Machine Learning, 10.0 c

Course code: 1DT071, Report code: 61217, 33%, DAG, NML, week: 03 - 22 Semester: Spring 2017

Result

This evaluation is answered by 54% (48/89) of the respondents.

Below are statistics on single- and multiple-choice answers and freeform text. Additionally, the summaries for freeform text responses that students will see are also shown.

1: Overall, how satisfied are you with the course? Answers: 48

Answer options: Median: 4 Mean: 4.1 / 5

0. Do not know/not relevant/do not wish to answer	0 responses	0%	
1. Not at all	0 responses	0%	
2.	3 responses	6%	
3.	7 responses	15%	
4.	22 responses	46%	
5. Extremely	16 responses	33%	

2: How was the work load on this course, in relation to the course size? (10hp = 13.3 h/week).

Answers: 48

Answer options: Median: 3 Mean: 3.6 / 5

0. Do not know/not relevant/do not wish to answer	0 responses	0%	
1. Very low	0 responses	0%	
2.	1 responses	2%	
3.	24 responses	50%	
4.	14 responses	29%	
5. Very high	9 responses	19%	

The first and last lab were particularly demanding.
I felt the labs were very long but they were for the most part very well put-together and so I enjoyed working on them. I definitely learned a lot from them and I'm not sure that shorter labs would have led to the same outcome. My advice: Keep the long labs, but make sure that they are really good. I would have hated this course if the labs had been the same length but lower quality (i.e if the questions involved more work/writing but less thinking, or had lots of similar questions, or the questions were just badly worded)
The labs took quite a lot of time, mostly because the TAs correcting them seemed to be quite strict and we often had to submit revised questions.
The last lab was pretty heavy compared to other labs.

3: The course included a guest lecture about Deep Learning. How did you like that? (please only respond if you were there)

Answers: 42

Answer options: Median: 5 Mean: 4.3 / 5

0. Do not know/not relevant/do not wish to answer	12 responses	25%	
1. Very bad	1 responses	2%	
2.	1 responses	2%	
3.	2 responses	4%	
4.	10 responses	21%	
5. Very good	16 responses	33%	

More guest lectures!
Missed it
It was a good lecture, even if the presenter seemed to force some humour in there.

4: This has been especially good about the course: Answers: 39

Bra spridning på kursmaterialet. Intressanta och nyttiga labbar.
att kursen tar upp flera olika typer av problem och algoritmer inom maskininlärning.
I enjoyed the reading notes, the handouts, and generally Olle being so open with information? I think other teachers have been less interested in students actually learning and more "I have better things to do than answer your stupid questions". I also liked that he took the time to explain what he expected us to know for the exam and told us common mistakes etc. It's easy to think you know shit and then end up actually being so off otherwise.
the labs are fun and helped a lot to learn the outcome
labs help in delivering the idea and make it clear, as they cover the important points of each part of the literature
Very clearly explained. The lecturer took enough time to explain the fundamentals and focused on the important points. Even though it could be said this course should cover more material, I think what is covered is covered thoroughly enough that it will serve as a good foundation for people wanting to go on to explore more (and the guest lecture was a good introduction and overview of what else is out there).
Lectures and Labs
Lectures
The guest lecture
The guest lecture.
Föreläsningar och projekt har varit kul
Det mesta Föreläsningarna
The overall quality of the lectures and the correlation between them and the labs as the course went on.
Free project
The intro lab and the lectures.
The project was a good snapshot into how a thesis will be especially with the supervisor setup.
Bra med feedback på labbar. Bra med ett fritt projekt, hade önskat att det var mindre fokus på rapporten dock.
Bra med ett projekt. Bra feedback på labbrapporterna. För det mesta bra och innehållsrika föreläsningar.
Trying a lot of different approaches in machine learning. Not to only focus on neural networks for example. First I felt that it was unfortunate but as the course went on I really liked that fact , I learned a lot. Thank you Olle.
Clear presentations of the topics by Olle. I particularly like his personal notes. Also, the labs were interesting and very helpful for my understanding.
The assignments were particularly nice to do, so that we got to work with the material covered in the lectures. The project was interesting as we got to explore some area of interest within machine learning, which got us to invest more time into it outside of the lectures and labs.

