Lärarkommentarer:

The class was generally excellent, with a really motivated crowd in the lectures and help sessions. We had switched in the last minute from pseudo-code to Python, and from an entirely manual grading of assignments to a partially automated grading via test suites: there were some transition problems, such as later assignment releases than targeted, but overall we teachers managed quite well, I think. We will re-calibrate the workload for the next instance of the course.

Regarding the improvement suggestions:
@7,19,22: See FAQ 3.7.
@7,20,22: See FAQ 2.5: the teacher just implements what the catalogue prescribes.
@7: Course evaluations are not supposed to contain sarcastic insults, expressed under the protection of anonymity.
@8: We are revising the schedule of help sessions.
@11: See FAQ 4.1: nobody had any questions at the final lecture!
@13: Bonus systems trigger an unreasonable amount of administration for teachers due to the switch to anonymous exams. The students cannot have it both ways.
@17,22: See FAQ 2.5, 3.1, and 3.3.
@21: The local students also had no prior exposure to Python. We only require code annotations that are universally considered good practice.
@22: See FAQ 2.2. I disagree: the MIT slides are extremely well thought out, and it would be unethical and unreasonable to clone them.

Kommentarer från studierektor/programansvarig (Aletta Nylen):

Overall a good and appreciated course. The students report that they experience the work load too be a bit high when they have two other courses in paraller and some think that 5 credits is not enough for the course. More problem solving support is also requested.

Registrerade: 37
Avslut: 21
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 this course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Svarsalternativ</th>
<th>Graf (%)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ( = very bad)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ( = bad)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ( = average)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ( = good)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ( = very good)</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Medelvärde: 4.45  
Standardavvikelse: 0.86

### 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 ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Svarsalternativ</th>
<th>Graf (%)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (&lt;110h)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (110..130h)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (130..140h)</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (140..160h)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (&gt;160h)</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Medelvärde: 3.64  
Standardavvikelse: 1.09

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Svarsalternativ</th>
<th>Graf (%)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Svarsalternativ</th>
<th>Graf (%)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TELL US WHAT WE SHOULD KNOW!**

**What in this course has been particularly good?**

- Thorough and precise presentation, especially the more advanced graph algorithm. For the most part, very stimulating assignments.¹
- The assignment questions, meaning it was fun trying to figure out solution algorithms.²
- Not much though Scott was awesome, the course content was interesting though hard.⁷
- Assignments were interesting, good level of difficulty but the grading seemed a bit harsh. On the other hand the weight on the assignments for the final score is pretty big though.
- Overall I feel they are very good as a way for preparing for the exam.⁸
- I learned a lot from assignments, I was interested in the subjects which is taught in course like dynamic algorithms, greedy algorithms,...⁹
- The lectures were interesting and well explained. The labs were challenging.¹⁰
- I think everything was really great. The assignments were hard but doable and the courses were really clear.¹¹
- helpful and quick answers to questions from both prof and assistants. slides: contained all the necessary information, well-matched with the lectures assignments: cool tasks, because they made us revise the concepts taught in the lectures, sanity check was also useful organization: homepage always up to date, lectures and lessons started on time. It was a very good course, many thanks to prof and assistants!¹²
- The main teacher is very good and take the time to explain things very well. The assistants have also been good at answering questions via email and in person. Personally I think bonus points is better than this scheme. A minor mistake in an algorithm give 0 points which I believe is maybe to much. Maybe because that effected me so much =). Having python instead of pseudo-code is great!¹³
- good explainations¹⁴
- - The exercises and the lab assistants. - That it wasn't very many students on the course so you got most of the help during the lab sessions, and for additional questions you knew the assistants' office hours. - That the exercises have been in actual code so we've had opportunity to see it work. - That the exercises covered most of the theory.¹⁵
- Very well structured and relevant¹⁶
- I liked Pierre teaching. teaching and sometimes discussion.¹⁷
- The lectures had a high quality.¹⁸
- The three teachers were great: friendly, patient and very good at explaining the concepts and examples. The assignments were very difficult though highly interesting and exciting. I learned a lot. A really good idea to actually implement the tasks. The lectures were intriguing. Pierre taught the material so that the material became great and interesting stories.¹⁹
- Relevant content, good lectures and assignments. Both TA's and the head teacher where really good at explaining and trying to get you to understand when you asked a question.²⁰
- Assignments and their feedback were very beneficial to grasp the subjects. Asistants helped us very much on assignments.²¹
- Using python²²
How could the course be improved?

