Rapport fra «Anonymous Half-Way Evaluation for INF4820 (2014)»

Innhentede svar pr. 15 oktober 2014 13:42

- leverte svar: 38
- påbegynte svar: 0
- invitasjoner sendt: 1

Med fritekstsvar

Background
Lecture Attendance *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
(almost) all	15	39.5 %
most	10	26.3 %
some	9	23.7 %
(almost) none	4	10.5 %

Laboratory Attendance *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
(almost) all	6	15.8 %
most	2	5.3 %
some	12	31.6 %
(almost) none	18	47.4 %

Weekly Hours of Self-Study (Outside of Lectures) *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
below two	0	0.0 %
below five	10	26.3 %
below ten	16	42.1 %
more than ten	12	31.6 %

Lines of Code Written Earlier *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
hundreds	4	10.5 %
thousands	9	23.7 %
tens of thousands	17	44.7 %
more than that	8	21.1 %

Feedback on Course as a Whole

Please rate your course experience this far according to the following dimensions.

Course Structure and Communication *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
crystal clear	20	52.6 %
mostly clear	17	44.7 %
somewhat unclear	0	0.0 %
somewhat mysterious	1	2.6 %

Significance of Course Content *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
highly relevant	21	55.3 %
mostly relevant	17	44.7 %
somewhat irrelevant	0	0.0 %
irrelevant	0	0.0 %

Overall Difficulty *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
a lot easier than average	0	0.0 %
a bit easy	9	23.7 %
a bit hard	24	63.2 %
really difficult	5	13.2 %

Pace of Instruction *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
too slow	1	2.6 %
leisurely	27	71.1 %
at time too fast	10	26.3 %
all too fast	0	0.0 %

Difficulty of Problem Set (1a) *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
trivially easy	11	28.9 %
a bit easy	26	68.4 %
a bit hard	1	2.6 %
above my head	0	0.0 %

Difficulty of Problem Set (2a) *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
trivially easy	0	0.0 %
a bit easy	12	31.6 %
a bit hard	23	60.5 %
above my head	3	7.9 %

Difficulty of Problem Set (2b) *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
trivially easy	0	0.0 %
a bit easy	8	21.1 %
a bit hard	27	71.1 %
above my head	3	7.9 %

Utility of Seibel (2005) *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
great book	6	15.8 %
useful	26	68.4 %
a bit weird	4	10.5 %
pretty obscure	2	5.3 %

Utility of Jurafsky & Martin (2008) *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
great book	5	13.2 %
useful	27	71.1 %
a bit weird	4	10.5 %
pretty obscure	2	5.3 %

Utility of Manning, Raghavan, & Schütze (2008) *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
great book	5	13.2 %
useful	26	68.4 %
a bit weird	6	15.8 %
pretty obscure	1	2.6 %

Suggestions for Revisions

Please give free-text feedback, preferably in a couple of sentences, to the following general questions.

What have you learned so far and expect to be useful?

Problem sets relates to real-life applications, e.g. IMDB review classification.

A lot of the things we've gone through so far is extending on things I've already learned in bachelor courses in functional programming and computer linguistics so a lot of it isn't new per se, but still useful in the domain of nlp. Things I think will be useful outside of the nlp domain is probably clustering and related topics as it appears to be applicable to problems involving large datasets.

A lot.

I think the lectures is useful, and the curriculum is interesting and fun!

Lisp!

I've learned the basics of CL. I finally got to try out emacs after many years as a hardcore vim-user. I expanded my knowledge of clustering. I already knew some from my bachelor, but the course included other variants of clustering and other perspectives, which I think is good.

Everything I have learned so far seems useful

lisp programing basics and word search approches, more or less what has been lectured

I expect to get more informations about feature space/vectors, data structures in LISP and efficiency in LISP because I had a some problems to do choices for my data structure for 2a. For exemple allocating 1000 cells for an array can be a correct choice.

I properly learned about feature vectors and how to use them in a vector space (I have been through this in other courses, but haven't really grasped the concept). I also suspect classification to be relevant later.

