1. The Instructor displayed proficient command of the material.

10 (55.6%): Strongly Agree
7 (38.9%): Agree
1 (5.6%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

2. The Instructor was well-prepared for class.

12 (66.7%): Strongly Agree
5 (27.8%): Agree
1 (5.6%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

3. The Instructor's voice was clear and audible.

8 (44.4%): Strongly Agree
9 (50.0%): Agree
1 (5.6%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable
4. The Instructor was accessible to students outside of class (office hours, e-mail, etc.).

10 (62.5%): Strongly Agree
5 (31.3%): Agree
1 (6.3%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
2: [No Response]

5. The Instructor was approachable, courteous and showed interest and concern for students' learning and understanding.

9 (52.9%): Strongly Agree
7 (41.2%): Agree
1 (5.9%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable
1: [No Response]

6. The Instructor presented material in an intellectually stimulating way that gave students deeper insight into the material.

9 (52.9%): Strongly Agree
5 (29.4%): Agree
3 (17.6%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable
1: [No Response]

7. The Instructor promoted and encouraged questions and discussion.

11 (64.7%): Strongly Agree
6 (35.3%): Agree
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
1: [No Response]
8. The Instructor organized class activities in a way that promoted learning.

12 (70.6%): Strongly Agree
2 (11.8%): Agree
3 (17.6%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
1: [No Response]

9. The Instructor provided feedback (written/oral) in a way that promoted learning.

13 (76.5%): Strongly Agree
3 (17.6%): Agree
1 (5.9%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
1: [No Response]

10. The Instructor is actively helpful when students have difficulty with course material.

10 (58.8%): Strongly Agree
6 (35.3%): Agree
1 (5.9%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable
1: [No Response]

11. The Instructor interacted well with students and treated them with respect and courtesy.

13 (76.5%): Strongly Agree
4 (23.5%): Agree
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable
1: [No Response]

12. The Instructor was clear about course expectations.

12 (70.6%): Strongly Agree
4 (23.5%): Agree
1 (5.9%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
1: [No Response]
13. The Instructor was clear about standards for evaluation.

10 (58.8%): Strongly Agree
6 (35.3%): Agree
1 (5.9%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable
1: [No Response]

14. I would recommend this instructor overall.

11 (64.7%): Strongly Agree
5 (29.4%): Agree
1 (5.9%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
1: [No Response]

15. What is your overall rating of the Instructor?

13 (76.5%): Excellent
3 (17.6%): Above Average
1 (5.9%): Average
0 (0.0%): Below Average
0 (0.0%): Poor
1: [No Response]

16. General comments about the Instructor’s performance

Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community

- Awesome

- Dr. Foulds illustrated many topics related LVMs, teach me of foundation and methods for modeling and solving problems.

- Dr. Foulds is both proficient in the material and a very good teacher. He is extremely friendly both in and out of class. He uses innovative pedagogical methods to make the class interesting and useful.

- This course covers a little bit too much algorithms. Though these are really important concepts! Hope we can have more TAs to help students with discussion session.
17. The course material was intellectually stimulating.

8 (47.1%): Strongly Agree
8 (47.1%): Agree
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
1 (5.9%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable
1: [No Response]

18. The materials for the course (textbooks, handouts, etc.) were useful and well organized.

9 (52.9%): Strongly Agree
7 (41.2%): Agree
1 (5.9%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable
1: [No Response]

19. Grading was constructive and assisted learning.

9 (52.9%): Strongly Agree
8 (47.1%): Agree
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%): Disagree
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable
1: [No Response]

20. What is your reason for taking this class?

4 (23.5%): Core Course Requirement
2 (11.8%): Subject Area Requirement
2 (11.8%): Elective
9 (52.9%): Interest
1: [No Response]

21. What were the particular strengths of this course?

- Apart from what I learned for machine learning, this course gives me a totally different aspect to look into the black box. We can first assume the model structure, derive the joint probability or conditional probability, and then apply the optimization procedure to find out the best parameters for models. To sum up, I do learn a lot from this course and would be able to utilize these knowledge in my future life!

- Bayesian approach not seen in other classes.
• Gives a broad insight into Bayesian Machine Learning - Only Graduate Course at UCSD that discusses Bayesian ML at length.

• Good homework design.

• It covers topics that are never taught in any other classes.

• POLL

• Research oriented

• The course covered a lot of topics, which is good for research students. They might find a topic that is well suited for their ongoing research, and then study that topic further.

22. What suggestions do you have for making this course more effective?

• Algorithm in details

• Have more discussion session. Slow down a little bit, there are too much to learn.

• I sincerely feel that too much material is covered in a class. Can it be please reduced by a little? It would be great if the course is podcasted.

• Maybe more coding homeworks will make it more effective.

• Maybe we can use other books such as PRML instead of Murphy's as the course material? Murphy's book sometimes doesn't explain things clearly. And there're some typos, which make reading harder.

• The idea of flipped classroom is good, but in practice it might not be as effective as the traditional way of teaching, especially since we sometimes couldn't finish the required readings (based on our performance on simple reading quizzes). Personally I felt like if I didn't finish the required reading I'd get completely lost in the class. I hope the classroom is less flipped, though I admit it's purely my bad not finishing the reading. The time for poll can be shortened, especially for simple reading quizzes. Thinking for a long time doesn't help as long as we didn't do the reading. It might be better if we spend more time explaining the "right" solutions for think-pair-share questions, and have the solutions on the slides. Having all homework assignments counting equally rather than dropping the lowest score might encourage us treating every part of the course materials equally carefully.

23. I would recommend this course overall.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 (64.7%)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (29.4%)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (5.9%)</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: [No Response]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. What is your overall rating of this course?

12 (70.6%): Excellent
4 (23.5%): Above Average
1 (5.9%): Average
0 (0.0%): Below Average
0 (0.0%): Poor
1: [No Response]

25. What are the most important concepts that you learned in this class that you expect will be useful in the long term?

- Bayesian methods, Box's model
- Bayesian view and latent variable model
- Different bayesian techniques and in general how to approach any real life data science problem.
- Gibbs sampling, mean field algorithm, etc.
- Latent variable models
- MCMC methods. Social Network Models.
- MCMC, Variational Inference, Graph Model

26. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Please consider adding slides before class for the next iteration of this class. It is easier to follow with the slides open on our computers (allows us to go back if we missed something)

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.