CS 4710-001 **Artificial Intelligence** - Spring 2015

ENGR (18069)

INSTRUCTORS: **Floryan, Mark (mrf8t)**

Respondents: 57 / Enrollment: 131

Summary: CS 4710-001 Artificial Intelligence - Spring 2015 (18069)

Overall Course Rating

CS-4710-001 Mean 3.94
CS-4710-001 Std Dev 1.00
CS-4710-001 Response Count 285

SEAS, 4000-level courses Mean 4.19
SEAS, 4000-level courses Std Dev 0.94
SEAS, 4000-level courses Response Count 9648

Overall Instructor Rating

INSTRUCTOR: Floryan, Mark
Mean 4.06
Std Dev 0.90
Response Count 397

SEAS, 4000-level courses Mean 4.37
SEAS, 4000-level courses Std Dev 0.84
SEAS, 4000-level courses Response Count 14316

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~ | *~ ANSWER MATRICES ~*

1. The course addressed technically rigorous subject matter consistent with the course objectives.

~
Question Type: Likert
~
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	4.23	0.87	25 (43.86%)	24 (42.11%)	4 (7.02%)	4 (7.02%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1928	4.42	0.76	1032 (53.53%)	721 (37.40%)	106 (5.50%)	31 (1.61%)	21 (1.09%)	17 (0.88%)

2. The instructor used methods other than/in addition to traditional lectures (for example, active learning, in-class problems, collaborative learning, in-class discussion) effectively in this course.

~
Question Type: Likert
~
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	3.79	0.90	12 (21.05%)	26 (45.61%)	15 (26.32%)	3 (5.26%)	1 (1.75%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
2049	4.28	0.92	998 (48.71%)	680 (33.19%)	174 (8.49%)	76 (3.71%)	38 (1.85%)	83 (4.05%)

3. There was a reasonable level of effort expected for the credit hours received.

~
Question Type: Likert
~
contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	4.11	0.92	21 (36.84%)	26 (45.61%)	6 (10.53%)	3 (5.26%)	1 (1.75%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1931	4.27	0.91	933 (48.32%)	744 (38.53%)	134 (6.94%)	74 (3.83%)	43 (2.23%)	3 (0.16%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

4. The homework assignments helped me learn the subject matter.

~

Question Type: Likert

~

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	4.00	0.96	19 (33.33%)	25 (43.86%)	8 (14.04%)	4 (7.02%)	1 (1.75%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1933	4.18	0.95	781 (40.40%)	641 (33.16%)	206 (10.66%)	74 (3.83%)	38 (1.97%)	193 (9.98%)

5. The textbook increased my understanding of the material.

~

Question Type: Likert

~

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	2.97	1.03	2 (3.51%)	7 (12.28%)	14 (24.56%)	6 (10.53%)	3 (5.26%)	25 (43.86%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1927	3.84	1.08	380 (19.72%)	373 (19.36%)	257 (13.34%)	94 (4.88%)	39 (2.02%)	784 (40.69%)

6. The course material was well organized and developed.

~

Question Type: Likert

~

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
55	3.53	1.25	13 (23.64%)	20 (36.36%)	10 (18.18%)	7 (12.73%)	5 (9.09%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
2040	4.21	0.92	888 (43.53%)	767 (37.60%)	199 (9.75%)	74 (3.63%)	40 (1.96%)	72 (3.53%)

7. The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter.

~

Question Type: Likert

~

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	4.37	0.72	28 (49.12%)	23 (40.35%)	5 (8.77%)	1 (1.75%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
2048	4.61	0.66	1365 (66.65%)	544 (26.56%)	70 (3.42%)	22 (1.07%)	11 (0.54%)	36 (1.76%)

8. The instructor was well prepared for class.

~

Question Type: Likert

~

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	4.12	0.76	18 (31.58%)	30 (52.63%)	7 (12.28%)	2 (3.51%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
2045	4.44	0.78	1131 (55.31%)	670 (32.76%)	119 (5.82%)	42 (2.05%)	20 (0.98%)	63 (3.08%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

