

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**

**Course Evaluation Response Summary**

**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**

**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**

**Instructor: Schalekamp**

**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% 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	3.17	53	0	6	36	7	4
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	4.32	53	0	1	6	21	25
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	4.36	53	0	2	3	22	26
14. [Course Content] Examples & Applications: Were the number and variety of examples and practical applications presented appropriate to the course content and beneficial to your learning? 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	4.43	53	1	0	3	20	29
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	4.57	53	0	1	3	14	35
22. [Course Delivery] Context: Did the lecturer motivate the course content and place it in the context of your major or your overall engineering/science education (beyond fulfilling a degree requirement)? 1. No 2. Somewhat 3. Adequately 4. Mostly 5. Absolutely	4.64	53	0	0	4	11	38

23. [Course Delivery] Engagement: Did the lecturer present material in an engaging way, which improved your understanding of the course content?	4.62	53	0	1	2	13	37
1. No, generally boring 2. Rarely engaging 3. Generally held my attention 4. Engaging 5. Very engaging and often required actively thinking about material							
31. [Recitation or Discussion Section] Was the section effective in increasing your understanding of, and ability to use, the course material?	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
1. No, usually poorly done 2. Sometimes 3. Usually adequate 4. Usually good 5. Nearly always very good							
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)?	3.49	53	2	4	23	14	10
1. Minimal value 2. Occasional value 3. Moderate value 4. Significant value 5. Very valuable, well worth time spent on them							
42. [Laboratory Section] Lab expectations: Were lab expectations (goals, tasks, reports, deadlines, etc.) clear and realistic?	3.94	52	0	3	12	22	15
1. Not at all 2. Partially 3. Adequately 4. Usually clear and realistic 5. Almost always very clear and realistic							
43. [Laboratory Section] Lab resources: Were lab resources (equipment, software, information, instructions, etc.) sufficient to provide a positive experience?	4.04	53	1	2	13	15	22
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							
44. [Laboratory Section] Lab Staffing: Support and help, during lab and for lab reports, were sufficient to successfully complete and analyze experiments.	3.94	53	1	3	15	13	21
1. Rarely sufficient 2. Partially sufficient 3. Adequate 4. Almost always sufficient 5. Excellent, significantly enhanced the laboratory experience							
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?	1.96	53	14	28	10	1	0
1. <3 hours 2. 3-6 3. 7-10 4. 11-15 5. >15 hours							
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.	4.02	53	1	3	9	21	19
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							

<p>53. [Workload, Resources, Assignments &amp; Assessment] Resources: How valuable were outside of class-time resources (e.g., readings, videos, online content, course notes) in building your understanding?</p> <p>1. Minimal value 2. Occasional value 3. Moderate value 4. Significant value 5. Very valuable, well worth the time spent on them</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3.94</td><td>53</td><td>0</td><td>5</td><td>8</td><td>25</td><td>15</td></tr> </table>	3.94	53	0	5	8	25	15
3.94	53	0	5	8	25	15		
<p>54. [Workload, Resources, Assignments &amp; 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> <p>1. Minimally 2. Sometimes 3. Usually 4. Almost always 5. Reliably and significantly increased my understanding and ability</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>4.36</td><td>53</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>5</td><td>21</td><td>26</td></tr> </table>	4.36	53	0	1	5	21	26
4.36	53	0	1	5	21	26		
<p>55. [Workload, Resources, Assignments &amp; Assessment] Exams &amp; 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> <p>1. No 2. Significant issues exist 3. Generally fair assessment of my learning 4. Well developed and fair 5. Yes, definitely</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>4.42</td><td>53</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>8</td><td>12</td><td>32</td></tr> </table>	4.42	53	0	1	8	12	32
4.42	53	0	1	8	12	32		
<p>61. [Course Environment] Diversity &amp; 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> <p>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</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>4.70</td><td>53</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>16</td><td>37</td></tr> </table>	4.70	53	0	0	0	16	37
4.70	53	0	0	0	16	37		
<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> <p>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</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>4.38</td><td>53</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>8</td><td>17</td><td>28</td></tr> </table>	4.38	53	0	0	8	17	28
4.38	53	0	0	8	17	28		
<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>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>4.66</td><td>53</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>2</td><td>14</td><td>37</td></tr> </table>	4.66	53	0	0	2	14	37
4.66	53	0	0	2	14	37		
<p>91. [Comparison to Other Courses] Instructor: Rate the overall teaching effectiveness of your lecturer compared to others at Cornell.</p> <p>1 = Worse than average 5 = Much better than average</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>4.81</td><td>53</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>10</td><td>43</td></tr> </table>	4.81	53	0	0	0	10	43
4.81	53	0	0	0	10	43		

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

4.57	53	0	0	2	19	32
------	----	---	---	---	----	----

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGR 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

### **Comments On Course Content**

929: The course is designed to apply to theoretical algorithms to real-world scenarios, which made it inherently interesting. Furthermore, everything in this class built upon past topics, which made progression feel exponential rather than jumbled/disorganized.

