

Introduction Artificial Intelligence A

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

Respondents (n) 52 of the 228

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 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| Deviation (σ) 1.9 | Deviation (σ) 1.8 | Deviation (σ) 2.0 | Deviation (σ) 1.9 |
| Questions 13 | Questions 11 | Questions 2 | Questions 4 |

Total average per question

Below are the total averages per question of this evaluation.

| | |
|---|---------------|
| The learning objectives (what you should know and be able to do by the end) of the course were clear to me. | Agree (3.7) |
| Disagree to agree 0.9σ n 52 | |
| The coherence between the different components of the course is | Much (3.5) |
| Very little to very much 0.8σ n 52 | |
| Studying the course materials was necessary to successfully complete the course. | Agree (4.0) |
| Disagree to agree 0.9σ n 52 | |
| The organisation (e.g. the planning, scheduling, method of information provision) of the course was good. | Neutral (3.4) |
| Disagree to agree 0.9σ n 52 | |
| The information provided before and during the course was sufficient. | Agree (3.5) |
| Disagree to agree 0.8σ n 52 | |
| The time that I spent on this course was less/more/equal to the number of course credits (EC). | Average (3.2) |
| Less to more 0.8σ n 52 | |
| My general opinion of the course is | Neutral (3.3) |
| Bad to good 0.9σ n 52 | |
| My general opinion of the lecturer(s) is | Good (3.7) |
| Bad to good 1.0σ n 150 | |
| The lecturer had a good command of English. | Agree (3.8) |
| Disagree to agree 1.1σ n 150 | |
| The difficulty level of the exam was appropriate. | Agree (3.5) |
| Disagree to agree 0.9σ n 52 | |
| The sample questions provided beforehand gave me a good impression of what the exam would be like. | Agree (4.3) |
| Disagree to agree 0.8σ n 52 | |
| The assessments reflected the learning objectives of the course well. | Agree (3.5) |
| Disagree to agree 1.0σ n 52 | |
| The assessment criteria were sufficiently clear beforehand. | Agree (3.7) |
| Disagree to agree 0.9σ n 52 | |

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 52

1. Course gives good overview of different aspects of AI. The practicals really connect to the material, which is great when studying for the exam. Some demos were given, which was nice.
2. It does give a broad insight in AI-methods
3. This course is able to present a lot of AI subjects in a short time span
4. The objectives are clear and it gives a sufficiently broad overview.
5. Got understanding of what search algoritmes do
6. - Clear subjects
7. good devision between topics
8. The subjects were nice The teachers were enthusiastic
9. comprehensive overview of AI
10. Interesting, good exercises
11. Nice overview of AI
12. Challenging
13. assignments made the theory of the lectures clearer
14. Nice to have a broad overbiew of AI subjects, told from different teachers perspectives
15. Good understanding of search algorithms
16. Jason Farquhar Iskaj Janssen
17. The material as such is good, with a good amount.
18. The focus on AI is more than in other courses,for example Programming, Math, or Cognitive Psychology, the relation between the course and the topic is very strong and obvious
19. I liked the topics the course covered and that the workgroups were not so full which made it easier to ask about things
20. Clear assignments
21. The gateway to AI
22. Lectures of Tom Heskes
23. great lecturers
24. Lots of important concepts are covered
25. It is good to have a course that goes over many AI topics as an oriëntation
26. Subjects discussed are relevant to AI

27. Good organisation overall
28. Very self-reliant and broad
29. The topics are aligning really well, there is a clear line in the content.
30. A decent oversight of basic search algorithms and methods used in AI development
31. It gives a good overview of the field of AI.
32. a lot of topics, which makes it interesting, the assignments were very good for understanding the content
33. N/A
34. The material is presented in such a way that it is relatively easy to understand. Very good and rich in information power-point presentations
35. Different teachers, lots of general information to use in our own projects
36. Good teachers, good PowerPoint slides
37. The different perspectives we got an introduction to.
38. Good overview of common AI practices
39. Gives an impression of what we came to do.
40. The workgroups are really helpful and the assignments prepare you really well for the exam
41. Clear slides and explanations
42. The setup of the assignments.
43. Good working groups
44. Practical applications
45. Interesting lectures and subjects
46. It gives a great overview of AI
47. enough access to course material, so you have a good overview of what to study
48. Mostly clear, good information provided about the exam
49. Interesting subject
50. I liked the feedback sessions about the exercises, liked that the exercises really used the lecture material, and were similar to the exam questions.
51. Nice to get an overview of what AI entails
52. The structure of the whole course was good; Tempo was also nice;

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

n 52

1. Some of the lectures could have been a bit faster with the material, mostly the ones at the beginning.

2. The coherence between the subjects that a lecturer presents is really clear, but the coherence between the subjects of different lecturers was definitely lacking.

