

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2023 **Course Owner: ORIE**
Course: ENGR1 1101 Lec 1 **CID: 7207**
Instructor: Schalekamp
30 Responses, 60 Enrolled, 50.00% Response

Question	Mean	Count	1	2	3	4	5
11. [Course Content] Preparation: How well prepared were you to learn the material in this course? 1. Very under prepared, more pre-requisites needed 2. Under prepared 3. Adequately prepared 4. Over prepared in some areas 5. Over prepared, material largely duplicates pre-requisites	3.13	30	0	3	22	3	2
12. [Course Content] Content Organization: Did the course structure and organization facilitate your learning? 1. Very disorganized, significantly hindered my learning 2. Somewhat disorganized 3. Adequately organized 4. Well organized 5. Very well organized and structured, significantly enhanced my learning	4.23	30	0	0	4	15	11
13. [Course Content] Synthesize & Apply Content: This course challenged me to synthesize ideas, think critically about the content, and apply the material to unfamiliar topics and problems. 1. Not at all 2. Occasionally 3. Every few classes 4. Many classes and assignments 5. Nearly every class and assignment	4.53	30	0	1	2	7	20
14. [Course Content] Examples & Applications: Were the number and variety of examples and practical applications presented appropriate to the course content and for your learning style? 1. No, almost no examples 2. A few, but insufficient number and/or mostly trivial 3. Some, but more or higher quality would have been helpful 4. Yes, including some very good ones 5. Excellent use of examples and applications that significantly increased my understanding of the material	4.37	30	0	0	4	11	15
21. [Course Delivery] Lectures: As a whole, were lectures clear, well-structured, free of significant or frequent errors, and did they appropriately cover the course content? 1. No, usually poorly done 2. Sometimes 3. Usually adequate 4. Usually good 5. Nearly always very good	4.72	29	0	0	1	6	22
22. [Course Delivery] Context: Did the lecturer motivate the course content and place it in the context of your major or your overall engineering education (beyond fulfilling a degree requirement)? 1. No 2. Somewhat 3. Adequately 4. Mostly 5. Absolutely	4.55	29	0	2	2	3	22

23. [Course Delivery] Engagement: Did the lecturer present material in an engaging way, which improved your understanding of the course content? 1. No, generally boring 2. Rarely engaging 3. Generally held my attention 4. Engaging 5. Very engaging and often required actively thinking about material	4.45	29	0	1	1	11	16
31. [Recitation or Discussion Section] Was the section effective in increasing your understanding of, and ability to use, the course material? 1. No, usually poorly done 2. Sometimes 3. Usually adequate 4. Usually good 5. Nearly always very good	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
41. [Laboratory Section] Lab Activities: How valuable were laboratory activities in enhancing your learning in this course (e.g., taught specific skills, provided experience with real equipment and data, provided hands-on experience, increased my understanding of the material)? 1. Minimal value 2. Occasional value 3. Moderate value 4. Significant value 5. Very valuable, well worth time spent on them	3.52	29	2	2	11	7	7
42. [Laboratory Section] Lab expectations: Were lab expectations (goals, tasks, reports, deadlines, etc.) clear and realistic? 1. Not at all 2. Partially 3. Adequately 4. Usually clear and realistic 5. Almost always very clear and realistic	3.93	29	3	0	4	11	11
43. [Laboratory Section] Lab resources: Were lab resources (equipment, software, information, instructions, etc.) sufficient to provide a positive experience? 1. Rarely sufficient, severely detracted from the experience 2. Sometimes sufficient 3. Usually sufficient 4. Almost always sufficient 5. Excellent resources that enhanced the laboratory experience	3.93	29	1	3	3	12	10
44. [Laboratory Section] Lab Staffing: Support and help, during lab and for lab reports, were sufficient to successfully complete and analyze experiments. 1. Rarely sufficient 2. Partially sufficient 3. Adequate 4. Almost always sufficient 5. Excellent, significantly enhanced the laboratory experience	4.03	29	1	2	4	10	12
51. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Workload: How many hours per week, on average, did you spend doing work associated with this course outside of scheduled class time? 1. <3 hours 2. 3-6 3. 7-10 4. 11-15 5. >15 hours	2.14	29	4	20	3	1	1

