

DS 457 (A1): Law for Algorithms, DS 657 (A1): Law for Algorithms

Spring 2023 | Gabriel Kaptchuk

10 | Students Enrolled
6 | Students Responded
60% | Response Rate

Quantitative

Please answer the following questions:	1 - Poor	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Very Good	5 - Excellent	N	DNA	SD	M
Relevance of assigned readings	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	33.33% (2)	66.67% (4)	6	0	0.47	4.67
Difficulty of course	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (3)	50% (3)	6	0	0.5	4.5
Workload in course	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	50% (3)	33.33% (2)	6	0	0.69	4.17
Overall rating of discussion instructor (if applicable)	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	0% (0)	83.33% (5)	6	0	0.75	4.67
Overall rating of lecture instructor (if applicable)	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	16.67% (1)	66.67% (4)	6	0	0.76	4.5
Usefulness of assignments and papers	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	33.33% (2)	50% (3)	6	0	0.75	4.33
Overall course rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	33.33% (2)	66.67% (4)	6	0	0.47	4.67
Please answer the following questions:	1 - Poor	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Very Good	5 - Excellent	N	DNA	SD	M
Effectiveness in explaining concepts	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (3)	50% (3)	6	0	0.5	4.5
Ability to sustain interest in subject	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	16.67% (1)	66.67% (4)	6	0	0.76	4.5
Encouragement of class participation	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (3)	50% (3)	6	0	0.5	4.5
Fairness in evaluating student work	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	33.33% (2)	66.67% (4)	6	0	0.47	4.67
Promptness in returning assignments	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	16.67% (1)	16.67% (1)	50% (3)	6	0	1.15	4
Quality of feedback to students	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	83.33% (5)	6	0	0.37	4.83
Availability outside of class	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	16.67% (1)	66.67% (4)	6	0	0.76	4.5
Overall rating of instructor	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	83.33% (5)	6	0	0.37	4.83
Please answer the following questions:	1 - Poor	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Very Good	5 - Excellent	N	DNA	SD	M
Ability to increase student interest in subjects	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	33.33% (2)	50% (3)	6	0	0.75	4.33
Preparation and organization	0% (0)	0% (0)	33.33% (2)	16.67% (1)	50% (3)	6	0	0.9	4.17
Presentation of course topics	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	33.33% (2)	50% (3)	6	0	0.75	4.33
Ability to increase student understanding of challenging topics	0% (0)	0% (0)	33.33% (2)	33.33% (2)	33.33% (2)	6	0	0.82	4
Gave useful, detailed criticism of student work	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	16.67% (1)	66.67% (4)	6	0	0.76	4.5
Fairness in evaluating student work	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	16.67% (1)	66.67% (4)	6	0	0.76	4.5
Overall rating of TF	0% (0)	0% (0)	16.67% (1)	33.33% (2)	50% (3)	6	0	0.75	4.33

Qualitative

<p>About the course: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great stuff! I've gotten a lot out of this course. The ideas and readings will be very useful for doing any kind of thinking about the proper use and legal implications of algorithmic tools. I feel like there are a few times where our reading could have been targeted a little bit better and we could have gotten more with less reading time. However... preparing that level of high-curated readings does take even more work from you, and the readings list you did give were already quite targeted and curated, also, I wish some of the lectures were less of a re-statement of material we had already read at a less-in-depth level than we had read, and instead added something more. An obvious method for doing this would be more break-out groups answering prompting questions. But, often times the break out discussions also weren't as useful or productive because it was hard to get into any meaningful discussion with such large and complex and contextually sensitive questions in such short times. This also has to do with the quality of the curation of the readings. The more applicable and complete our understanding from the readings is the better we can come up with ideas in these break out groups. The readings plus the projects are where most of the learning happened, and the largest benefit of lectures was as a way to keep me emotionally engaged and motivated to do the readings and get to know the professors. The projects were good. I feel like there's something that could improve some of the projects... can't exactly put my finger on it... But I think this also has to do with the curation of the readings. What level and usefulness/specificity of knowledge we gain from the readings determines how meaningful of responses we can give to the projects. I remember in particular the differential privacy one I just didn't know what to say about whether the methods used would have given enough anonymity or not... perhaps this is because the state of the art doesn't know this question yet either? There are only so many topics that can be discussed in the time frame, and I liked the ones we did, but I can think of many others, like - what about questions of copyright and data ownership of training data for big generative ai things, and who own the creations or consequences of such data... probably a very emerging topic, but seems like one that will get bigger and bigger... and algos and platforms that mediate our digital speech (misinfo, freedom of speech) - what is reasonable with data use Terms of Service, can a company really get any right they want just by sticking some small clause in the middle of some intractable flood of legal-jargon text? Great course, I learned so much and gained a new perspective of the field. Fabulous course. I gained a cool interdisciplinary understanding of law and technology.
<p>About the instructor: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The instructors were all fabulous. They shared the work well, teaching on different relevant subjects to each of them. Instructors were all fantastic. They care a lot about the subject and the students.