

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2016 **Course Owner CS**
Course: CS 6784 Lec 1 **CID: 16715**
Instructor: Weinberger
15 Responses, 28 Enrolled, 53.57% Response

Question	Mean	Count	1	2	3	4	5
1. How valuable were the assigned readings? 1=taught me little; 5=extremely educational	4.67	15	0	0	0	5	10
2. How valuable were the homework and/or computer assignments? 1=taught me little; 5=extremely educational	4.69	13	0	0	0	4	9
3. How valuable were the laboratories? 1=taught me little; 5=extremely educational	5.00	1	0	0	0	0	1
4. Rate the examinations in this course as a test of your knowledge. 1=too easy, not adequate; 3=adequate; 5=too difficult, not a fair test	3.83	6	0	0	3	1	2
5. Did the lecturer stimulate your interest in the subject? 1=not at all; 5=stimulated great interest, inspired independent effort	4.93	15	0	0	0	1	14
6. Was the lecture presentation organized and clear? 1=disorganized and unclear; 5=very organized and lucid	4.64	14	0	0	1	3	10
7. Was the lecturer willing and able to help you overcome difficulties? 1=was of no help; 5=was very helpful	4.87	15	0	0	0	2	13
8. Rate the overall teaching effectiveness of your lecturer compared to others at Cornell. 1=worse than average; 5=much better than average	4.71	14	0	0	0	4	10
9. Was the recitation organized and clear? 1=not at all; 5=very organized, lucid	4.50	2	0	0	0	1	1
10. Was the recitation instructor willing and available to help you overcome difficulties? 1=was of no help; 5=was very helpful	4.50	2	0	0	0	1	1
11. How would you rate the recitation instructor's command of the course material? 1=poor command of material; 5=excellent command of material	4.50	2	0	0	0	1	1
12. What was the overall quality of the recitations and your recitation instructor? 1=worse than average; 5=much better than average	4.50	2	0	0	0	1	1
13. Overall, how does course compare with other technical courses you've taken at Cornell? 1=poorly, not educational; 5=excellently, extremely educational	4.83	12	0	0	0	2	10
14. How many hours each week did you spend on this course outside of class/lab/recitation? 1=less than 2; 2=(2-4); 3=(5-8); 4=(9-15); 5=16 or more	3.33	15	0	1	8	6	0
15. How prepared were you for this course? 1=overprepared, it repeated material; 5=underprepared, course assumed unfamiliar knowledge	3.27	15	0	1	10	3	1
16. Was the code of academic integrity maintained in this course? 1=no, often violated; 5=yes, well maintained	4.93	14	0	0	0	1	13
17. Most important reason for taking this course? 1=field or major requires it; 2=prerequisite for further courses of interest; 3=interest in subject matter; 4=reputation of the course; 5=reputation of the instructor	--	15	1	0	10	1	3

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2016 Course Owner CS
Course: CS 6784 Lec 1 CID: 16715
Instructor: Weinberger
15 Responses, 28 Enrolled, 53.57% Response

1. Please comment on the strengths of any aspect of this course (e.g., the lecture, recitation, laboratory, computing, text, homeworks, examinations or course content).

885: - Extremely useful course which covers some of the latest research in machine learning through paper readings and presentations. This material is not covered in any other course at Cornell

- Most of the assigned papers were very interesting and stimulated a desire to learn more about the topic. Some papers dealt with issues like data privacy and algorithm trustworthiness which are relevant to our society at large
 - The paper review assignments made me pay attention to the paper readings without being too time-consuming
 - Student-led presentations were very professional but also easy to understand for the student audience
 - Instructor was very knowledgeable and gave excellent insights into the paper readings
 - Instructor is very friendly :)
-

907: The format stimulated lots of interesting discussion, and the professor was a great resource.

8331: The materials of the course are very updated and insightful. The course offers a impressive overview of the state-of-the-art deep learning techniques by paper presentations and discussion.

9632: The course practically brought me up to the cutting edge of current machine learning research and provided a good point from which to evaluate possible directions of my own future research. This would have been very hard to achieve without this course, so I would rate it as extremely valuable not only for the students, but for the department as well.

11356: Kilian is a phenomenal lecturer: engaging, knowledgeable, funny, and helpful. He really understands machine learning (its content, history, trends, and future) and has a brilliant knack for sharing his knowledge.

11529: Kilian is a very inspiring professor with a deep intuition for anything involving machine learning.

11675: The class is very unique, shapes your opinion about the field a lot, gives you a lot of good experience, very flexible in choice of work.

11878: This course was really great. I liked how it was run like a normal grad course, so the emphasis was on the final project and the individual paper presentations. Additionally, I really liked how we primarily saw papers that were presented in the recent NIPS conference which made the course very current with ML research.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2016 Course Owner CS
Course: CS 6784 Lec 1 CID: 16715
Instructor: Weinberger
15 Responses, 28 Enrolled, 53.57% Response

2. Please comment on the weaknesses of any aspect of this course (e.g., the lecture, recitation, laboratory, computing, text, homeworks, examinations or course content).

885: - Picking a good project topic was tough, and there was not much assistance.

8331: The course is not quite well-organized. It will be better if the papers are selected by instructor and the students just pick ones according to their interest.

11356: Paper reviews can occasionally get overwhelming. Could help to have slip days for them.

11675: Hard to tell how the class is going for you without any intermediate updates.

11878: If there was an individual problem set for Differential Privacy, that would have been nice so that we could work through some problems on our own before seeing it used in papers. If I hadn't been presenting a Differential Privacy paper myself, I probably would not have understood it very well.