<p>52. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Workload Value: The time spent on various assignments (homework, lab reports, coding, projects) was reasonable for the amount it improved my understanding of the course content.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Little value relative to the time required 2. Some value 3. Reasonable value for the time spent 4. Good value for time spent 5. Excellent value to time ratio 	4.07	29	0	0	9	9	11
<p>53. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Resources: How valuable were outside of class-time resources (e.g., readings, videos, online content, course notes) in building your understanding?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimal value 2. Occasional value 3. Moderate value 4. Significant value 5. Very valuable, well worth the time spent on them 	3.86	29	0	1	11	8	9
<p>54. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Value of Assignments: Independent of the time required, overall, did assignments (e.g., homework, labs, programming assignments, projects, papers, presentations) improve your understanding of, and ability to use, the course concepts and content?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimally 2. Sometimes 3. Usually 4. Almost always 5. Reliably and significantly increased my understanding and ability 	4.34	29	0	0	5	9	15
<p>55. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Exams & Grading: Were exams and grading a fair and reasonable measure of your learning? (Exams: clear, well written, range of content and difficulty. Grading: fair, prompt.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No 2. Significant issues exist 3. Generally fair assessment of my learning 4. Well developed and fair 5. Yes, definitely 	4.31	29	0	0	4	12	13
<p>61. [Course Environment] Diversity & Inclusion: To what extent have the professors and teaching staff fostered an inclusive environment such that the class is welcoming to all, everyone is encouraged to participate, none are made to feel different, and all are treated fairly?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extremely non-inclusive with inappropriate comments and/or behaviors 2. Actively not inclusive with certain students ignored, left out, or treated dismissively 3. Passively not inclusive; comments or contributions by some students are valued less than those of other students 4. Passively inclusive where everyone is welcome to participate. Nothing specific to encourage or discourage anyone. 5. Actively inclusive, all are fully encouraged to participate and are supported 	4.59	29	0	0	1	10	18
<p>62. [Course Environment] Access to Assistance: Was there sufficient access to assistance (through office hours, online forums, in-class or section questions and/or activities, special accommodations met, etc.)?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Almost no access and/or help was ineffective 2. Limited access or value 3. Acceptable access and help 4. Good access with quality help 5. Abundantly available high quality help 	4.29	28	0	1	2	13	12

<p>63. [Course Environment] Academic Integrity: Was the code of academic integrity maintained in the class (e.g. with respect to cheating, copying, plagiarism, use of unauthorized sources, etc.)?</p> <p>1. Blatant disregard for Academic Integrity 2. No. Violations clearly occurred that were not addressed. 3. Not strongly. Violations could well have occurred (even if I am not aware of any). 4. Yes. Instructor took reasonable steps to maintain academic integrity. 5. Yes. Academic integrity was clearly and intentionally maintained.</p>	4.72	29	0	0	1	6	22
<p>91. [Comparison to Other Courses] Instructor: Rate the overall teaching effectiveness of your lecturer compared to others at Cornell. 1 = Worse than average 5 = Much better than average</p>	4.79	29	0	0	1	4	24
<p>92. [Comparison to Other Courses] Course: Overall, how does this course compare with other comparable (technical or non-technical, as appropriate) courses you've taken at Cornell? 1 = Poorly, not educational 5 = Excellently, extremely educational</p>	4.55	29	0	1	1	8	19

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2023 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 7207
Instructor: Schalekamp
30 Responses, 60 Enrolled, 50.00% Response

Comments On Course Content

3468: The organization of the course content and pacing were perfect for me. The course pack was very well written and extremely helpful for doing the homework, labs, and preparing for prelims.

5556: Interesting stuff! Prof. Schalekamp often challenged us to apply know concepts to new situations — this was often difficult, and also interesting!

5862: The course content was incredibly interesting and will be useful for future classes, which I find important.

6058: Wonderful

7399: I loved the content and presentation of the course as everything was very well explained and the application of the concepts was very clear.

7872: Course Content was well organized and Frans was well prepared for each lecture.

11510: Course content wasn't difficult, but that was largely due to the fact that I was taking CS 4820 alongside this one, which has a lot of overlap.

Comments on Course Delivery

3468: Lectures are well organize and cover all the content in the course pack and what's tested on prelims. The professor is funny and laid back, enhancing the overall learning experience. He can go a little fast at times, so there's not always time to process what is just said or write the notes down.

5556: Very good lecturer! Always asks for questions as he talks and he is very good at responding to such questions. He sometimes adapts lectures in response to questions. Throws jokes on occasion and in general keeps delivery interesting/engaging!

5862: Lectures were clear and well-delivered, and gave good examples and explanations.

6058: Great Professor!

6480: Very fun and engaging- love Fran's outfits!

7399: He is a great lecturer and really brought the subject to life.

7872: The course content was delivered in a mundane lecture format where it was easy to just copy down what he was writing and not understand.

11510: He teaches the content well, but his notes can be disorganized and difficult to read.

Comments on laboratory component

3468: The labs became significantly more challenging towards the end of the course. I wish the labs on harder topics could review the basics first, before applying them to more challenging scenarios. TAs were readily available and were consistently able to answer my questions.

5556: Laboratory component was good for reviewing content and understanding how to implement basics of concepts.

5862: I noticed that it was certainly helpful to have some background in python for some labs, but regardless they were straightforward.

7399: The labs were helpful in visualizing what we had been learning.

7872: Lab TAs did not engage with the students and except for direct questions. The labs were sometimes hard to understand and unengaging.

