

Multi-Stage Ensemble and Feature Engineering for MOOC Dropout Prediction

Jeong-Yoon Lee
Conversion Logic

12300 Wilshire Blvd. Los Angeles,
CA 90025, USA

jeong@conversionlogic.com

Kohei Ozaki
AIG Japan Holdings KK

Kamiyacho MT Bldg 18F, 4-3-20
Toranomom, Minato-ku, Tokyo
105-0001, Japan

ozaki.kohei@aig.co.jp

Song Chen
American International Group,
Inc. (AIG)

175 Water Street, New York, NY
10038, USA

song.chen@aig.com

Andreas Toescher
Opera Solutions

Hauptplatz 12, 8580 Koeftach,
Austria

andreas.toescher@commendo.at

Mert Bay
Conversion Logic

12300 Wilshire Blvd. Los Angeles,
CA 90025, USA

mert@conversionlogic.com

Tam T. Nguyen
Institute for Infocomm
Research, A*STAR

1 Fusionopolis Way, #21-01
Connexis (South Tower), Singapore
138632

nguyentt@i2r.a-star.edu.sg

Michael Jahrer
Opera Solutions

Hauptplatz 12, 8580 Koeftach,
Austria

michael.jahrer@commendo.at

Peng Yan
NetEase Youdao

2nd Floor, Chuangye Building,
Tsinghua Science Park, Beijing,
100084, China

yanpeng@rd.netease.com

Xiaocong Zhou
Tsinghua University

Haidian District, Beijing, 100084,
China

infinitezxc@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the winning solution of the KDDCup 2015 “Predicting dropouts in MOOCs” (Massive Open On-line Course). The problem is binary classification, where a student will dropout in the next 10 days given historic actions. Overall goal is maximize the AUC on the testset. Our approach begin with hand-crafted feature design, on top of that we build single models. Single models were blended to stage2 ensembles. Five stage2 ensembles were blended to our final solution, which results in AUC=0.90918 on the public leaderboard. We used stratified 5-fold cross validation to locally check our performance.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

I.5 [Pattern Reconition]: Feature Design; Ensemble Techniques

1. INTRODUCTION

Our final solution is a joint work from 9 data scientists, distributed around the world. The pipeline from raw data to final solution is as follows:

- Hand crafted feature design (most of hard work)
- Automatic feature design (autoencoder)
- Individual models (gbm, nn, factor model,..)
- Stage2 ensemble (blends individuals)
- Stage3 ensemble (blends Stage2's)

This approach was published by a winning team of Otto kaggle competition [?],[?].

2. DATASET

We got history from 200k enrollments, from 120k we know the labels. bla bla
bla bla

3. FEATURE DESIGN

bla bla
bla bla

4. SINGLE MODELS

something like this:

- -Model 1: RandomForest(R). Dataset: X
- -Model 2: Logistic Regression(scikit). Dataset: Log(X+1)
- -Model 3: Extra Trees Classifier(scikit). Dataset: Log(X+1) (but could be raw)
- -Model 4: KNeighborsClassifier(scikit). Dataset: Scale(Log(X+1))
- -Model 5: libfm. Dataset: Sparse(X). Each feature value is a unique level.

5. STAGE2 ENSEMBLE

We used xgboost [?], neural nets and linear regression for stage2 ensembling.

6. STAGE3 ENSEMBLE

We tried xgboost and linear stage3 ensembling. Finally we ended up with linear ensembling with 39 courseID correction factors. These 39 factors improved the score from 0.9091 to 0.90918.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Our final AUC=0.90918 score results from a complex pipeline from raw data to final score. Every part of that pipe needs to be (sub-)optimal implemented by our team to get the best score at the end. The first part “feature design” is the most important one and needs expertise, experience and of course a bit luck to capture all signals in the data.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to dropbox, github and skype to enable easy communication around the globe.