3. Merging Intro A and B seems like a good plan to make, right now you must study practical methods as theoretic and that is a bit odd and hard to memorize

4. I would not know anything

5. The slides are a bit unclear. Also it was not really clear to me what the goal of this course was. The assignments we got were really unclear. Also, it would have been nice if we got feedback on the assignments, to learn from our mistakes

6. - Calculations better explained, e.g. example on the blackboard instead of slides - Don't elaborate too much on subjects, it makes the course very boring ("langdradig")

7. more enthusiastic. Too much info on slides

8. - rephrasing the questions in the homework and test, to include the hints in the question. The current structure is very confusing and makes the student feel like they are incapable, and therefore they need hints. By 'hiding' the hints in the question, it feels more like one knows how to answer it. - Not using raw power point files: this looks unprofessional; it is very easy to convert files to pdf and helps people on different operating systems. - Getting rid of the useless illustrations in slides: this is confusing and distracts from the true content. Graphs & schematics -> good image illustrating example -> mostly bad multiple images repeated -> bad images of coins illustrating chance -> very bad - properly label separate parts of (sub)exercises (an example of bad labeling: week 1 ass 3.a) Test: - Using multiple fonts is just careless and lazy. - So is having multiple conflicting page numberings - Correcting answers on the answer sheet was unclear (also to invigilators) - One of the invigilators made me copy over 40 answers onto a new sheet, because I tried to correct a question twice. This is unacceptable. - The test asked for a lot of reproduction of course material. This is counterproductive, as much is forgotten quickly. It would be much better to ask questions testing only basic reproductive knowledge, but much more practical, employable knowledge.

9. coherency of the lectures, exam was very mediocre

10. -

11. Clearer slides and maybe more preparation from the lecturers, I sometimes had the feeling a lecturer did not yet think of what he would like to say -> euhhhhh euhhhh

12. Working groups not just for making the assignments, but maybe instead making the assignments at home and evaluate them in the working groups

13. more examples in the lectures

14. Make the documents on BlackBoard consistent, i.e. same kind of naming of files/titles, same lay-out (e.g. fonts), same formatting type (preferably pdf). The first two things mostly apply to the assignments, got a big feeling it was just copied from different places on the internet.. The rest also applies to the lectures, mainly also because of different teachers. Also, for all teachers, maybe it is nice to record yourself once to see how you present. Some have the feeling to talk to the board/read slides. Furthermore, sometimes a lot of time was spent to tell actually not that difficult/important stuff. This felt like an information overload, though it actually was all fine. For the mathematical part look at what is needed to tell the story. A lot of formulas we didn't practise with and got no question about. Not needed to stay there very long then in my opinion.

15. - Make more coherent presentation, there is a too big of differences between the presentations - Some teachers could make the material more interesting and less reading of the slides - For question hour it would be better if all the teachers are going to be there instead of one who can't answer questions about the subjects of other teachers

16. Paul Kamsteeg

17. Overall i think the theacher could but a lot more effort into the course. It looks like they are using the same powerpoints and the same assignments every year and don't update much about it or make it a bit more modern. It is not the case that the information is outdated, but more recent examples could be used. It looks like the three different teacher don't necessarily prepare for their lectures but look through their old slides to look what they have to say and think its alright. One other thing is the exam, it is multiple choice and fairly easy. It was basically the practice exam (which was the exam from last year) only a bit adjusted with different situation. The difficulty of the exam could be upgraded and I mainly feel like the theachers could put more effort into this and they also should as the course is followed by a lot of students.

18. Make the lectures more interactive, because they tend to be a bit monotone The lecture slides are also a bit chaotic, the balance between visuals and text sometimes off

19. The teachers could lecture a little more interesting because sometimes it was really boring. Also, the teachers all had their own topic which made them not know anything from a topic of someone else. The coherence was therefore very bad.

20. For the question hour before the exam only 1 of the 3 lecturers was present and he tried to explain there part but would be nice if the others had joined

21. Organisation and overlap/transition with other subjects

22. Lecturer Kamsteeg often takes too much time for explanations, so that other material might be skipped

23. I would have liked to see more coherence between the different subjects in the lectures

24. Concepts are only briefly discussed, and sometimes explained badly

25. The slides could be improved by removing useless info and keeping to the important stuff

26. Lectures and powerpoint slides were not clear, exercises did not reflect the exam, not enough practice material for the exam.