9. I received adequate preparation from the prior courses in the curriculum to be successful in this course.

~

Question Type: Likert

~

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	3.98	0.91	14 (24.56%)	32 (56.14%)	5 (8.77%)	2 (3.51%)	2 (3.51%)	2 (3.51%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
1929	4.10	0.97	748 (38.78%)	740 (38.36%)	232 (12.03%)	105 (5.44%)	42 (2.18%)	62 (3.21%)

10. The grading policy was fair.

~

Question Type: Likert

~

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	3.96	0.82	14 (24.56%)	30 (52.63%)	11 (19.30%)	1 (1.75%)	1 (1.75%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
2045	4.26	0.90	946 (46.26%)	754 (36.87%)	186 (9.10%)	58 (2.84%)	43 (2.10%)	58 (2.84%)

11. The instructor responded adequately to in-class questions.

~

Question Type: Likert

~

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	4.39	0.73	28 (49.12%)	25 (43.86%)	2 (3.51%)	2 (3.51%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
2044	4.42	0.79	1108 (54.21%)	699 (34.20%)	113 (5.53%)	44 (2.15%)	23 (1.13%)	57 (2.79%)

12. The instructor effectively used technology in support of the learning goals for this course.

~

Question Type: Likert

~

contributed by Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science

Results for CS-4710-001, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
57	4.26	0.74	24 (42.11%)	25 (43.86%)	7 (12.28%)	1 (1.75%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Not Applicable (NA)
2045	4.34	0.83	984 (48.12%)	748 (36.58%)	139 (6.80%)	44 (2.15%)	30 (1.47%)	100 (4.89%)

13. The average number of hours per week I spent outside of class preparing for this course was:

~

Question Type: Multiple Choice

~

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-4710-001

Total	Less than 1 (NA)	1 - 3 (NA)	4 - 6 (NA)	7 - 9 (NA)	10 or more (NA)
57	1 (1.75%)	24 (42.11%)	19 (33.33%)	12 (21.05%)	1 (1.75%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Less than 1 (NA)	1 - 3 (NA)	4 - 6 (NA)	7 - 9 (NA)	10 or more (NA)
1934	88 (4.55%)	645 (33.35%)	759 (39.25%)	269 (13.91%)	173 (8.95%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

14. I learned a great deal in this course.

~
Question Type: Likert
~
contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-4710-001

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
56	3.86	1.05	15 (26.79%)	27 (48.21%)	8 (14.29%)	3 (5.36%)	3 (5.36%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
1925	4.30	0.90	981 (50.96%)	683 (35.48%)	166 (8.62%)	52 (2.70%)	43 (2.23%)

15. Overall, this was a worthwhile course.

~
Question Type: Likert
~
contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-4710-001

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
57	3.82	1.04	17 (29.82%)	21 (36.84%)	12 (21.05%)	6 (10.53%)	1 (1.75%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
1925	4.32	0.93	1037 (53.87%)	641 (33.30%)	131 (6.81%)	66 (3.43%)	50 (2.60%)

16. The course's goals and requirements were defined and adhered to by the instructor.

~
Question Type: Likert
~
contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-4710-001, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
56	4.16	0.87	21 (37.50%)	27 (48.21%)	5 (8.93%)	2 (3.57%)	1 (1.79%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
2042	4.41	0.76	1071 (52.45%)	807 (39.52%)	109 (5.34%)	32 (1.57%)	23 (1.13%)

17. The instructor was approachable and made himself/herself available to students outside the classroom.

~
Question Type: Likert
~
contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-4710-001, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
57	4.54	0.63	34 (59.65%)	21 (36.84%)	1 (1.75%)	1 (1.75%)	0 (0.00%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
2043	4.43	0.79	1167 (57.12%)	668 (32.70%)	156 (7.64%)	26 (1.27%)	26 (1.27%)

18. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher.

