the information that is discussed in that lecture.

22. .

23. The teacher just read the slides during the lectures.

24. it sometimes didn't feel like the content was useful, and it was redundant at times, and the simulations were difficult to work with sometimes since we couldn't see 'behind the scenes'

25. The exam was too easy and focused too much on memory instead of understanding. George

Kachergis is just bad at explaining the material in an engaging way. He is just boring to listen to. Not his fault, some people just don't have the gift of teaching.

26. The theoretical part of the course needs a similar remake to what the practical part received this year.

27. More TA's. Grade the resit faster, it took really long, specially because it was long past the date stated on the exam.