1810: The course content was very engaging. I thought the coursepack was very easy to follow along with and the homeworks supplemented concepts learned in class very well.

1975: I didn't really know what to expect from the course walking in but I think my instructor organized it very well so that even someone new could understand it.

2388: Very useful

3524: Definitely sufficient for an intro course.

6689: loved course content, really nice intro not too difficult but very engaging.

7326: I enjoyed the material of the course and the way Professor Schalekamp taught the course. The material was new to me and several other people in my class so it was daunting to absorb at first but the material definitely gave me multiple chances to get stuck mentally, and find my way through the problem. I enjoyed the course content, even though it was something I had never studied before and was a little difficult to get used to at first.

7386: Very interesting and engaging.

7766: great, easy enough to follow but still engaging.

7978: I think more practice problems would be nice, but the course was very fun!

8039: I really enjoyed learning the content and could tell that the professor knew and liked what he was talking about. I am interested in exploring this content more in the future and its intersection with computer science and other aspects of ORIE :)

8229: The course is very well structured in the sense that we start out with basic problems and then build upon them later. The organization with the homeworks and labs is also helpful.

8371: Interesting class would recommend.

8476: Very applicable to real world

9407: Great!

11291: I was hoping to get more practice problems.

11326: Solid contents and valuable lectures.

11427: Great course that can be used to improve general critical thinking within engineering/coding.

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**

**Course Evaluation Response Summary**

**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**

**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**

**Instructor: Schalekamp**

**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

---

12759: It's an intro course, not much to note.

---

13004: Lectures were well organized and content made sense.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

### **Comments on Course Delivery**

929: The lectures that Professor Schalekamp held were especially important in making the class and material fun. He always encouraged questions, was available after class to clear anything up, and emphasized mastery/understanding over technical accuracy. He was also an awesome person in attitude, in general.

---

1810: Excellent course delivery

---

1975: The instructor was very good at presenting the material in a clear way and more details were always provided in the coursepack along with the notes posted on Canvas if needed for later reference.

---

2388: Amazing

---

2727: Everything is good.

---

3368: Instructor was very engaging in every class.

---

3524: Professor Schalekamp's lectures are great.

---

3768: Amazing. Frans is so kind and made everything seem amazingly intuitive. He motivated me to pursue more courses in the ORIE department.

---

7326: Professor's lively manner of delivery his lectures definitely kept me engaged. I enjoyed his funny analogies and his great sense of fashion and humor. He brought a sense of lightheartedness to a subject that seemed really daunting at first. He was able to explain complex topics with much ease and gentleness which I really appreciated.

---

7386: He made it very engaging and increased my interest in the subject.

---

7721: fun lectures

---

7766: very passionate and entertaining profession.

---

7978: I enjoyed the classes a lot!

---

8039: Very bubbly and happy attitude in class everyday  
funny guy teaching

---

8229: Frans is a great lecturer who always makes lectures very interesting. He motivated problems that we did we real examples before we actually went into the mathematical models.

---

8371: Good at lecturing and involving students.

---

8476: Very funny and entertaining while learning

---

9407: Very good

---

11326: The lectures were delivered more like a high school course, which i personally really liked.

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**

**Course Evaluation Response Summary**

**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**

**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**

**Instructor: Schalekamp**

**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

---

12759: Franz is genuinely such a good professor

---

13004: Professor went into great detail and truly cared about what he was teaching.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

### **Comments on laboratory component**

929: The labs reinforced attained knowledge from lectures, and usually brought in a more concrete, nuanced real-world example into the mix, making the material interesting and relevant. The lab TAs were also an excellent resource to answer any lab-relevant or general class content questions.

---

1810: Lab period is very helpful all TAs are very open to questions. Lab supplement concepts learned in class well.

---

1975: The lab activities helped a lot with actually practicing the algorithms we learned about and understanding how they work/can be applied in different situations.

---

2388: Useful

---

2727: I would say sometimes the lab instructions are not clear (since they would introduce new ideas), but most of the times they are good to learn and understand.

---

3524: To be honest I stopped attending lab after the second week and just did the Colab Notebook online. Not sure how helpful TAs were overall, but when I was there it seemed like a study hall for the most part.

---

6689: some labs were harder than others, sometimes the hard ones the TAs didnt provide totally enough help, but usually very good.

