Algorithms and Data Structures III, 5.0 c

Course code: 1DL481, Report code: 61034, 33%, DAG, NML, week: 03 - 11 Semester: Spring 2018

Result

This evaluation is answered by 45% (14/31) of the respondents.

Below are statistics on single- and multiple-choice answers and freeform text. Additionally, the summaries for freeform text responses that students will see are also shown.

1: Overall, how satisfied are you with the course?

Answers: 14

Answer options:

Median: 5 Mean: 4.6 / 5

0. Do not know/not relevant/do not wish to answer	0 responses	0%	
1. Not at all	0 responses	0%	
2.	0 responses	0%	
3.	1 responses	7%	
4.	4 responses	29%	
5. Extremely	9 responses	64%	

2: Is the course relevant to your education?

Answers: 14

Answer options:

Median: 5 Mean: 4.8 / 5

0. Do not know/not relevant/do not wish to answer	0 responses	0%	
1. Not at all	0 responses	0%	
2.	0 responses	0%	
3.	0 responses	0%	
4.	3 responses	21%	
5. To a very high extent	11 responses	79%	

3: To what extent have you made the effort to benefit from the course content?

Answers: 14

Answer options:

Median: 4.5 Mean: 4.2 / 5

0. Do not know/not relevant/do not wish to answer	0 responses	0%	
1. Not at all	0 responses	0%	
2.	1 responses	7%	
3.	2 responses	14%	
4.	4 responses	29%	
5. To a very high extent	7 responses	50%	

4: I feel that the work pace during the course has been:

Answers: 14

Answer options:

Median: 3 Mean: 3.4 / 5

0. Do not know/not relevant/do not wish to answer	0 responses	0%	
1. Far too low	0 responses	0%	
2. Too low	0 responses	0%	
3. Just right	11 responses	79%	
4. Too high	1 responses	7%	
5. Far too high	2 responses	14%	

5: What has been your main source of information during the course? Course literature, Wikipedia, YouTube, lectures, some other literature, ... ? Answers: 11

Lectures.
Föreläsningar
Mainly lectures and slides. Course textbook (CLRS3) was helpful for exam topics.
The main source of information has been the course book(clrs), the Algorithm design book and the lecture slides.
Course literature and textbook
Slides and lectures
The lectures and lecture slides.
Course lectures and lecture slides, documentation of the solvers we used.
CSLR3 and Youtube.
Course Literature, Lectures, WikiPedia
Föreläsningar och CLRS.

