

eValuering 2.1 - Sammanställning

SAMMANSTÄLLNING

Utvärdering: AD2 (1DL230) Autumn 2009
Antal svarande: 33




WELCOME!

Please fill out the survey below to provide the assigned teachers and the department with feedback. Don't forget to click on "Submit Evaluation" when the form is complete. Your answers are anonymous.

QUESTIONS

The following questions are required by the faculty board. You must answer them.





What is your general feeling about the course?

Svarsalternativ	Graf (%)	%	Σ
1 (= bad)		0	0
2		0	0
3		9	3
4		30	10
5 (= good)		61	20

Medelvärde: 4.52

Standardavvikelse: 0.67




The total amount of work on the course, in relation to the credits (5 higher-education credit points = approximately 135 hours of work expected), was ...

Svarsalternativ	Graf (%)	%	Σ
1 (<110h)		3	1
2 (110..130h)		18	6
3 (130..140h)		45	15
4 (140..160h)		33	11
5 (>160h)		0	0



Medelvärde: 3.09

Standardavvikelse: 0.8

Did you at the start of the course receive information about previous course evaluations and measures taken because of them?

Svarsalternativ	Graf (%)	%	Σ
no		12	4
yes		73	24
I don't know		15	5

Did you get the opportunity during the course at a scheduled time to give anonymous written feedback on the ongoing course (in short: was there a mid-course evaluation)?

Svarsalternativ	Graf (%)	%	Σ
no		0	0
yes		97	32
I don't know		3	1

TELL US WHAT WE SHOULD KNOW!

What in this course has been particularly good?

- The lecturer is pretty responsible and is able to convey every necessary details very clearly. And his English is really good, I really enjoy the lecture. Besides, he told us every necessary thing about the course at the start of the course so that we could easily deal with problems involved the course. And the course website is excellent, I can everything I need from there. The assignments are good and we got tutorial lessons before the assignment deadline and feedback lesson after the assignment in which I learnt a lot. ¹
- the planning was excellent. ²
- Almost everything was great! :D ³
- the content of this course is practical, professional ⁴
- Lecture is good, and I can get fully understand. ⁵
- The lesson after each assignment. I can learn some different methods to solve the same kind of problem, and I can figure out why my solution is wrong. ⁶
- The teacher always has his own understanding of the literature's content, but is not as same as the published materials ⁷

- The teacher teaches carefully ⁸
- The way of teaching, assignments, examples during lectures and we were free to ask from basic questions to very high level of questions without any shame. At the beginning of all lectures, Pierre asks us "Is there any question about previous lecture?" and it sounds very good for me. During the lecture, he asks and after a bit he answer the question and I like the way because we have to think about the question and after thinking we get the correct answer. ¹⁰
- The lecture slides. Clear information about the rules of submitting assignments and such things, The teacher knew a lot about the subject and could explain about it. ¹¹
- The professor is good. Assignment questions are good. ¹²
- Nearly everything. The instructor is like a vaudevillian, keeps you on focus all the time. He also knows he can make mistakes, and makes you aware of it, and accepts and corrects them very quickly, modestly. ¹³
- Clarity make difficult things easy ¹⁷
- The lectures was well structured and stimulating. The TA's Toni and Nikos were excellent. They were very helpful and patient to explain concepts and answer questions. ¹⁸
- * The first hour of the course, where Pierre did an excelent work when he went trough all the information needed at the begining. Only problem was that it where a little hard to get a clear picture of all information due to the massive amount of it. * The assignments (or atleast the first two of them), booth gave a challange but was in no way to hard (In my opinion). Sure you needed to spend time on them but you learned alot from them. The last assignment felt like an easy excuse to get alote of people accepted, or maybe you where just out of ideas to make funny problems. But they where very good overall. * The lectures by Pierre was two-sided. Pierre have an excellent presentation skill and a way to make the understanding for the student easy. The problem with the course this year (and I know it will be different from now on) was that we had a mix of 3:rd year and 2:nd year DVP student on the course. This unfortunat led to a need for the lectures to be a bit slow and all example to be dealt with in greatest detail. For the students that have had Parosh in ADI alot of the material where already known and many felt that the course would have given more if the speed had been higher. My guess is that this will be the case in the future. I feel that I didn't learn as much as I could since the tempo was so low. Another thing was that I felt that the argument that the course only have so and so many hours of time from the instutuion fall flat when the tempo was so low, in a higher tempo there would have been time for more exercises and so on. But unfortunly many of the 2:nd year student would have had a harder time. One aspect of the course that I found really annoying was the fact that one didnt know how to prepear for the exam, I have a personal problem with bad nerves when we are talking of exams and when no examples of old exams are avabile I have a hard time to relax. Also if I had known the type of exam Pierre usually constructs I could have done a better job preparing for the exam and thus getting a result that better reflected my knowledge. To sum it all up. A really good course but the exam contained to much detailes that could lead to errors due to small and stupid errors. Thanks for a course that was of good quality. ¹⁹
- Most of it, but I'll pick the assignments, which may seem annoying to the student at first, but the learning-by-doing aspect soon gives better understanding of the algorithms. A rather unexpected outcome was learning more about LaTeX and graphics software... ²⁰
- The lectures. ²¹
- (Some of) the slides, (most of) the lectures and the exam. Most of the slides are really nice with lot of explicitly stated examples which is good for repetition. The lectures are often of high quality with precise statements and a clear language (no ambiguities). Sadly, this course contained (what I think) a bit too much of the same examples over and over again. The exam was really nice! I felt that you could apply what you had learned in a new way (the sudoku thing was great!) and I felt that you realized even more the power behind the algorithms. ²²