9539: The TAs were pretty helpful when I had problems with the code

11510: Labs were very helpful to my understanding of the course content—TAs were very knowledgeable and helpful.

Comments on workload, resources, assignments, and assessments

3468: Course pack was 100% worth my time reading it. The workload, especially the homework, was a bit hard to manage at the beginning, but the homework workload became much more reasonable as the semester progressed. The homework was very similar to the difficulty of the prelims and really helped me reinforce my understanding of concepts. The grading on explanations on the prelims were a bit picky and harsh, but other than that, the assessments are fair.

5556: Homework problems generally include a question that requires us to apply concepts taught in lecture to new situations. Homework could be challenging; however, Prof. Schalekamp held very helpful office hours and was generally very available to students — this alleviated difficulty. Homework substantially enhanced understanding of concepts and introduced interesting new general problem solving skills.

Assessments were always fair and general good gauge of understanding of basic concepts and some applications of concepts.

6480: The course pack is a great resource.

7399: The workload was manageable and the grading system was very fair as it really encouraged learning.

9539: The CoursePack was very helpful, and the workload was fair.

11510: Homeworks were fair for the most part, but sometimes points would be taken off for very simple mistakes. They did help my understanding, it's just that the grading for homeworks was a little harsh, especially for a 1000 level course. Exam grading and expectations were very good.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2023 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 7207
Instructor: Schalekamp
30 Responses, 60 Enrolled, 50.00% Response

Comments on Environment-Diversity

5556: N/A

Comments on Environment-Assistance

3468: The professor and TA offer a lot of office hours at different times that work well with my schedule. I consistently receive high quality help on difficult homework problems and course content usually made more sense after going to office hours.

5556: Prof. Schalekamp held very helpful office hours and was generally very available to students. He is very good at answering questions helpfully.

5862: Ed discussion and office hours were very helpful.

7399: Ed discussion was a good place to ask for help and answers were given very fast.

7872: Office hours were great!

11510: All the office hours were at the beginning of the week but the assignments were due at the end of the week. I would have been way more helpful to have the office hours closer to the due date.

12888: It would have been nice to have office hours on the day the homework was due because sometimes I had some final questions I needed help with.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2023 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 7207
Instructor: Schalekamp
30 Responses, 60 Enrolled, 50.00% Response

Comments on Environment-Academic Integrity

5556: N/A

Comments on TA

494: Noah Schiff; he is very patient and clear when answering my questions during lab, and is willing to walk the class through every step of a procedure/algorithm to strengthen our understanding of the content.

2536: Owen Ralbovsky, who was a TA for ENGRI 1101 this fall, had to have been my favorite TA this semester. He was always chill, and always tried to explain concepts in a way where we would slowly build towards a solution, instead of diving headfirst into a topic without knowing anything. He also talked a lot outside of the given class, which was comforting and insightful to me as an underclassman.

5437: I would like to nominate TA Owen. He was my TA and extremely helpful during lab and preparing review content for the final. He knows his stuff.

5556: N/A

6480: Amin- very helpful and knowledgable.

7399: Owen Ralbovsky because he was very helpful in answering questions and explaining concepts during lab and review sessions.

7964: n/a

9539: Lily Young because she is very nice and helpful.

Comments on Strengths

423: Professor Schalekamp is amazing! Very patient while explaining concepts and also super knowledgeable and able to answer all kinds of questions we have

494: Homework and labs (especially the visualization aspect)

518: lectures

967: Lectures were helpful and covered most of the material that we needed.

3468: The homework, labs, and prelims all effectively reinforced concepts taught in the lectures. The lectures are clear and present information in a logical and organized manner. Professor Schalekamp is funny, knowledgeable, passionate, helpful, and truly an inspiring person. He made this course 100% worth taking and greatly improved my learning.

5556: Homework and subsequent office hours were very helpful — a strength of the course.

5862: The lectures and homework assignments.

6708: The lectures were engaging and very information relating to the exam and homework problems.

7279: The lectures were very helpful and I was able to understand majority of the content off of this alone.

7399: I think the fact that all homework was scaled on a factor of 10/9 really encouraged me to try my hardest and not be scared to make a mistake. It allowed me to thoroughly think through problems and submit my best work rather than stressing about it for hours.

7964: Course instructor is great and presents content in an engaging way. Made topic interesting and fun to learn about.

9539: The homework was very helpful because the problems were good applications of the material we learned in lecture.

10296: I found the labs to be extremely engaging and forced me to have demonstrate a deeper understanding of the material.

11510: Labs

Comments on Weaknesses

3468: The lectures could be a little slower so we have enough time to process new information and write things down.

5556: None.

5862: None

6708: The grading of exams and homework is inconsistent because if you did not write the exact explanation, no points were awarded.

7279: The homeworks were sometimes very hard and involved stuff we didn't really go over in class so this was frustrating.

7964: n/a

9539: Faster return time on some assignments.