- While of course real world situation has to be taken into accord, ideally less time would be spent revising material from predecessor courses. I understand why, but for those who do not need the reminder, time could be spent on new content.
- Check that solutions (the teachers think of) comply with the programming language. For example in case with binary heaps there were some unexpected difficulties in python implementation.
- The course for should be upgraded to ten credit points, it's much closer to reality than the measly five it's currently worth for the amount of work I took two other courses this "half term" or period or whatever it's supposed to be called. I wish I had dropped one of them instead of trying to ride it out. I focused hard on passing AD2, but I'm not sure I will. I could have done a better choice, as I could only had time to attend lectures of one of the other courses as a result, and pretty much nothing else thanks to the huge time sink of a course AD2 is. The assignments did not prepare me for the exam in any great way, despite Pierre's reassurances. I have more complaints, but here are my suggestions: 1. Re-organize the course, either keep the current content etc. for double the points or make cuts if you still want to keep it at five. 2. Pierre, being a good computer scientist doesn't a good teacher make. You gave me the impression that I would be semi-retarded if I didn't understand the content perfectly when you lectured. Thankfully I could ask Scott questions when I needed. This evaluation could have more options, more details about the course evaluated, but I guess having your lecturing skills appreciated with a number from one to five wasn't very flattering. Not that writing any of this will matter. 7
- Not really that many suggestion but if something I'd say that the earlier the assignments are released the better as that provides more flexibility for the students. I think as soon as you start teaching any material brought up in the assignments they could be released. Also the lab session, I dont know how useful it is. We didnt attend any of them because we were mostly finished with the assignments by the time they happened. 8
- May be more guidance or hints in assignments could guide students in right way unless students spend a lot of time to create the right way. 9
- There were something missing in this course. I would like to have a final lecture were we correct one of the previous exams. I think it can be useful for the students and they can directly ask question if there is any problem. 11
- It is a very good course and I'm glad I took it. Introduce a few bonus points maybe. 13
- I feel like I have no constructive comment to help to improve this course, sorry. 14
- This course does not need an examination, instead another lab covering the end would be preferable. There is no way to make "an honest attempt" on the labs without learning enough to deserve a passing grade. 16
- I saw the lack of some lectures to ask our problems or solve some problems by assistance. 17
- More time on the exam! 18
- Me and my partner used over 25 hours each per assignment which were quite a lot. I don't know how to reduce that time whilst keeping the assignments easy to learn from, because we enjoyed the process of understanding and progressing through the assignments. It's just that it took a lot of time from the other courses... 19
- The time between getting you awnsers corrected before the TA-meeting was usaly way to short. I think that this time should atleast be 24 hours. This to prevent so that you wont be sitting all night trying to figure out what you did wrong. Also this course is now a basic
course, but in reality it had more the form of an advanced course. So it would better reflect what the course was about to change it to an advanced course if possible.  

- The python language could be hard to write for exchange students since there is a probability that they could have no idea of the python language. Therefore, assignments of exchange students could be graded different than local students. For instance, losing points from comments, and variable types etc though algorithms and codes were correct makes no sense.  

- the course worth more than 5 hp. in comparison to the work we have to do during the course. Its would be much better if we get more exemples for each algorithm we study. The MIT slides wasn't good enough to understand the algorithms, & at the same time the head lecture has nothing else than these slides!(is it possible that Uppsala university hasn't its own slides?)

Please be informative and constructive.