The lectures
Olle is funny, he may show some interesting examples to explain the concept. I still remember the one that he shaved all his beard. XD
very interesting
The lectures were very clear, and the load of work was very well distributed along the course length. Very good to have the exam before the project, and not after or at the same time as it is done in most other courses.
The lectures have been very good, the concepts were presented in a way which made them easy to understand.
The lectures
The overall structure ans the lectures.
Very good structure and clear explanations of a broad subject. Related concepts were linked together effectively.
Hard labs, but interesting and they worked well to learn about machine learning. Olle is a very good lecturer and I enjoyed all the lectures, I think I only missed one because of clashes.
I can gain more knowledge for machine learning . It is very good to use black board for explanation.
The labs, Olle's lectures, the project, Sabine's feedback!
Bra labbar
good workload, like the way the project was handled with people getting almost no restrictions on what they can do with it.
Great lecturer, machine learning project was fun + good guidance from the TA
The material is great and the way Olle explains it is great
Olle Gällmo and his crew
The broad approach and olles thoughts on each of the areas covered.
Olle is an excellent lecturer, that really bring the subject to life. The field of ML is really engaging with all the small stories about where all the algorithms come from and how they relate to how humans and nature works.

5: This could be improved in the course: (Make your suggestions as constructive as possible)

Answers: 33

Mindre fokus på skrivandet (rapporten) i projektet, det hade varit kul att göra något eget men det var svårt när nästan hela betyged bestämms av rapporten. Teo var den bästa mentorn för rapportskrivning jag någonsin haft, behåll honom!

I think the project could be more directed. At least I feel my project was a bit boring/not interesting for anyone involved. Which is my biggest regret with the course. Idk what to do about it though as it is probably more a student creativity issue? Haha. Otherwise I wish the labs where a little less of a black box (i.e. you just push buttons until you get it right?). Some instructions where unclear, and maybe they should try to better use the same terminology that Olle uses on lectures. Also, some of the TA's seemed to be out to get you rather than interested in you understanding? Not only on the grading of the labs, but also during the labs, I got the feeling they didn't really want to be there. Or well it was different between the TA's. Sabine was very helpful, she admitted when she wasn't sure of something, and took the time to figure things out together! While some of the male TA's told you you were doing it wrong without offering any more guidance. Also, sometimes it took about 4 emails to get a proper answer on the supplementation (only partial answers without any motivation to why why it was partial or any clues on where to access better understanding of things)

Generally the labs seemed to be marked in an overly fussy way. Stuff was sent back without a clear reason. In general parts of the labs were a bit boring/tedious (basically: run grid search manually) and some of the questions were clearly wanting a particular answer but were written as if they were open ended. Actually filling in what we observed seemed to result in a "no wrong -- that's not what I have here". It's a bit frustrating to have to go back and set the whole thing up again. For this style of labs I feel like it should be more important that all the experiments were actually tried rather than the particulars. Also, what's the point in being pedantic about the labs when they're done in the wrong way anyway? Nobody should set up a real experiment that way. I feel they were sent back because my lab partner wasn't very articulate. I could've just written and driven the whole thing and allowed him to watch, but then what would he have learnt? The dynamics introduced by having group work are toxic and highly unpleasant and demoralizing to deal with. More time is spent dealing with people than the subject matter. Sometimes people try and justify group work by saying it mirrors a professional environment. It only mirrors the worst possible professional environment. Professionally, there's plenty of choice for someone who knows what they're doing. Here? What is our choice? There should at least be some assistance so people can make informed choices about groups. It's annoying having to choose your own group. You are evaluated based on group project work and so you are evaluated upon your ability to choose a good group partner. Is this fair? Many people on the course cannot even program. How is this possible? Who has allowed this to happen? At least if there had been a group lottery there wouldn't constant feeling "this would be less painful if I'd grouped up better".

Lab could be assessed based on general idea of the answer instead of marking sentences and words

Adding deep learning in the course

I don't like the concept of using the black board - it made it hard to follow the orally given information and sometimes it was hard to read what's written. The course notes uploaded on Studentportalen were not useful for me - rather felt like a loose collection of keywords without any explanation. Explanations were just given orally. But since it was hard to follow this part, a lot of information simply got lost. Providing slides giving (brief) explanations would solve this in my opinion. Also, the course puts a lot of focus on neural networks and for every other machine learning technique, it is mentioned how the same thing could be achieved using neural networks - why?

I don't really like the concept of using the blackboard so much. I think it's a nice idea but sometimes it took just way too much time and sometimes this results in the lectures being quite boring. Moreover, the uploaded lecture notes were not helpful at all, and they should be at least uploaded before the lecture. Furthermore, the course should not focus that much on Neural Networks. The labs were not interesting, and using Matlab was really cumbersome. Especially the last lab took way too much time for the credit points. Overall I think this course should be revised. The project is supposed to be a 3 credit project, but the expected time to spend is way more.

Make the labs less about shooting in the dark for random parameter values and more about answering

questions showing understanding of the core concepts.