~
Question Type: Likert
~
contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-4710-001, Floryan, Mark

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
57	4.18	0.97	24 (42.11%)	25 (43.86%)	4 (7.02%)	2 (3.51%)	2 (3.51%)

Results for SEAS, 4000-level courses

Total	Mean	Std Dev	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
2053	4.37	0.85	1112 (54.16%)	715 (34.83%)	147 (7.16%)	41 (2.00%)	38 (1.85%)

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~

19. Please make any overall comments or observations about this course:

~

Question Type: Short Answer

~

contributed by Office of the Provost

Results for CS-4710-001

Total	Individual Answers
38	*See below for Individual Results*

Floryan is a really nice guy.

This course is very badly structured. There were four short "take-home" exams and there were no classes on those days. That added up to two weeks without classes. I feel the instructor simply does not prepare enough material for the course. There are not enough materials and the homework is very badly designed. Not rigorous or formal in any sense.

This course was all about checking boxes. Almost everyone involved put in the minimal amount of effort for it to count for credit as well as it having been taught.

I regret taking this class; I learned virtually nothing and the professor was disorganized and unprofessional. This was the first time Floryan taught this course, so I understand some of the disorganization, but it became frustrating to constantly have the specification for programming assignments change and to find contradictions (and typos) in the write-ups. He relied on the TAs to write, edit, and test the programming assignments; I'm not sure what he actually did for the class besides rip content and images from lectures at other universities for his slides. The content was boring; each lecture was either useless high-level philosophical discussion of 'intelligence' or extremely technical analysis of one or two functions or algorithms. I don't think I have an idea of what AI is yet. Floryan tried his hardest to appear cool to the 120 students, which I found unprofessional and distracting. There were daily references to drinking and party culture (many implying that heavy drinking and hangovers lead to better grades) as well as unnecessary cursing. Overall, boring, useless course. And no, I'm not being dramatic.

Why have a cumulative final that isn't take home or open notes but have all other tests this way? I thought that was rather stupid, and not at all helpful for preparing us for what was to come on the final. The communication between the TAs and instructor needs to be better, as assignments required SEVERAL clarifications both in class and on Piazza before it was clearly understood what was expected.

Since this was Professor Floryan's first semester teaching the course, it makes sense that there were a few bumps along the way. I saw two major problems in the layout of the course. The first was that the take-home "tests" were open-note. I don't know of a single person who studied in advance for these, and it led to frantic studying during finals week since none of us had memorized the things that needed to be memorized for the closed-notes final. The second major problem I noticed was that a lot of the homeworks and exam questions were very open-ended. Yet, the rubrics used to grade them were very strict. These two elements did not match up well, in my opinion. Overall, though, I thought the class was a good intro to AI, and I definitely learned a great deal. Prof. Floryan was, as always, a great lecturer.

The homework specifications probably need to be made more clear. There were a lot of questions about what exactly we should be doing that had to be cleared up in class or on Piazza.

Now that I've completed the course and this suggestion can in no way apply to me, I think it would be cool/helpful if there were also written homework assignments.

Please put some work into your slides to make them easier to follow and more interesting. Looking at the slides without you there to explain them is not very helpful :(Also, the homeworks could use some more structure. I liked the take home exams, but am dreading this final.... Thanks for a great semester! Love you Flo <3

The various topics seemed a bit disjointed. If there were some way to tie everything together, it may help improve the flow of the class, and the connections may make things easier to remember and understand.

I really didn't learn much from the lectures or the textbook. I had to just learn it on my own, through practice. I think this class is rewarding, but way too tough. I spent like 15 hours on each assignment...

A smaller class size would have made this course more effective.