Mostly, I have learned the syntax and different useful datastructures and how to use them. Coming from inf2820 I mostly had the functional thiking down

I wish I could say I expect knowing LISP to be useful, but sadly that's probably not the case. I still enjoy learning it though :)

i have touched on Classfication and SVM from inf 3800, and scheme from inf2810, so i knew the basics of these things from before. But I had forgotten most of it so it has been a great recap so far.

Machine learning techniques, AI techniques

Lisp coding

I have learned the basics of Lisp and how functional programming is a better option than for instance java in some cases.

I have learned Lisp and new ways of thinking.

finding similarity of words using co-occurrence matrices, mainly the idea behind it, and that there are many ways to use such co-occurrence matrixes, we just happened to use them for context appearance of grammar within the same sentence (BoW style), but they can be used for anything. So probably a lot of AI uses n such.

Mostly only the Lisp is new

I have learned very useful things about classification, and I like using common lisp to solve problems.

Functional programming.

How to do classification in lisp have been very fun, since I'm very interested in both machine learning and love the lisp language.

Loop poetry.

classification

Extracting features from text for feeding classifiers.

What had you expected, but miss so far?

Nothing that I know of.

-

Perhaps a bit more of the "artificial intelligence" side of ainlp, although the term not very well defined. All in all I've found the topics interesting and enlightening so no real complaints here.

Maybe a little more practical examples in the lectures. I think some of the algorithms are explained a little bit to fast sometimes.

I expected a slower pace with learning CL before assuming that we're capable of fairly advanced use.

I can't find something else I should have expected

nothing I can think of now

I was expecting some group works.

Nothing really, I didn't quite know what to expect before I started.

Mostly as expected, good pace.

i'm looking forward to learning about Neural networks, and hidden markov models

The course is as expected, though harder than I thought

More focus on programming and relevant techniques on how to do the assignments.

More algorithmic theory

I can't think of anything.

Artificial intelligence

I look forward to the more AI-specific programming

more than one group per week

So far we have only applied machine learning to text. I am curious to see how to extract features from other types of data, maybe some examples with speech etc. for use in lectureres and assignments. One more thing: I am specially interested in the "Algorithms for AI" part of this course. Are we going to learn other algorithms than just those for implementing classifiers? I miss an expansion on this.

If you were to teach the course yourself, what would you do differently?

Nothing really.

Upload slides in some self ordering format as e.g.: year.month.day_title, or lecture_No.X

Lecture each week instead of two every second week. Other room than smalltalk. The room sucks.

I like the quizzes in the lectures, but speaking for myself my commute is about 1.5 hours each way which essentially means 3 hours travel for a 2 hour lecture. I'd greatly appreciate being able to participate in the quizzes from home as telecommuting is far more practical for me. Well that or magically make the rent in Oslo far cheaper.

Use more terminology and notation from math, more specifically real analysis.

I do not know. I think the teachers in this course do a great job!

Spend more time on teaching CL or simply drop teaching CL. I think learning CL is a very attractive part of the course, but right now I feel like I'm spending more time and effort on struggling through the language rather than focusing and learning from the problems.

I wouldn't change anything, bur perhaps be sure that everything of importance, like questions asked and answers given at lecture, could be repeated or said clearer, so that it would be understandable when one listens at the screen casts.

no

I would have less repetition at the start of the lectures. A little is fine, but using half the Thursday lecture for repetition seems like a waste.

Mostly the same. Not 2 bi-weekly lectures but 1 weekly.

Make it a little bit easier to use other software than ACL and emacs. Simply stating what parts of the "getting started" text are mandatory and what parts are optional should suffice for anyone who wants to use their own setup.

Especially the exercise 2b is a bit difficult to understand. A lot of text, and not too much explanation of why one are to solve things in an (at first sight) unintuitive way, such as keeping 0-values in the vectors when processing reviews. I wish the subtasks were explained better, and maybe the theory questions should have been excersice 1, not 3 (it is natural to do it last as it is task 3, but some of the questions asked in 3, provide better theoretical insight of doing 2)

more example, both easy and hard ones

Fewer assignments

Change language and environment to Clozure. Lisp and emacs seems so outdated as a modern environment to develop in unless one is familiar with it.

Not sure if neural networks are going to be introduced, (I was barely introduced to them in a different course) and those are fun.

