Course and Instructor Evaluation Summary
Department of Computer Science and Engineering

McAuley, Julian John
CSE 190 - Topics/Computer Sci & Engineer (A)
Fall Quarter 2015

Number of Students Enrolled: 84
Number of Evaluations Submitted: 31

1. Your class level is

0 (0.0%):	freshman
0 (0.0%):	sophomore
5 (18.5%):	junior
19 (70.4%):	senior
3 (11.1%):	graduate
0 (0.0%):	extension
4:	[No Response]

2. Your reason for taking this class is

6 (24.0%):	major
0 (0.0%):	minor
0 (0.0%):	gen. ed.
12 (48.0%):	elective
7 (28.0%):	interest
6:	[No Response]

3. What grade do you expect in this class?

15 (57.7%):	A
9 (34.6%):	B
1 (3.8%):	C
1 (3.8%):	D
0 (0.0%):	F
0 (0.0%):	P
0 (0.0%):	NP
5:	[No Response]

INSTRUCTOR Julian McAuley

4. Instructor displays a proficient command of the material.

18 (66.7%): strongly agree
9 (33.3%): agree
0 (0.0%): neither agree nor disagree
0 (0.0%): disagree
0 (0.0%): strongly disagree
0 (0.0%): not applicable
4: [No Response]

5. Instructor is well prepared for classes.

17 (63.0%): strongly agree
6 (22.2%): agree
3 (11.1%): neither agree nor disagree
1 (3.7%): disagree
0 (0.0%): strongly disagree
0 (0.0%): not applicable
4: [No Response]

6. Instructor's speech is clear and audible.

17 (63.0%): strongly agree
7 (25.9%): agree
0 (0.0%): neither agree nor disagree
2 (7.4%): disagree
1 (3.7%): strongly disagree
0 (0.0%): not applicable
4: [No Response]

7. Instructor explains the course material well.

16 (59.3%): strongly agree
6 (22.2%): agree
2 (7.4%): neither agree nor disagree
2 (7.4%): disagree
1 (3.7%): strongly disagree
0 (0.0%): not applicable
4: [No Response]

8. Lectures hold your attention.

12 (46.2%): strongly agree
7 (26.9%): agree
1 (3.8%): neither agree nor disagree
2 (7.7%): disagree
4 (15.4%): strongly disagree
0 (0.0%): not applicable
5: [No Response]

9. Instructor's lecture style facilitates note-taking.

12 (44.4%):	strongly agree
7 (25.9%):	agree
4 (14.8%):	neither agree nor disagree
1 (3.7%):	disagree
3 (11.1%):	strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):	not applicable
4:	[No Response]

10. Instructor shows concern for students' learning.

17 (65.4%):	strongly agree
7 (26.9%):	agree
0 (0.0%):	neither agree nor disagree
1 (3.8%):	disagree
1 (3.8%):	strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):	not applicable
5:	[No Response]

11. Instructor promotes appropriate questions/discussion.

15 (55.6%):	strongly agree
7 (25.9%):	agree
2 (7.4%):	neither agree nor disagree
2 (7.4%):	disagree
1 (3.7%):	strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):	not applicable
4:	[No Response]

12. Instructor is accessible outside of class.

18 (66.7%):	strongly agree
7 (25.9%):	agree
2 (7.4%):	neither agree nor disagree
0 (0.0%):	disagree
0 (0.0%):	strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):	not applicable
4:	[No Response]

13. Instructor starts and finishes class on time.

18 (66.7%):	strongly agree
9 (33.3%):	agree
0 (0.0%):	neither agree nor disagree
0 (0.0%):	disagree
0 (0.0%):	strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):	not applicable
4:	[No Response]

14. Instructor is effective in promoting academic integrity.

18 (66.7%):   strongly agree
6 (22.2%):   agree
2 (7.4%):   neither agree nor disagree
1 (3.7%):   disagree
0 (0.0%):   strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):   not applicable
4:      [No Response]

COURSE MATERIAL CSE 190

15. The course material is intellectually stimulating.

17 (63.0%):   strongly agree
8 (29.6%):   agree
1 (3.7%):   neither agree nor disagree
1 (3.7%):   disagree
0 (0.0%):   strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):   not applicable
4:      [No Response]

16. Assignments promote learning.

16 (59.3%):   strongly agree
10 (37.0%):   agree
1 (3.7%):   neither agree nor disagree
0 (0.0%):   disagree
0 (0.0%):   strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):   not applicable
4:      [No Response]

17. Required reading is useful.

11 (40.7%):   strongly agree
8 (29.6%):   agree
3 (11.1%):   neither agree nor disagree
1 (3.7%):   disagree
1 (3.7%):   strongly disagree
3 (11.1%):   not applicable
4:      [No Response]

18. This course is difficult relative to others.

12 (44.4%):   strongly agree
11 (40.7%):   agree
4 (14.8%):   neither agree nor disagree
0 (0.0%):   disagree
0 (0.0%):   strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):   not applicable
4:      [No Response]

19. Exams are representative of the course material.

12 (44.4%):   strongly agree
12 (44.4%):   agree
1 (3.7%):   neither agree nor disagree
2 (7.4%):   disagree
0 (0.0%):   strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):   not applicable
4:     [No Response]