I LOVED this class. Sure, there were some bumpy things with assignment organization, etc, but that's just "first time" stuff. I'm sure any organizational issues will go away by next semester now that Floryan has been through it once. I thought it could have been made a bit more difficult/work-intensive. I would have loved to do some implementation of a POMDP, especially if it could be a "second attempt" at the robot assignment. (i.e. "Before, you didn't have the tools to approach this the 'right' way. Now, we'll use a POMDP to get a really good path through the maze.") Anyway--keep being awesome. You are one of the top two professors here, IMO (and it's pretty much a tie at that point). :) I really like your lecture style and you're really approachable during office hours, after class, etc.

Can we drop an exam, pretty please? :) Jokes aside (not really, that wasn't a joke) Professor Floryan made AI fun and interesting. Huge thing for me to say, since AI was one of the classes I'd swore I'd never take, until I got peer pressured into taking it my final semester at UVA since everybody and their mother were taking it as well. I learned a lot and was exposed to great material. Floryan was so approachable outside of classes and was really there for his students. Will definitely recommend this class to others.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~
	Group projects suck, I ended up doing almost all of the work for homeworks 1 through 3 even though I partnered with someone (tried 2 different partners across the 3 assignments).
	I appreciated that you used real stats in the slides. I'M SO ORIGINAL HEHEHE. In all seriousness, the class was well taught. Material was interesting. Wish we did more examples in class, when you go over algorithms you kind of breeze through them. Very helpful outside of class. Thanks!
	Great Teacher and a completely awesome course. It was difficult but I would take it again in a heartbeat.
	Floryan was great, but the material seemed somewhat random at times (like I was unsure why we were learning it or how things fit together). Also, the slides were difficult to read and use for review as if they were thrown together. Some of the homeworks were not well defined. I realize that was intentional in terms of the solution (and I appreciated that), but the input/output was not always clear which caused a lot of unnecessary trouble. Overall, a good course. Floryan was especially good at responding to in class questions.
	A-
	I am biased due to already having prior experience with AI, Machine Learning, and some Computer Vision. The course would be better if some topics were covered in more depth and would prefer more assignments over exams/final since we learned more with assignments.
	Good course overall, but some of the material felt unorganized Homework assignments need refinement/clarification Acceptable considering the course curriculum was overhauled by Prof. Floryan
	Homework guidelines were ill defined
	This course was far from conventional, and while the intent was good, in practice there were some problems. Specifically, the homeworks. The idea was good, to leave the assignments a little open ended, and then challenge the students to compare different approaches and see what worked best. The trouble comes with the nature of the assignments. Whereas a traditional homework assignment for an upper level CS course might take on average 10 hours (more or less depending on the individual) you could easily spend 30 or 40 hours on an assignment for this class and still not be satisfied with your results. While certainly indicative of real world applications, the fact that there isn't really a "best" answer made it hard to feel as though you were done with the assignment. It always felt as though there was more to do, because there was always more that could be done. As a result, it was hard to tell if you were meeting the expectations of the course, and many students tended to work up to and beyond deadlines. This isn't purely a result of procrastination, it mostly was because it always felt like what you were submitting wasn't enough. To preserve the nature of the assignments, that is comparing alternate approaches, perhaps they could be broken up into smaller, more guided tasks. For example, given some starter code, implement a specific classifier algorithm, then the next week the assignment to implement a different one. Students would get to more fully experience the value of different approaches (as most students that I knew seemed to just slightly "improve" their same basic approach and use that for comparison) while taking the stress off if you can't get one specific implementation working, as there were so many. This was a problem because often in the current format of the class, you could pick an approach, struggle with it and waste valuable time, only to have to completely restart with a different tactic or submit a very poorly performing version. On a different note, the exams were quite nice. They suffer from the same issue, an exam that we were told should take an hour could easily take 3 or 4 if you're a perfectionist. This wasn't as big of a deal though, as minimal studying was required, so compared to the normal level of effort for an exam they were fairly easy. Lecture was fine, though at times the math made it harder to understand what was going on. Take, for example, the neural networks slides. The concepts weren't that hard to grasp, but the awful notation made it very difficult to figure out what was going on. This was true of some other lectures as well, so perhaps more worked examples would be beneficial. Overall though the lectures were really, really great. This was a pretty great class, and I think with a few changes it could become one of the best electives the department offers.
	Some of the homework assignments were a little bit vaguely defined. HW1 and HW4 were more clear, which was nice
	This course only offered a very basic level understanding of a broad range of AI topics. I would have preferred this course to be more math-heavy and more applicable to problems that real implementers of AI would have to deal with.
	Floryan prepared a really interesting course schedule. The material definitely seemed to build upon each other as we progressed to more complex examples of artificial intelligence. With such a large class I recognize it is difficult to teach the material in other ways than a traditional lecture. I appreciated the few online demos and chalk diagrams used to demonstrate algorithms. I would have enjoyed the class more if Floryan had been able to vary the mode of teaching in ways similar to these examples