27. nothing

28. English of the speakers, more information granted during lectures, more details on assignments

29. The practicals are not very useful. The exercises are in the first weeks very easy compared to the last weeks.

30. please please please PLEASE allow us to get personal feedback on made homework exercises. Not all TA's gave sufficient information or feedback to help us with what we did (at least mine didn't). Also the system used to grade the exercises was a bit arbitrary. Providing a proper solution and explanations for all but one exercise, which you didn't understand, results in an 0/1 because there was the attempt made at the exercise was "insufficient", while writing a block of unrelated text at each exercise could result in a 1/1 Grade. Finally information distribution (The slides) differed greatly in usefulness from week to week. Various examples of concepts were vaguely explained and the explanations on the slides weren't always complete, so you were left with a vague concept of the procedure.

31. It should have been more clear what the learning objectives were. We had to make weekly assignments, which were graded on the basis if they were a 'serious attempt' or not. People could easily flunk an assignment and still get a full graded point for it. Maybe they could be graded on if the students understood the course material well, and not only for a serious attempt. In this way it will be both better for the student as the teachers, as the students should actually put more effort in the workgroups/homework.

32. none

33. Maybe showing some sample exercises at the end of every lecture would be more helpful

34. None
35. More coordination between teachers
36. Don't have any
37. Stronger coherence between different parts.
38. It would be nice to have all teachers present at the last response lecture before the exam (which wasn't the case :/)
39. Expansions of the assignments.
40. I found the lectures boring, in contrast to the study material. The lecturer really only reads from the slides, so reading them yourself is as useful as going to the lecture.
41. The exercises were very easy at the beginnen and then suddenly became way more difficult, that can be improved
42. Not only MC questions on the exam
43. Unclear lectures
44. -
45. Clearer exercises
46. Make the workgroups obligatory
47. get personal feedback on the assignments, so you know precisely what you've done wrong/right
48. Some parts too high-paced (Bayesian networks), while others were (too) slow (agents)
49. nothing to say
50. I would have really appreciated if the lectures would have been recorded, it makes studying much more flexible and effective for me.
51. The assignments were sometimes rather easy (though in the end they were quite difficult) there might've been a more coherent connection between different parts
52. - The presenters were very boring usually talking monotonously and making the audience sleepy. - Dr. Kamsteeg says "aaaa" and "eeee" VERY often and it is really irritating. - It is very sad that we don't get any individual feedback on our assignments. Other courses manage that, why not this one? In the end, you always get 1 point even if you made everything incorrectly. - Some exercises after dr. Kamsteeg and dr. Farquhar lectures were so much simplified and redundant that you can't even see what they wanted you to learn from it (e.g. Sudoku exercise).

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

n 52

1. I have to put something here to proceed, so: overall, I think the course was good
2. I did not like the course because in the exam detailed questions were asked about subjects that were never discussed or emphasized in lectures/assignments
3. none
4. No comment

5. Our TA was really helpful but feedback on the assignments would have helped. I still have no idea whether I understand anything or did it good on the exam

6. -

7. Sometimes quite unclear what we need to learn especially for constraint satisfaction problems

8. There are many small sub-optimal things in this course. Due to those, and the generally bad exam, I disliked the course and underperformed.

9. -

10. -

11. No

12. no

13. nothing

14. No

15. The quality of the course really depends on the teacher

16. The lectures varied a lot depending on which lecturer was giving them

17. no

18. The weekly Q&A hours of the exercises were nice and useful

19. no

20. Nvt

21. nope

22. no

23. No

24. None

25. Cant remember

26. /

27. no

28. If it was not for Berend, my TA, I don't think I would have passed this course. He managed to explain the lectures' information in 5 minutes every time.

29. Having grades for the homework exercises or getting personal feedback would stimulate spending more time on the exercises. In a brief lookback a week later it is often difficult to see what exactly went wrong.

30. please please please PLEASE fix the homework feedback issue. Even if the slides are vague at times, a ta that gives proper feedback on exercises made can help so much in this aspect.

31. -

32. none

33. N/A

34. dr. Jason Farquhar should give more lectures

35. no

36. Nothing

37. All in all I enjoyed the course and think i've learned a lot about a lot of different concepts.

38. Nope

39. No.

40. No

41. No

42. No

43. No

44. -

45. N/A

46. The workgroups were very good and helped me a lot

47. -

48. Tutorial hours were not that useful, did not provide hints nor tips for the exercises and did not help understand the exercises of the previous week (except for the explanations by Mr Heskes, those were good)

49. nothing

50. -

51. -

52. Exam. We were given 1 hour 45 minutes to answer 51 questions. Previous year students had 2 exams of the same length to answer a LITTLE bit more questions? What's up with that? Why we had to rush through the exam like crazies? I am not saying that it is not doable but I answered some questions wrong because I did not have time to think about them! E.g. the question about CSP solutions, I did not have time to think about those solutions. I think this is not fair and should be lengthened. In the end, what difference does it make? If you don't know it then you don't know it and you can't get the answer out of the blue. Please.