Reference group meeting, May 26th 2021:

Present:

Sara Martino

 Aurora Hofman

 Julie Berg

Digital lectures:

* They have been good, and the hybrid between live and digital lectures have been solved smoothly.

Books/Curriculum:

* Some students find the books hard to read, but the lecture notes are good and mostly used.
* Each book uses a different/confusing notation, would be nice to get a notation overview so we can read the books in addition to Sara’s lecture notes
	+ For example in the book GL the posterior is denoted $π(θ)$ or $p(θ|x)$, but sometimes also the prior is denoted by $π(θ)$…
	+ The acceptance ratio also has different notations, like $α, A, R(u,v)$etc.

Projects:

* Part 2 was very difficult. We recommend giving a heads up to the students about time management for project 2, as it is more time consuming than the other projects. We feel like there was not enough time for part 2, and would have preferred a little less time for parts 1 & 3 in exchange for more time for part 2.
* Part 3 was very easy compared to part 2/project 2. Most students did very well.
* Detailed feedback on the projects can be given from Sara or Silius upon request.

Other comments:

* Office hours/Question hours before the exam is requested. We can also send Sara an email.
* The recap/summary lecture was appreciated, and well put together.
* More open problems on the projects have been requested, but this is a topic that has split opinions.

Exam:

* If there are unclear questions or you think there is a mistake somewhere, Sara’s mobile phone number is given on the exam page. Call and ask.
* We are recommended to state our own assumptions, for example “We assume these variables are independent” if we are unsure about the assumptions provided.
* There will not be any difficult programming like MCMC, but possibly code understanding, making plots and tables etc.