	Calculus and Statistics should be prerequisites for this course if the curriculum is going to focus on such rigorous formulas and calculations. This class felt more like a crash course in AI than an introduction. I did not feel well prepared to understand and implement the formulas we learned about. Thankfully, Professor Floryan is very helpful and understanding of students' different struggles and he recognized the difficulties students were having--I hope that he adjusts the curriculum accordingly in coming semesters to accommodate the less calc/stats-savvy students in the class.
	Course could have been better organized, seemed like it was very backloaded. Probably will be better in future semesters as the kinks get smoothed out.
	The material in this course can get dense and lose everyone very, very quickly. Fortunately Prof. Floryan was able to minimize this with the way that he presented some of the topics. I would like to see more class engagement during some of the harder topics though.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~
	I understand the course is a survey of AI, but it felt much too shallow in some places. Overall I was disappointed with the course. There were a total of 4 homework and 4 written exams. Each of them was out of 10 points with no indication as to how much the homework was weighted compared to the tests. At the time of the final exam 5/8 of these had been graded, giving very little indication to what I needed to study. The grading was alarmingly harsh for this kind of course. A single error in an exam or homework could knock off 3-7 points (out of 10). There was no rubric provided for any of the assignments or exam. Much of the grading was subjective. Some exams asked opinion based questions "how might you approach..." or "suggest a possible solution..." but only a narrow range of opinions were given points. Keep in mind, each point on these exams is an entire letter grade. Getting 3-5 subjective points off results in a C (or a F) on the exam. On some assignments I did way more work than I should and got almost nothing back. Some components of the assignments were unfairly represented. For example, in the negotiator homework we were told that our results compared to our peers would have little to no affect on our grade and that "it was just a fun experiment." It ended up being 15% of the grade. About 20%-30% of the material covered in lecture was actually practiced. My favorite lecture was one on machine learning where we discussed a predictive model for a tutoring application. We looked at one of the driving factors for modeling mastery being the number of times a student had completed a practice problem correctly. In this class we "learned" about 20 different topics. We had 4 practice problems total. Imagine if this class was trying to teach us the mechanics of statistical analy--oh wait. On a constructive note, I think if this class is taught again that there should be 8-10 much smaller homework assignments that allow students to actually engage with the material. If the exams are going to ask very specific mechanical details about the mathematics behind different proofs of algorithms then I would appreciate at least learning how to do those proofs and then practicing them first. All that being said, I did learn a lot in the class. I appreciate the interest in the field of study, I just wish the course was executed more fairly. I liked the take home exams. But that made the final so much harder to prepare for. In general Floryan test are to hard. That seems like a constant for every class I have taken with him. A lot of the time it comes down to memorizing every single slide, in order to do well. There are less questions on the higher level concepts, most are about specific details. Great class. Really got me into machine learning. Professor Floryan is the man. Seriously, he connects with students better than anyone I've had as a professor during my time at UVA. You can tell he is really interested in the field of AI and because of that, he teaches with enthusiasm and in a way that causes students to become interested in AI as well. Almost every CS course requires a lot of work, so I took this knowing that it would be no different. Sure, there were times that I was swamped but Professor Floryan was pretty reasonable with the amount of time given to complete assignments and exams. I'm sure the whole class would back me up on that as well. The only ways that I think the class could be made better has to do with the complexity of the course material. There were examples done in class, but more examples that are worked out step by step would be beneficial (at least it would have been for me). We were given formulas for a lot of things, and kind of told where to apply them, but doing out problems with real example data would have helped me in more beneficial ways. The class was definitely a little disorganized, both in terms of the lecture and the homework assignments. It's partly because this is Floryan's first semester teaching it, but I feel like he also could've put a little more effort into preparing the assignments earlier, and there were always more questions than he anticipated about each assignment. That being said, the assignments themselves were pretty fun and I really appreciate the take-home exam structure because it's a much more lowkey way to ensure we know the material. Floryan could probably stand to be a little less chill to the class as a whole - this is one of the only classes I've ever seen where students will complain about being let out on time instead of early.... a side effect of whiny people expecting Floryan to accommodate them. But that being said, I still really appreciated it and enjoyed the class material. This is my 4th year at UVa. I loved this class. I learned quite a bit. Professor Floryan is quite possibly the best computer science professor at UVa. Having had the opportunity to meet him when he first came here and was new to the scene and seeing him become a part of our UVa community has been a privilege. He's moved around in teaching a variety of classes the last couple semesters and I've been lucky enough to be in a fair number of those. Also, Prof. Floryan made a great mentor for research as he actually knows what he is doing and gives great guidance. Overall, super thankful for having had him as a part of my 4 years here, even if it was just at the tail end. Keep on keeping on FloFlo.

