eValuering 2.1 - Sammanställning

SAMMANSTÄLLNING

Utvärdering:	Constraint Programming (autumn 2011)
Antal svarande:	11

KURSRAPPORT

Lärarkommentarer:

Kommentarer från studierektor/programansvarig (Aletta Nylen):

Registrerade: 39
Avslut: 22 (56%)
Svarsfrekvens: 11 (28%)

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	▮	9	1
3	▮	9	1
4	▮	9	1
5 (= good)	▬▬▬▬▬▬	73	8

Medelvärde: 4.45
Standardavvikelse: 1.04

The total amount of work on the course, in relation to the credits (10 högskolepoäng = 10 ECTS credits = 267 hours of work expected), was ...

Svarsalternativ	Graf (%)	%	Σ
1 (<230h)	▮	9	1
2 (230..250h)		0	0
3 (250..280h)	▬▬▬▬	45	5
4 (280..300h)	▬▬▬	36	4
5 (>300h)	▮	9	1

Medelvärde: 3.36
Standardavvikelse: 1.03

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

Svarsalternativ	Graf (%)	%	Σ
no		0	0
yes	▬▬▬▬▬	55	6
I don't know	▬▬▬▬	45	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	▬▬▬▬▬	55	6
I don't know	▬▬▬▬	45	5

TELL US WHAT WE SHOULD KNOW!

What in this course has been particularly good?

- Really interesting subject, fun and challenging to model and good trade- off between ordinary lectures and guest lectures. Instructions are typically precise for the assignments and the lectures are well structured. Nice to deal with state of the art stuff and NP-hard problems. I think I will definitely try to use this when I start working in the industry. [1]
- It has been interesting. [2]
- The practical part, e.g. assignment and project [3]
- Hands on approach with plenty of theory. [5]
- Organization. Through out the assignments and the project, we can learn the contents in the lectures by doing. [6]
- Teacher and TAs are good. [7]
- The lectures were truly epic. Pierre's lectures are the main attraction of being a student at Uppsala University. The assignments were often very tricky and hard to figure out but provided a nice payoff when you did. The TAs gave nice assistance when asked questions and had good lessons about the assignments. [8]
- I really liked the contents taught and especially the way Pierre hold the lessons. They have been very informative as well as interesting. [9]
- The project was challenging and fun. [10]

How could the course be improved?

- It was really hard to learn how to use Gecode, especially for the first assignment. I'm not saying that we should've been spoon fed, but for me it doesn't feel realistic to read 9 chapters in the MPG during such a short time and then manage on poor documentation from the web and trial and error to figure things out that's not mentioned in the MPG. Getting appointments with the TAs is hard because it feels like you're imposing on their time. When facing a completely new subject with all these terms that we now take for granted, digesting that kind of technical material is hard. I think there should be more support for this phase of the learning process during the course. Or even better - have one constraint programming and modelling "black box" course of 5 credits and then have an advanced continuation course where you get to design propagators and branchers, more like this one (10 credits). Knowledge of C++ and Gecode should otherwise be a prerequisite since they are assumed. Including what used to be a project as the last assignment was not a very good idea, especially since this was during exam times. I feel that at least one of my assignments were unjustly graded but I'm waiting until after the exam before I appeal this case since I don't see the point unless it affects my final grade. I think that we satisfied all the requirements of the assignment and our report was decently well written, still we got a 1 just because of the performance of the code. I therefore suggest rethinking the grading strategy or at least clearer information on how the assignments are graded. The labs weren't that much help, but I guess that was also my own fault being too Swedish. However, it felt like the TAs weren't allowed to help us with anything and they certainly did not ask anyone how we were doing as I typically do when I work as a lab assistant (this usually gives raise to questions). Instead they gave no help unless we asked the exact right questions. I'm not saying this is wrong, just something to think about. Consider removing the labs or improving the lab assisting strategy. I would have loved to have people from outside Uppsala University come and do guest lectures. Devising a filtering algorithm is part of the course goals but although there's just two days left before the exam I don't know what is meant by that. Maybe this could be better included in the lectures. I would have liked to have an assignment for local search. [1]

- In the first slides I would have liked some example of a gecode script with commandline options for branching and search. I used an ugly work-a-round, since I found nothing in gecode for specific search options, just a random search option ability. [2]
- No [3]
- The course lacks labs. It has 6 assignments where we student are supposed to learn how to use the tools almost by ourselves. By labs I mean some extended lab sessions to guide us through the practical use of the theoretical notions given in the lectures, where we have to complete smaller tasks and gradually understand how things work, and maybe later on apply them on real assignments. Other courses such as "Advanced computer architecture" that is run in parallel have a format that helps students much more and makes learning easier and hence more enjoyable. Furthermore, the lab session for an assignment used to be the day after correction lesson of the previous assignment. Many times we didn't make it to start to work on an assignment and weren't able to profitably use the lab session. I think that was the case for other groups as well. [7]
- One thing I would suggest is that the first assignment should maybe not be as full of testing huge number of heuristics and generate such large tables before the students have gotten into Gecode. So an assignment with less material to generate for the first report would be my advice. [8]
- Regarding the last assignment, I would have preferred to have more time. I know that we actually got 3 weeks instead of 2, but since the last assignment is to be done alongside the exams, it was (at least for my partner and me) not enough time. I would have preferred to have a less intensive assignment in the end. [9]
- Maybe have a more elaborate debriefing for the assignments/projects. Somehow encouraging student interactions for comparing solutions or subsolutions to the assignments/project would have been desirable. I would have liked to see how some students approached certain aspects of the problems. Maybe a good way to do that as a first step would be to encourage more forum posts, especially during the period between the assignment submission and the lesson. [10]
- lab sessions have to be structured in a better way. I'd say adding TA's guided exercises. [11]

Please be informative and constructive.