Bland de sämsta laborationer jag har haft på Uppsala Universitet. Laborationerna ger lite förståelse över hur man använder verktygen och hur parametrarna kan påverka resultatet men större delen av tiden man sitter med dem handlar om att bara köra tester, skriva ned vilka parametrar du använde, lägga in bilder, etc. Det är mer dött jobb än tänkande bakom laborationerna. Det som verkligen drog ned dem för mig dock var rättningen av laborationerna. Många fick komplettering för väldigt små detaljer trots att de förstod och hade tagit med sig innehållet av labben. Ibland kändes det som man fick "komplettering för kompletterings skull", att den bakomliggande orsaken var att man lärde sig mer om man kompletterade så varför inte komplettera. Det är sant, men den tiden hade kunnat läggas på andra moment i kursen som faktiskt hade lett till mer lärande. Kanske en eller två föreläsningar i Deep Neural Networks och ha med det i tentamen? Alla labbassistenter var inte dåliga, Sabine var fantastisk och kollade faktiskt upp saker som hon inte hade koll på för att hjälpa oss under labben. Gustaf kändes mer överdrivet sträng och rättade utav "mallen" istället för att försöka förstå om studenten hade förstått vad labben försökte förmedla. Min upplevelse är såklart personlig och kanske bara var dålig just detta år men laborationerna skulle kanske behöva kortare rapporter och fokusera mer på frågor där eleven kan visa att den förstått ämnet. Jag skulle även föredra om labbassistenterna gav ledtrådar eller förklarade vad man missat när man får komplettering. Även om de nästan ger ut svaret har man lärt sig av det.

Labbarna var ibland lite oklara, varierande nogrannhet vid rättningar

More work during the theory lectures to get a more solid grasp of things

The labs: Sometimes it was hard to understand what happen by only inserting some values. The project: It was hard to know what level the project should be at.

I didn't think the labs were very easy to follow and the workload for them was very varied.

Handledningen i projektet var bistfällig när det kommer till den tekniska biten. Svårt att förstå vad som eftersöktes på tentafrågorna ibland. Mycket poängavdrag på tentan som kändes oväntade. Det nämndes flertalet gånger att vi inte behövde kunna formler men sen kom det flera frågor på tentan som var formler. Att behöva delta två hela dagar för att lyssna på redovisningar, en dag hade räckt.

Mer konstruktiv feedback av handledare i projektet vore att föredra. Kanske ta upp mer om det "senaste" inom ML. Bra labbar men ibland lite väl mycket black box, nu var det mycket "tunea" parametrar. Kanske använda något annat språk än Matlab, t.ex. Python som ofta efterfrågas i industrin. Tentan kunde till viss del efterfråga lite väl specifik kunskap om ekvationer/formler. En del poängavdrag kändes lite väl hårda.

Maybe some more recent research result, some things felt a bit outdated. However, as I mentioned before, this was also very educational. Just add some more recent stuff, machine learning is hard to stay updated on but it is vital to try to do that for the students.

Perhaps, introduce more recent topics such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN), which a lot of students used for their projects

The material should be updated to cover more relevant and widely used ones (like CNN).

Have the lab helpers more available. Maybe have the possibility to set a meeting with them

not a lot

For the guest lecture on DL, it would have been interesting to see some actual technical content (algorithms etc.).

I did like the notes on the board and specially the drawings, however some writing parts were too much time consuming, I think, or hard to read because the room was too crowd.

Classes specific to more recent developments in the field.

The book has some deficiencies that were mentioned in the teacher's notes. Maybe some other reference literature could be better, or other types of reading material that can help the student.
I realize it is a budget/time issue, but doing the labs in groups of two and then having to find a third or split the group for the projects was a bit jarring. I would have preferred if we could use the same group for the labs and project. Some more programming focused labs would have been great, but that be unfit for the course depending on what kind of students take it.
It will be better, if you can give a little bit detail explanation for the formula because sometimes, it is different with the book as a student, I get confused
Some tutors could be provide some more feedback/be a little more responsive. But overall, a great course.
Alldeles för mycket med två heldagar att lyssna på presentationer. En halvdag hade räckt. Då hade man orkat lyssna och inte bara sitta där.
The last lab could be divided into two labs so we can have enough time to complete all the tasks more effectively. Also, maybe the exam format could be changed to multiple choice. It's difficult to remember everything in exam. if we write too less, we might forget to mention what's considered important point for the given question. If we write too much, there is a possibility, we might write something stupid and get a point deduction, so the point could be deducted again. maybe a cleverly created multiple choice question can be best for the course.
The lab could be more detail on what to be expected from us. The grading system could be better if student just graded based on how many things we got it right without reducing the grade if we got some wrong
Possibly the project having less focus on the rapport and more focus on assignment and presentation. Don't know how that would work but it is the only thing that I regarded as less fun then the rest of the course
Making clear that the last project should be considered a report mainly.
There should be more labs, and at least one lab that is for general help and not dedicated to a particular lab.

Summary of free-text responses/comments for the whole course evaluation