---

7326: Sometimes, the software used for the labs would crash really badly and remove all of the answers I had written. That is one thing that I had to face on several occasions, but other than that, the labs were pretty fun too. However, at times they did feel very long and it did take a little more than two hours to complete them. I liked the prelabs better than the actual lab. Because they were shorter, i thought they were able to get to the point of the concept a little bit more directly and clearly as compared to the actual lab.

---

7386: TAs were helpful in understanding course material.

---

7766: not very helpful.

---

7978: good!

---

8229: I think the labs were quite helpful in understanding the content, and especially in the later lectures, it was helpful to visualize what we were doing in the labs.

---

8476: It was fine just like another homework assignment though

---

9407: I think it would have been nice for us to do more coding.

---

11326: Labs are well designed and not overwhelming.

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

### **Comments on workload, resources, assignments, and assessments**

929: The value to workload ratio was definitely the best of any class. I'm not sure if it's because the material itself was interesting or because the assignments were well designed (probably a mix of both), but the workload was well-worth the time I spent on it. Some homework assignments took longer to complete than others (depending on grasp of the material), but I always walked away with a much better understanding than I did before and always felt prepared for upcoming assessments.

---

1810: Homework is very well preparing for Prelims.

---

1975: The workload was never too much to handle on top of my other courses and they usually helped me understand the topic a lot better.

---

2727: Everything is good for me.

---

3524: Workload is very very manageable, the coursepack imo is incredibly useful. Assignments and assessments are both fair.

---

7326: The homeworks were extremely intellectually stimulating and challenging. There were several occasions where I was stumped and did not know how to approach them. At those instances, I did feel like the homework should have been slightly easier or perhaps shorter but I understand the motive behind having difficult homeworks. They did help me understand the subject matter in a more practical light as well. The prelims were a little difficult, for me personally, too. I would find myself getting blank at some of the real-life based scenarios despite feeling (from my preparation) that I understood everything. However, after my first prelim, I realize that that too was a skill that I needed to use this course to develop and I did significantly better later once I spent more time trying to look at the subject matter through the lens I wish my professor spent more time trying to look through. With that said, I wish we looked at practical and logical examples more in class like we are tested on the prelim.

---

7386: Workload was perfect and exams were very fair.

---

7766: all was goods, sometimes on tests it was unclear why i was losing points.

---

7978: Sometimes difficult to understand the questions in homeworks and exams.

---

8039: The workload was sufficient enough for my understanding and was not overwhelming.

---

8229: I enjoyed the homework for this class, and it also helped me get a better grasp on the material because we actually got to apply it. I really like the coursepack, and it was the main thing I used to study for prelims. The coursepack is very well written and was very helpful. The prelims were fair, and we were given a good idea of what to expect beforehand.

---

8371: balanced workload, maybe a little more than most ENGRIs

---

8476: All of them were fine

---

11326: Great ratio for spending time in this course.

---

13004: All fantastic!

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**

**Course Evaluation Response Summary**

**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**

**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**

**Instructor: Schalekamp**

**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

### **Comments on Environment-Diversity**

929: N/A

1810: Peers and TAs are inclusive

1975: No issues observed.

7326: None.

7978: good!

8371: n/a

11326: A lot of participation were encouraged during class.

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

### **Comments on Environment-Assistance**

929: When the assignments, coursepack, or lecture notes didn't answer my questions, the rest of my questions would be cleared up during the lab period, as the TAs took the time to explain the material in a unique but understandable way.

---

1810: TAs very helpful and attentive to questions on Ed.

---

1975: I thought my instructor and the TAs did a great job with being available to answer questions and provide clarification whether in person (in class or during office hours) or through EdDiscussion.

---

3524: Dunno.

---

7326: I wish we had more office hours with the professor at different times.

---

7978: good!

---

8229: I attended the professor's OH, and he was welcoming and answered my doubts.

---

8371: n/a

---

10556: The ED discussion page was incredbily helpful

---

11326: Professor is very friendly.

---

11427: Has an Ed Discussion with timely replies.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

**Comments on Environment-Academic Integrity**

929: N/A

1810: N/a

1975: No issues observed

7326: None.

7978: n/a

8371: n/a

11326: Didn't have any issue with this.

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**

**Course Evaluation Response Summary**

**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**

**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**

**Instructor: Schalekamp**

**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

**Comments on TA**

929: David Domanski was my lab TA, and almost like a second teacher. He would always be available to answer questions during that lab period, even if they weren't necessarily relevant to the topic we were covering during that lab. He also explained things in a way that was unique to Professor Schalekamp, but equally effective, which helped when confusion emerged.