6: This has been especially good about the course: Answers: 12

Found all assignments very interesting.
Pierre och Gustaf. Två underbara människor som fått en supersvår kurs att kännas behaglig. <3
Well-organized, all rules and schedule available early on (and followed consistently). Lectures were informative, entertaining and thorough. Connections between different parts of the course, well-displayed during the culminating closing lecture, were also nice. All the subcontracted lectures were
The course is very well structured and it is almost always clear what you should do / what is expected of you
It's been very interesting
The assignments are fun and interesting.
The lectures and lecture slides were really good. The slides were informative and easy to read even though not attending the lecture. Also, Gustav Björdal is a really good teacher. Very accommodating and pedagogical.
The assignments were fun and interesting, and interesting guest lectures.
The assignments. Even though they were challenging, they were also good to understand how the concepts from class are applicable to real-life (or at least close to it) problems. I'm also very glad the final was drawn from a pull of already given questions.
Lectures, Guest Lecture, Assignments.
What follows are general comments, good and bad. I have taken both AD3 and M4CO in the past period, so I'll begin by making some general remarks about both courses, which will be repeated in both evaluations, and then talk about AD3 specifically. Overall both courses were great, and I really enjoyed attending the lectures. Although it's always hard to pinpoint why some lectures appeal to you, while others do not, I think in this case it boils down to interesting topics, a good balance between generality and detail, a steady pace, as well as a healthy dose of interaction with the audience. I think it's great that you try to find people from industry to give guest lectures, and I really liked what you did in AD3 where you convinced other people from the department to come and talk about their own research areas. The help and solution sessions were also pretty good (albeit a bit hastily prepared sometimes, it seemed). I like the administrative style, in which it is made perfectly clear up front what the students can expect from the teachers and what the teachers are expecting from the students. Having done so, the policy can always be relaxed in exceptional cases, which I think is a lot better than doing it the other way around. I don't understand why the grading criteria need to take several pages to describe, however, and I still never fully understood the formulas for M4CO. As I'm sure you are aware, Pierre, you courses are more demanding than most other courses. This might be motivated as well – maybe most other courses are too lenient, what do I know. I just wanted to tell you that taking two of them at the same time has been rough. I don't think I've worked this hard ever in my life before; not when I studied 150%, and certainly not when I was working a regular job. I've had to do something or other almost every evening, and almost every weekend for the past couple of months. Still, I didn't feel I had enough time to read the course material and solve problems, and I absolutely didn't have enough time over for the third course that I was taking. Of course I know that you have calculated strict time budgets for your courses, but let's be honest: that's not really how things work, especially not when the work is graded. Since there are no hard guarantees regarding grading, the only way I can get a grade I'm hopefully content with is to do my very best, and that is proportional to the size of the problem (or whatever it may be) and not a pre-calculated time budget. The Algorithms and Data Structures courses are some of the few courses at the IT-department witch has a course book at all, and a really good one at that, which I think deserves mention. I wish more courses had decent literature. The assignments were mostly fun. I appreciated the fact that we could choose programming language (more or less) freely, which meant we could use the right tool for the job. I also liked that both assignments had two problems each, so it was easy to split the work between two people. While I understand that you wanted to have one problem each on the various solving technologies we saw during the course, I can't help but feel there should have been some theory as well, and not just practice. This leads me to what is probably my biggest concern with the course (and which by no means unique to this course): it went way too soft on the math. To be fair, the lectures contained a decent amount of analysis, but the students were not expected to do much. This seems like a general trend: somewhere along the way the computer science program turned into the software engineering program, which is really a shame, especially since there already exists an IT-focused engineering program at the very same faculty. I liked the format of the exam, in that we knew what to expect going into it. There were two things I want to nitpick about, though. First, I really hate it when you have to write your answers on the exam paper, for several reasons: - I want the grid lines. - Copy paper is generally worse quality than writing paper. - I need to remove the staple with my fingernails in order to see the writing area and the problem statement at the same time. - If I want to start over, I cannot just start on a new sheet. - I usually want to keep the exam questions. Second, while most problems were good, the one about set covering stood out. While the other problems were self contained, and could in principle be solved without preparation, this one referred to a specific proof in CLRS which more or less had to be memorised. I don't understand what makes this problem so good that you've included it in three consecutive exams. Luckily, there was an alternative.
The assignment problems were interesting and challenging.

7: This could be improved in the course: (Make your suggestions as constructive as possible)	Answers: 9

~
Fördelningen av help sessions. Första är innan man kommit igång, sista är alldeles för nära deadline.
A bit less time could be spent on the write-up. E.g., if LaTeX source for the assignments was available, some formulas in Assignment 2 could be copied directly. Some predefined format for theoretical part of Assignment 2 Part 1 would also make things easier. Another suggestion about this sub-assignment would be to reorder tasks: the theoretical ones are good to refresh the knowledge about CDCL, which gives a clue about which encoding to choose when some trade-off (e.g. number of clauses vs number of variable vs width of clauses) comes up.
It would be nice if the assignments could tie in with the exam. As of now they are two different entities which covers different subjects which don't feel all that intuitive.
The workload is too high. The professor should really see over how much work they're assigning.
The SMT assignment felt like it was mostly about making a script write SMT code rather than understanding SMT. It would have been good to get a little bit more information about SMT.
It was a bit hard to select a good topic (not to small, not too large) for the presentation, a little more guidance to choose a suitable topic would be nice.
Some of the guest lectures were not as helpful as the head-teacher lectures.
See above.

Summary of free-text responses/comments for the whole course evaluation