- Slides was good, and the questions on the labs. ²³
- Having assignments. Having the slides available easily through the course page. Clear rules. ²⁵
- As for the subjects: I enjoyed the topics selected and it felt relevant to my future studies/professional life. Although Pierre had high demands I believe he gave us every possibility of living up to his standards. The lectures were well prepared, thorough and clear. It was also easy to get in touch with the teachers/assistants. In short, I perceived that a lot of effort had been invested in making the course as good as possible, and this spurred my own work. ²⁶
- The assignments were very good. Love 'em, even though they require a lot of work. The assistants. Professionals with high knowledge. Keep 'em around for AD{2,3}. :-)²⁷
- The whole course has been fun and well executed. ²⁸
- the assignments of course ²⁹
- basic course for computer science. learn how to analysis problems and evaluate the solutions. ³⁰
- The level of the course is significantly higher than on a lot of other courses given by the IT institution. It seemed like the teachers really wanted to teach the students something. ³¹
- assignments to get some hands on experience and more depth in the topics the variety of topics that are included in the course, which makes it very interesting ³²

How could the course be improved?

- I am a little confused about the notation of the pseudocodes in lecture because of which I got failed score in one of the assignment. There is a website explaining the conventions and notations in the course homepage but it still didn't make it clear. And in the tutorial lessons, the assistant teachers didn't give the results in a standard way as mentioned on the course homepage. So I hope, at least at the first tutorial lesson, instructor can give a more standard and detailed answers:D ¹
- It would be nice if the questions in the assignments were checked for ambiguity a little better, i.e. be specific when you want a description of an algorithm, the actual algorithm or plain pseudocode. Note that these three are not necessarily the same. I (and my lab partner) interpreted the questions in the following way: description - a short text about how an algorithm worked and what it did algorithm - the steps of an algorithm pseudocode - pseudocode that implemented some algorithm We mailed to check what we were supposed to produce for our hand-in and found that it was pseudocode most of the time, but it would be nice if that was what the question stated since we literally wasted a couple of hours each time we had written an algorithm and later were told that we were supposed to write pseudocode and vice versa. This was a tad frustrating. Great course in every other aspect though :) ³
- It's better to put some electronic-version answer of the assignments, so that we can see the answer on the Internet.. ⁴
- The assignment should give more time to finish ⁵
- It would be better if the three assignments could be harder. ⁶
- It may be better if we could have more practices on the implementation of learned algorithms ⁷
- More detail about the usage of algorithm ⁸
- I don't think it can be improved according to the limitation of time. Pierre did his best. ¹⁰
- Better/clearer instructions for the assignments, they could easily be misunderstood. Not quite that difficult assignments, it took much more time than expected to finish them. Some exercises for the exam. Now we didn't have any old exams for practising and didn't really know what the exam was about to look like. ¹¹

- ... I will say more examples, but I know that time is not enough. So this course simply needs more credits. ¹³
- Remove the soft deadline and make the deadline on Sundays the only deadline that exists, without penalties. Students are chronic procrastinators, and however noble it is to try to prevent them from doing things in the weekend, it is sometimes the best alternative when you are taking 3 courses at the same time. ¹⁴
- Shorter examples on how the algorithm works, and go through more examples or more material instead. Disjoint data sets should be included with some algorithm and not just the structure itself. ¹⁵
- maybe the tutorial session be perfected. More material, more Q&A ¹⁷
- A special (optional?) lecture/lesson in using CLRS-code. Maybe also on TeX/LaTeX for beginners, but I would have needed an intro to CLRS-code. ¹⁸
- See above ¹⁹
- Less backtracking during lectures. Less time spent on elementary discrete mathematics - we're supposed to know this. Less time spent on - and attitude and pedantry regarding - administrative formalities. ²⁰
- Slides: I don't really know, they are very good, but maybe an extra example or two. Now, you only have a single example of BFS/DFS/Topological sort/Etc, which means a lot of special cases are left out, and this can be a problem. Lectures: More different examples. During the lectures, I think the BFS (or was it DFS?) example was made two times, almost identically. It would be better to have two graphs and show BFS on both of them (and the same for the rest of the material) Also, I think its bad that we don't get any examples to prepare for the exam. We did not get any study questions (which is of course rare in any course) but also, when a student asked about the old exams, the answer was "I haven't read them, so I can't say anything". It would be really good if the teacher could just browse them through and make a list and state that Question 1,3 and 6 on 2007 exams are good examples of questions. He did point out his right to do whatever exam he wants, so he mightn't be obliged to do this kind of stuff, but it would be really nice to have it. ²²
- Have one deadline once a week for each question instead of three big ones. Then the labs would be more aligned with the lectures. ²³
- Perhaps the size of the assignments could be balanced a bit. Assignment 1 felt a bit big while 3 felt a bit small. Assignment 2 felt about right. Perhaps the reason why 3 was so small was because we only had 1 week between 2 and 3's deadline. If possible always having at least 2 weeks between the deadline would be great. Providing a simple list (one page max) with areas we've touched and some important algorithms/data structures/lessons learned from these (not explaining, the just listing them) might have made studying for the exam easier in the absence of old exams. ²⁵
- The lessons were a bit unstructured which caused us to loose time, jump some topics etc. However, I understand that some problem are inevitable given that both Toni and Nikos are new here. ²⁶
- Workload of the assignments could be more evenly distributed; my workload: assignment 1 (~20 hours), assignment 2 (~30 hours), assignment 3 (~15 hours). ²⁷
- Have the lab two days before the handin of the assignments. ²⁸
- maybe only assignments, no exams ²⁹
- Explain how all the knowledge taught are connected. Why these knowledge, not the other in the textbook? ³⁰

Please be informative and constructive.

Licensierat till Institutionen för Informationsteknologi, Uppsala Universitet.