MSc

DD2442 Proof Complexity Course Poll December 7

*Please **circle** your answers.*

1. How often have you **read new material in notes (or papers) to prepare for an upcoming lecture?** 5 = almost every lecture; 4 = roughly every 2nd lecture; 3 = roughly every 4th lecture; 2 = maybe for a couple of lectures all in all; 1 = pretty much never.

1 || 2 | 3 || 4 | 5 |

2. How often have you **gone over the notes to repeat the material covered in a lecture before the next lecture?** 5 = almost every lecture; 4 = roughly every 2nd lecture; 3 = roughly every 4th lecture; 2 = maybe for a couple of lectures all in all; 1 = pretty much never.

1 | 2 || 3 ||| 4 | 5

3. **How do you like these in-lecture opinion polls?** 5 = seem really useful; 4 = seem fairly useful; 3 = neutral as to the value; 2 = seem not very useful; 1 = seem not useful at all.

1 2 || 3 || 4 ||| 5

4. Looking back at this course, what are some **good aspects that you think should stay the same for the next course offering?** (Note that the next seminar course will be about some other topic, though, so try to focus on aspects not specific to proof complexity.) Please continue on the back if needed.

SEE NEXT PAGE(S)

5. Looking back at this course, what are some **less good aspects that you would like to see changed regarding how this course is organized?** (Like less polls, perhaps? ;-)) How would you suggest to change things? (Again, please try to focus on non-proof-complexity-specific aspects.) Please continue on the back if needed.

SEE NEXT PAGE(S)

6. I am a

(Master's or Bachelor's student) PhD student or PhD

MSc comments

Dec 7 T

(4.) Good aspects that should stay the same

I'm satisfied by the problem sets and the scribing tasks

Scribing was useful to force myself to better understand the subject.

Doing simpler versions of results first. It seems that a lot of work happens behind the scenes to clean up and simplify research papers. Thanks! Scribing helped me understand the lectures I wrote or reviewed. Recapping briefly what happened last time. 5-10 minutes of this is plenty

SEE NEXT PAGE

(5.) Less good aspects that you would like to see changed

I'm sure that the idea behind peer-review and Piazza discussions accompanying that is good and I believe it could be great. But somehow in practice it's not that useful.

Polls don't hurt. Problem sets could be smaller but more of them. With shorter deadlines, too.

Use attempted proofs as motivation. When giving a complicated definition with lots of parameters, giving a long exposition on how the intuition will go is just confusing. Save this time to spend reflecting on a proof

SEE NEXT PAGE FOR CONTINUATION

Dec 7 II

(4) Good aspects

Overall, I think the combination of scribing and problem sets with peer-reviewing was an excellent way of studying the material, and also learning to communicate math.

Genuinely hard, real math

Interaction with students, listening to our feedback during the course. Reviewing solutions for bonus points

(5) Aspects to change

... In that vein, perhaps some parameters can be left out the first time through (Actually, you did this sometimes, like with the k-Hamming weight monotone circuit.) Don't redefine things so much. I think we saw Resolution, Frege, PHP, and strong implication defined several times each.

Piazza discussions have great potential, I think, but maybe we need to encourage strong students to also participate in the discussion of the easier problems?

Be more strict about staying on time regarding lectures :)
Maybe lower the difficulty of problem sets a little.