Examples done on the blackboard would be done on screen instad, so that they are in the screencasts.

Possible to retry Assignments

I generally really like the way this course is arranged, both the lectures and assignments. I think however the course got a slow start due to Lisp basics, and there is sometimes a little to omuch repetition in the lectures.

Course Content: Common Lisp Programming *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
more of this	26	68.4 %
less of it	12	31.6 %

Course Content: NLP and AI Algorithms *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
more of it	31	81.6 %
less of it	7	18.4 %

Course Content: Machine Learning *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
more of it	34	89.5 %
less of it	4	10.5 %

Finally, Some Meta-Evaluation Utility of This Questionnaire *

Svar	Antall	Prosent
just fine	10	26.3 %

Svar	Antall	Prosent
not bad	13	34.2 %
a litle weird	14	36.8 %
obscure	1	2.6 %

Is there anything in this questionnaire that you would like to see changed?

Maybe there should be a "middle" option listed to some of the questions.

You could specify the question "Lines of Code Written Earlier". In lisp or coding total in all languages?

Maybe a bit later during the course (in case there is no additional questionnaire coming up later)? Possibility to give (specific) positive feedback!

It is disrespectful when half of a lecture is just repetition from the previous lecture, then I would rather have stayed home. Especially since most of us have had courses in classification earlier.

Perhaps make a text field for "anything else" for input that does not neatly fit in any of the existing questions.

An option to answer medium/fine.

I understand why the questions are made like this, but when you are satified, it is «a litle weird» (sic) to give answers that imply a wish for change.

("a litle weird" -> "a little weird") on the question. "Utility of This Questionnaire". Perhaps include a "fine as it is"-option on the course-content questions. "More" and "less" are currently the only options.

I think you should have a choise to say "The level was OK" for Problem 1, Problem2a and Problem2b. I do not think it was to hard, but it take lot of time to solve problem2a (not because of the exercise but I am not use to program in functional programming)

i haven't opend any of the curriculum.

Maybe include a question asking about the pace of different topics. I think some might have an opinion of whether too much or too little time is spent on a topic.

some places I would like to answer that the pace ore amount is perfect now. Not everything need adjusting

I would love to see OK for some of the questions. All of my "a bit easy"/"a bit hard" is really closer to OK.

Two choices for the last questions is not enough.

There weren't enough neutral answer options. For instance, you won't get a representative view of the textbooks when there isn't an option for "I haven't used the book". Also, what if the difficulty of the problem sets was "Just right"?

Most of the question should have a neutral answer. Like the utility of the books: I have not read in all three so 'not used' should be an answer. In the Course Content questions 'the right amount' sould be an answer. I dont want more or less of Lisp Programming. I think it was a perfect amount... This also applies to difficulty of the different problem set-questions.

add "haven't used it" to the book reviews

I wish there were a "neutral" or "perfect" alternative. Many of these things, such as common lisp lectures, I neither need more than less of, I thought it was exactly the right amount. There should also be a "have not read the book" alternative on the books... bold to assume that all the students have read the curriculum before each lecture.

You should add another option to almost every question. For instance; more of it, adequate, less of it

You should add a neutral answer to all questions. If you haven't read the book, how can you rate it?

I haven't used any of the books, so I just put a 'neutral-ish' answer of 'useful' for their related questions. should have some options like 'haven't looked at' it ffor those, and maybe a middle ground for stuff like course content questions, as for example, i found there to be just the right amount of Common Lisp Programming. (but I also have some prior experience, and ultimately the other things are much more important for the course, so i chose 'less of it' in the end)

A note on the questions about the books: An option to select "I don't have this book" would be nice :)

The obligatory excercises has a lot of type'os, that makes for some rather confusing sentences.

Free text answers to feedback to the lectures and teaching assistant.

I miss the option to pick "just fine", eg. Course Content: Common Lisp Programming, only offers more of it and less of it, what if I thought it was just right?

Have not read anything in Seibel (2005) yet, so it is difficult to choose one of the options.

There is no neutral answer alternatives. There was no way for me to say I didn't read the last two books. I answered "a bit weird" for these questions as result.