College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2020   Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5310 Lec 1   CID: 10489
Instructor: Schalekamp
3 Responses, 11 Enrolled, 27.27% 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	3.33	3	0	0	2	1	0
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	3.67	3	0	0	1	2	0
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	4.00	3	0	1	0	0	2
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	3.67	3	0	0	1	2	0
21. [Course Delivery] Lectures: As a whole, were lectures clear, well-structured, free of significant or frequent errors, and appropriately covered the course content? 1. No, usually poorly done 2. Sometimes 3. Usually adequate 4. Usually good 5. Nearly always very good	4.33	3	0	0	0	2	1
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	4.33	3	0	0	1	0	2

Question	Avg	N	1	2	3	4	5
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	4.00	3	0	0	1	1	1
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 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	3.33	3	0	0	2	1	0
42. [Laboratory Expectations] Lab expectations (goals, tasks, reports, deadlines, etc.) were clear and realistic. 1. Not at all 2. Partially 3. Adequately 4. Usually clear and realistic 5. Almost always very clear and realistic	4.00	3	0	0	1	1	1
43. [Laboratory Resources] Lab resources (equipment, software, information, instructions, etc.) were 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	4.00	3	0	0	1	1	1
44. [Laboratory 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	4.00	3	0	0	1	1	1
51. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Workload: How many total hours outside of class, per week, on average, did you spend on this course (beyond lecture, recitation or discussion section, and lab sessions)? 1. <3 hours 2. 3-6 3. 7-10 4. 11-15 5. >15 hours	2.67	3	0	1	2	0	0
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. 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	3.33	3	0	0	2	1	0

Question	Mean	N	1	2	3	4	5
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? 1. Minimal value 2. Occasional value 3. Moderate value 4. Significant value 5. Very valuable, well worth the time spent on them	3.67	3	0	0	1	2	0
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? 1. Minimally 2. Sometimes 3. Usually 4. Almost always 5. Reliably and significantly increased my understanding and ability	3.67	3	0	0	1	2	0
55. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Exams & Grading: Were exams and grading a fair and reasonable measure of your learning? 1. No 2. Significant issues exist 3. Generally fair assessment of my learning 4. Well developed and fair 5. Yes, definitely	4.00	3	0	0	1	1	1
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? 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	4.00	3	0	0	1	1	1
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.)? 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	4.00	3	0	0	1	1	1
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.)? 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	4.33	3	0	0	0	2	1
71. [Remote Learning] If you experienced issues with connectivity or other interruptions to your remote learning, were you able to work successfully with your instructor(s) to make needed adjustments? 1. I did not need to ask my instructor(s) for any adjustments (Not applicable) 2. No, I was not able to work out any adjustments with my instructors(s) 3. Yes, I was somewhat successful in working out needed adjustments with my instructor(s) 4. Yes, I was very successful in working out needed adjustments with my instructor(s)	--	0	2	0	0	0	--

Question	Mean	N					
72. [Remote Learning] How effective was the presentation of course material or subject matter? 1. Not at all 2. A little 3. Moderately 4. Very	3.67	3	0	0	1	2	--
73. [Remote Learning] How clearly did the instructor(s) communicate changes that were made to the course? 1. Not at all 2. A little 3. Moderately 4. Very	4.00	3	0	0	0	3	--
74. [Remote Learning] How accessible was help if you needed it from the instructor(s) (e.g., via "virtual" office hours, online forums, email)? 1. Not at all 2. A little 3. Moderately 4. Very	3.33	3	0	1	0	2	--
75. [Remote Learning] How aware were you of academic misconduct among students in this class? 1. Not at all 2. A little 3. Moderately 4. Very	2.00	3	2	0	0	1	--
77. [Remote Learning] One common characteristic has been the recording of lecture content. How valuable did you find the ability to access this content after lecture? 1. I only watched each video once or less. 2. I only watched once but I valued being able to pause lectures. 3. I occasionally returned to review content. 4. I often returned to review content and valued having the lectures as an additional resource. 5. Access to recorded lectures dramatically improved my ability to successfully complete the learning outcomes for the course.	3.33	3	0	1	1	0	1
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	4.00	3	0	0	0	3	0
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	3.33	3	0	0	2	1	0

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2020   Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5310 Lec 1   CID: 10489
Instructor: Schalekamp
3 Responses, 11 Enrolled, 27.27% Response

Comments on workload, resources, assignments, and assessments

8084: Grading was sometimes based solely on a rubric, with no comment given on why points were deducted; and sometimes, even when an explanation was given, points were deducted for correct solutions. I can understand this given it was a large class and a few details are bound to be missed.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2020   Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5310 Lec 1   CID: 10489
Instructor: Schalekamp
3 Responses, 11 Enrolled, 27.27% Response

Comments on Environment-Diversity

5910: I was taking this course towards the core requirement of my graduate program. However, there were multiple instances when prof would reply "I am not going to cover that here, go to grad school" to some questions being asked by me and other students. I am not sure if prof was aware that this course is one of the core course

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2020   Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5310 Lec 1   CID: 10489
Instructor: Schalekamp
3 Responses, 11 Enrolled, 27.27% Response

Comments on Environment-Assistance

8084: This was my first time working with Piazza and, in general, I found it very helpful.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2020   Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5310 Lec 1   CID: 10489
Instructor: Schalekamp
3 Responses, 11 Enrolled, 27.27% Response

Comments on Remote Teaching - Aspects to Continue

8084: I'm of the opinion that take-home exams, while they take more time, have the potential to be more rewarding.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2020   Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5310 Lec 1   CID: 10489
Instructor: Schalekamp
3 Responses, 11 Enrolled, 27.27% Response

Comments on TA

5910: Sander Aarts: he was quite passionate, organized, and approachable.

8084: Sander Aarts was consistently friendly and helpful, so much so I often willingly stayed after labs to ask questions and get his opinion on the course material. I would recommend him as an exemplary Teaching Assistant.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2020   Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5310 Lec 1   CID: 10489
Instructor: Schalekamp
3 Responses, 11 Enrolled, 27.27% Response

Comments on Weaknesses

8084: The reliance on AMPL, a proprietary programming language (albeit with some free work-arounds) favors students who will go on to work in industry; the rest of us might find our AMPL skills obsolete once our academic trial runs out at the end of the semester, and we can't afford the hefty AMPL pricetag. That, and it is difficult to tie AMPL into other workflows. The final lab on using NEOS was helpful, but I think a lab on some open-source library like PuLP might improve the chance that students from other majors or career paths will go on using the skills developed, as I plan to. Even better, I would love to see a project instead of an exam, where students apply principles to a real-world problem of interest to them; I believe that this improves student memory and creates intrinsic motivation.