Jenifer Spencer: Freelance materials consultant email: jenifer.spencer1@btinternet.com

TASK A

Here are two emails from a lecturer[1] drawing up guidelines for an assignment on a Law master's course. Together with the Guidelines (In the separate file). How might you exploit these in your teaching situation?

Dear colleagues,

I have decided to "tweak" the formative exercise for the IP Law students ever so slightly. Rather than encouraging generality and regurgitation of textbooks, I would like the students to analyse the justifications to protect copyright works by law from the viewpoint of their respective home jurisdictions:

"The legal protection for copyright works does not require any formal justifications, as its merits are clear."

Critically analyse this statement from the viewpoint of your individual home jurisdiction.

Do you think this is clear enough? It would require each student to undertake a little bit of original and independent research in their respective national copyright legislation and its history.

Full exercise guidance sheet is attached.

With best wishes,

Thorsten.

Thorsten Lauterbach
Learning Enhancement Coordinator (ABS PG)
Aberdeen Business School
RGU Aberdeen

Second email:

Do you think this is sufficient, or should there be more on how all students will benefit from completing the exercise? One student asked me yesterday whether this feeds into the summative coursework, so that students do not waste any of their time on something that does not count...

In my book, non-participation will be noted, and feed into any reference requests students may make in the future...

With best wishes,

Thorsten.

[1] The permission of Thorsten Lauterbach to use these materials is gratefully acknowledged.

Jenifer Spencer: Freelance materials consultant email: jenifer.spencer1@btinternet.com

TASK B: A case study:

Here are extracts from a PhD student's emails[2] to his language tutor, after some feedback on part of his writing. On the next page are extracts from the Results, Discussion and Conclusions of a published PhD thesis, from the St Andrew's University on-line PhD repository. (Note: a part of the abstract is included, just to orient you to the topic of this Computer Science thesis). How might you use these materials in a classroom situation to clarify the issues raised in the case study emails?

Dear Jenifer.
I am wee bit wary about using tense in my thesis
For example what tense I should use in introduction
Literature review
Result discussion and
Conclusion
My supervisor prefers to use past tense in result deduction and conclusion of my thesis he said the study covers the period 1998-2009 and now we are in 2014 so we talk about past
However I notice you changed the tense in conclusion to present is that right?

Regards
……..

Thank you very much for your advice
Actually it is very complicated for non-English speakers to understand.
What I have heard is that three tenses are used in writing thesis
Present and future tenses in introduction
Present and past on literature review and
Past in findings, discussion and conclusion
But I think there are many different views in this case

So can I use what my supervisor believes?
Regards
……

Examples of the language tutor's corrections referred to by the student are:

Conclusions

… we found that the majority of [these] banks operated at either more or less than their optimal size. Our findings are in favour of the view that increased returns to scale ~~were~~ are displayed by small banks, while decreasing returns to scale ~~were~~ are displayed by large banks.

…[these] banks were negatively influenced by financial liberalisation, as the frontier of efficiency indicate~~d~~s that there was a significant decline in average efficiency during liberalisation (see **Error! Reference source not found.** and **Error! Reference source not found.**).

[2] Thanks to Adel Enpaya for permission to use these emails.

Jenifer Spencer: Freelance materials consultant email: jenifer.spencer1@btinternet.com
Authenticity: BALEAP PIM Leeds University 15 Feb 2014

TASK B : Text: IMPROVING THE EFFICIENCY OF LEARNING CSP SOLVERS

Neil C.A. Moore A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of St. Andrews

Abstract

… CSP solvers provide a powerful framework for search and reasoning. The aim of constraint learning is to increase global reasoning power by learning new constraints … and hopefully reduce search effort. In this thesis constraint learning is developed in several ways to make it faster and more powerful. First, lazy explanation generation is introduced, where explanations are generated as needed rather than continuously ... This technique is shown to be effective in reducing the number of explanations … and consequently reducing the amount of time taken...

From Body of thesis:

3.5.5.1. Experimental evaluation. Alldifferent is probably the most important of all the global constraints, on the basis that it occurs frequently and naturally in constraint models ... Furthermore, there has recently been considerable interest in adding an alldifferent theory to SMT solvers … For this reason I will now compare the three different variants of alldifferent explanation described above, namely: eager: … very lazy: …lazy: …

Methodology. Each of the 161 instances was solved by the g-learning version of minion …. Parameters to each run were identical, and the minimum time for each is used in the analysis... Each instance was run on its own core, each with 1GB of memory… The instances used are

- all the instances from [GMN08] that my solver is compatible with
- all the instances from [BM10] (the problem class is called \minion"), …

Discussion. These results presage those of 3.6. Figure 3.6(a) compares the performance of variants … where the alldiff constraint is respectively lazy and eager, but for all other constraints the lazy explainer is used. These results show that, other than instances that finish in a very short time … the lazy variant is always at least as good and up to 1.6 times better. The results … in Table 3.2 show that lazy wins on all problem classes handsomely…

3.6.2. Experimental methodology. The experimental methodology used is identical to the experiments … in 3.5.5.1, except that here an extended set of benchmarks have been used. …

3.6.3 Results

Now to evaluate the subject of this chapter: are lazy learning explanations effective in reducing the runtime of the …network? The answer is yes. Figure 3.8 is a plot … for instances where neither solver timed out. It shows a reduction in number of explanations generated in all cases, ... This proves that the rationale behind lazy learning is correct: many explanations are never used and hence should not be calculated. For example a point with y-axis 20 needed just 1=20th of the explanations…

3.7. Conclusions

I have introduced lazy explanations for constraint propagation, in which explanations are computed as needed, rather than stored eagerly. This approach conveys the twin advantages, confirmed experimentally, of …avoiding wasted effort for explanations that are never used.