---

1810: N/a

---

1975: Serena Zhang - I knew I could always rely on her office hours to get good explanations when I needed help on the homework.

---

7326: None.

---

7978: n/a

---

8371: n/a

---

10516: Rachel Pineda was an excellent TA because she helped us throughout our labs and prepared us for prelims with clear, detailed explanations for any question we had. I always felt more confident in the course material after attending her discussion section.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**

**Course Evaluation Response Summary**

**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**

**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**

**Instructor: Schalekamp**

**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

**Comments on Strengths**

840: Homework

---

929: The existence of so many safety nets (i.e. resources) beyond the professor's lectures was extremely helpful to reinforce my knowledge. Attending lectures is the best way for me to focus and learn material, but having online lecture notes, homeworks, Gradescope feedback, labs, TAs, the coursepack, and practice material made me feel secure. I never felt like I was completely lost.

---

1810: The homeworks were most helpful I feel

---

1975: Knowledgeable and engaging professor and TAs who are always on top of answering questions (especially through Ed Discussion - also being able to see other people's questions get answered helped me gain a deeper understanding of the topic myself as well.

---

2727: 1. Lectures are engaging and detailed.  
2. The coursepack is really helpful for learning and getting clear on the concepts step by step.  
3. Homework assignments are helpful for practice  
4. Labs help me to tackle problems step by step.

---

2975: Contents were explained very clearly in class

---

3368: The manner in which Professor Schalekamp taught, he was fun and explained difficult concepts in easy to understand manners.

---

3524: homework

---

3984: This class was amazing and it was largely due to Professor Schalekamp. He explains concepts extremely clearly and he is a fair professor. His homework and lectures helped prepare me well for the exams, which are fair in the difficulty and course material.

---

5717: The homework and provided course pack were the most helpful in learning the material and preparing for exams.

---

6689: Super nice content, the coursepack was easy to read and insightful, homeworks were always interesting, super nice.

---

7326: I remember in our introduction class for this course, professor said the goal of this course is to make you smarter than you already are. I really do think in that regard I really benefited from taking this course. It exposed me to a way of thinking I had not contemplated before and gifted me a new perspective for looking at problem solving. I really do think taking this course was worth it. The subject matter was incredibly interesting and professor was able to break it down in a beautifully simple manner.

---

7386: The staff.

---

7978: I think it helped a lot with understanding how to approach real world problem with an open mind and critical thinking.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**

**Course Evaluation Response Summary**

**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**

**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**

**Instructor: Schalekamp**

**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

8039: Strengths of this course was that the labs were related to what we learned in lectures, so it gave me a better understanding of what was going on

8186: I thought the lab assignments helped me contextualize and apply the concepts better. They allowed me to check my understanding and look back on parts I may not have fully grasped.

8229: The lectures and coursepack.

8253: Great lecture

8371: n/a

8476: Coursepack and lectures

9407: Lectures were very helpful. I didn't even have to look at the coursepack to get good grades on exams.

10556: The lectures were super engaging and walked you step by step through derivations of complex problems and it was incredibly clear what we were expected to know for exams.

11225: The professor made it so that the course content was engaging, using good examples and storylines to teach the knowledge.

11291: Course Pack, Professor Notes

11326: Very good introductory class for ORIE.

11427: Labs and Homework expand on lecture and course material.

12759: The light but fun nature

13004: Useful examples that had strong connections to what we were learning.

13094: Course packet, engaging lectures

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

### **Comments on Weaknesses**

840: No

929: No significant weaknesses.

1810: N/a

1975: Sometimes I felt the homework was graded a little harshly without enough explanation/extra comments from the grader about where exactly I lost points (especially in questions that required more explanation and the rubric criteria doesn't provide a lot of clarity about where the points were deducted/not earned).

3524: labs (not to say that they're bad, but not great either)

3984: None.

5717: The lab activities were not always applicable to the homework or exams, but were interesting to go through (though sometimes a little tedious as well).

6689: not many, although i do remember a few stressful labs

7326: I don't have too many particular weaknesses that I saw in this course.

7978: It was sometimes difficult to understand the assignment+exam questions and the course packets writing style.

8039: No weaknesses!  
Loved this class

8229: NA

8253: Not much.

8371: n/a

8476: None really

9407: I think the labs are a bit tedious and not that engaging. As I said, having more coding would be fun.

10556: No, this is my favorite course at Cornell thus far.

11291: Not Enough number of practice problems to prepare us for exams

11326: It is honestly a great experience.

12759: Depth? It's an intro course though so that's not realistic

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Fall 2025 Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 2 CID: 6723**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**54 Responses, 93 Enrolled, 58.06% Response**

---

13004: Nope!

---