~ QUESTIONS AND DETAILS ~	~ ANSWER MATRICES ~
	This class was fantastic! I got everything I wanted from an intro to AI course. Especially the assignments; they were very satisfying to look back. Thank you for shining light on AI today. I personally think it is very primitive and we have not developed anything we can call intelligence, just efficiency with memory. Memory is a part of intelligence... but there is so much more. Those lectures on What is Intelligence was badass. Loved hearing from different students and it was a great introduction to the course. To add to the course, make going to lecture worth it. I know you like leaving early or showing that "no one wants to be here" but I did. I am sure other students do too. I loved hearing your lectures (partly why I wanted to be in AI when I heard you were teaching). They are high level and easy to comprehend. You abstract needless information well and give us pointers to more detail if we want. I really wish that videos, visuals, animations, or something was supplemented when explaining the many algorithms in this course. It is nice to see real examples. Many students did not pay attention. Making class more interesting would help. When explaining the algorithms, they seem concise enough, but adding supplements (videos, animations, etc.) or even jokes will help a lot. Remember that cat cheating? Yeah. That was hilarious. Memes are great! Show more of your personality like in the first couple of lectures. I loved your exam style. I hate exams. Treating these exams as nice open assignments was pleasing. This mimics real work assignments too. The phrasing of the questions helped me reconcile the information I learned. This process of "compiling" the information helped internalize my learning in smaller chunks. Internalized learning/conceptual learning, I think, is better than rote memorization or fact looking up. These exams, listening to class lectures, and slides that helped "point" information greatly helped during the final exam, even though there were small mistakes it was good enough that it allowed me to learn and think highly about Artificial Intelligence. Side Note: Decision Boundary was explained in class... but I don't think they made it to the slides? at least the version I got didn't have it... it messed with my memory, but the answer key made me remember (so I still learned, yay!) Thanks for an awesome class! Floryan's a great instructor, but holy cow that final exam was so much harder than the midterms. Either more rigorous midterms to better prepare us or an easier final and this class would be a fantastic elective.