GENERAL QUESTIONS

20. I learned a great deal from this course.

11 (44.0%):   strongly agree
9 (36.0%):   agree
2 (8.0%):   neither agree nor disagree
2 (8.0%):   disagree
1 (4.0%):   strongly disagree
0 (0.0%):   not applicable
6:     [No Response]

21. How many hours a week do you spend studying outside of class on average?

0 (0.0%):   0-1
1 (3.8%):   2-3
4 (15.4%):   4-5
3 (11.5%):   6-7
9 (34.6%):   8-9
6 (23.1%):   10-11
2 (7.7%):   12-13
1 (3.8%):   14-15
0 (0.0%):   16-17
0 (0.0%):   18-19
0 (0.0%):   20 or more
5:     [No Response]

22. How often do you attend this course?

3 (11.1%):   Very Rarely
12 (44.4%):   Some of the Time
12 (44.4%):   Most of the Time
4:     [No Response]

23. Do you recommend this course overall?

24 (85.7%):   Yes
4 (14.3%):   No
3:     [No Response]

24. Do you recommend this professor overall?

26 (92.9%):   Yes
2 (7.1%):   No
3:     [No Response]

PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

25. Instructor Julian McAuley:

- Cool dude

- I didn't think the lectures helped prepare us for the assignments although the professor had a great grasp of the material

- Less than half the class attends the lecture, out of the 120 people in the class, I counted about 20-30 attending, and of those attending 2-3 were actually paying attention. The reason for this is because his lectures seem to be formatted for graduate students or students with prior machine learning experience. He brushes over equations and topics without noticing if anyone got it. It also seems like he is in his own head the whole lecture. When he is switching from the powerpoint to code and starts trying to put "theory into practice" I have no clue what his code is doing (or what the variable names mean or are) and he just starts typing away even though no one understands. Sometimes he did ask (once in 1.5 hour lecture) if anyone got it. And there wasn't a peep from anyone in the class (that's not because everyone got it! Its because no one got any of it).

- Super chill guy! Throws a couple jokes in and I like that. The way he teaches is very accessible with no prior knowledge. That's a huge plus for undergraduates.

- Very down to earth and willing to provide help. Awesome professor and cool guy.

- Awesome professor. You can really tell that he cares about his students and is very passionate about his field. Very accessible outside of class, great humor, and a quirky personality. The best part about his teaching style is that he focuses on real-world implementation but still gives you an idea of the mathematics and theory behind it. This promotes MUCH more retention of material than if it were a purely theoretical class... because as you do assignments, you refer back to lecture slides and the theory, and have "aha" moments.

  That being said, constructive feedback: some more vocal variation (tone and volume) and use of pauses during presentation would make for a more engaging lecture. Also stopping briefly and giving metaphors, real world applications, and analogies for difficult theory would be good too, as sometimes it was too hard to follow all the math on the slides 100%.

- Great instructor. Lectures are well planned and are very clear. Makes material approachable to people without prior data mining experience. Complements lectures with interesting case studies to show applicability of material.

- Great professor. Very knowledgable.

- He is a genuine professor who is a beast at machine learning. He is very smart and takes command of the material.

26. Course CSE 190:

- Good overview over a wide breadth of topics in data mining. Geared toward people with no prior data mining experience. Fair homework, and fair assignments.

- One of the most useful and interesting classes I've ever taken at UCSD.

- This class could be interesting if it was setup better.

- Very fun introductory course.

- Very interesting material

- Data mining is interesting, but dry at the same time.

- It has potential

- More challenging than I expected, but very fun.

- Very cool/relevant material

27. Exams/Quizzes/Papers:

- Felt like the exam was fair and the projects were very manageable.

- I liked the homeworks, I just wish lectures helped us understand more about what to do to get optimal results - not for the grade, I just feel like the course was great and the assignments were interesting but I had no idea how to do better.

- In terms of grading, the HW's are unfair since there is no answer key, rather the median score from the students is taken as the correct one. He said that he wanted to make the HW's open-ended, however this leads to confusion on how to answer the homework questions (our grade is not based on what we think, its based on what the median of the class thinks, so its not as open-ended as he thinks it is, instead its confusing).

  The exam questions and grading was fair. However I (and others) felt like we were not given enough time to complete it.

  I don't really like the fact that half of our grade for the first assignment is based off of how our model in terms of the rest of the class. If this must be a component of the grade, I think that it should be less of a factor in the grade. I think that what you tried (machine learning methods from class) should be what counts, rather than choosing some simple model that happens to conform to some trend in the data.

- The labs are what representative of what is expected in the field for this type of work.

- Too hard!!!

- Fair

- Fair, though in the Kaggle competition for assignment 1 you're competing in ranking against graduate students which is quite difficult. But the ranking on the kaggle leaderboard didn't count for too much.

- Midterm is fair. Nothing too surprising, but some of the questions were challenging.

- Straightforward but challenging. Homework assignments are sometimes ambiguous but professor is always available to clarify any confusions.

- Tough midterm, but relevant.

28. Reading [title(s) and comments]:

- Meh

- Useful.

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Computer Science and Engineering, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.