

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% 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	3.12	25	0	3	17	4	1
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	4.04	25	1	2	2	10	10
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	4.44	25	0	1	1	9	14
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	4.32	25	0	0	3	11	11
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	4.16	25	1	2	2	7	13
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	4.28	25	0	2	3	6	14

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	4.48	25	1	0	1	7	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	3.96	24	0	1	6	10	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	4.25	24	0	1	2	11	10
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	4.33	24	0	0	1	14	9
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	4.58	24	0	0	1	8	15
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	2.08	24	4	15	4	1	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	4.00	24	0	1	5	11	7

<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 	4.00	24	1	1	3	11	8
<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 	4.21	24	0	0	5	9	10
<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 	4.39	23	0	0	3	8	12
<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 	4.67	24	0	0	0	8	16
<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	24	0	0	1	15	8
<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	4.50	24	0	0	2	8	14

<p>64. [COVID-19 Support] If you were diagnosed with Covid-19, or had to quarantine this semester due to symptoms or exposure, did you feel supported as far as staying connected with the class and making up any missed work?</p> <p>1. No, I did not feel supported. 2. Somewhat. Deadlines were extended but I didn't have a way to learn lecture material. 3. Yes, I did receive support. I was provided with a way to access content remotely if needed. Deadlines were considered and may have been extended. 4. Yes, I felt very supported with an appropriate mix of accessible content, an opportunity to participate in office hours and/or get help, and extensions and make-ups when needed. 5. Not applicable.</p>	3.75	8	0	0	2	6	--
<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>	4.50	24	0	0	3	6	15
<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>	4.42	24	0	1	1	9	13

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% Response

Comments On Course Content

1913: I appreciated how the course content was organized and easy to follow with the course handout. Very good examples walked through in lecture and practiced in labs.

3229: The course content is very helpful and in-depth! I found most lectures very intriguing, although I felt a bit less interested in the second half of the course about linear programs. That is likely just a subjective thing, though.

3422: Very interesting. Cannot wait to move on to higher levels of ORIE.

4312: Was hoping for more real-world applications before diving into the mathematical notation. That way, it would help me ground my understanding of the topic in real world setting before understanding why it is important to do something.

4999: Good!

5002: Great content, strongly enhanced understanding.

6116: The course content is overall very interesting and I especially enjoyed learning about practical applications of the algorithms we learned.

7398: As a beginner, office hours were essential for gaining a better understanding of the material.

7961: I really enjoyed the course, and I found the content very interesting and engaging. I saw a lot of real-world applications in this course, and it progressed very well.

10754: I think the lab content helped me to understand the course content more. However, I think having more practice problems before prelims and finals with solution keys would have prepared me better for exams.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% Response

Comments on Course Delivery

1913: Always enjoy attending lectures. Professor Schalekamp is very kind and cares to explain the material very well.

3229: Near the beginning of the course, Frans was a bit disorganized with his lectures and winged some of his examples. However, he improved a lot in the second half of the course, and his lectures in that time period were far better and well organized.

3422: Awesome job each time and very friendly.

4312: I love the professor's attitude towards the subject and towards his students. While I did not do well in the course, with his encouragement, I wanted to learn more about the topic outside of class.

4999: Good!

5002: Great lectures, greatly supported learning the course content

6116: The lectures encouraged participation and were generally easy to understand and follow.

7398: Professor Schalekamp excelled at motivating us to try to fully understand the material.

7961: Professor Schalekamp did a great job of lecturing and being passionate about class every day. He clearly cares about the subject material and the students in his class. He always brought great energy, and a smile to each and every lecture.

11345: Professor Schalekamp was a fun professor, enthusiastic about teaching and introducing us to the content. He was always open to questions and answered them thoroughly.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% Response

Comments on laboratory component

1913: Labs are very long and seem harder than what we are prepared for which is challenging but sometimes discouraging. The TAs are very kind and explain questions when we ask for help.

3229: Labs were well made and very relevant to our current lecture topics. There was one lab that was FAR too lengthy, but apart from that I think labs were very helpful.

One thing I have to say about labs is though that the ortools code segments were not introduced well enough. I could figure out how to write them on my own, but I know a bunch of people less well versed in code had some trouble figuring out ortools. Perhaps we could dedicate some time to learning how to write those functions?

4999: Good!

5002: Labs were great overall

6116: The labs were very helpful to apply the information we learned during the lectures. Sometimes there were issues with the software, but the TAs were always helpful and explained how to fix issues that arose.

7398: Lab TA Ashley Jiang was very willing to help with assignments and was a major reason why I was able to understand the work.

7961: I enjoyed the lab and liked digging further into the material. At times the code became quite confusing, so maybe some more clarity as to what the code meant and what code needed to be added could have been useful.

10567: I love my TA. Rebekah is the best TA I have ever met in school :DDDDDD

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% Response

Comments on workload, resources, assignments, and assessments

1913: Homeworks are very challenging but reinforce class material well.

3229: Assignments were in my opinion the highlight of this class! Homeworks were all very well written, and the optional segments of the assignments later on really forced me to think critically. Some typos, but they were usually fixed rather quickly.

4312: Exams were quite difficult for me. But homework were very fair.

4999: Good!

6116: The workload was good since I got a chance to practice the concepts outside of class while still having enough time to work on them slowly or go to office hours to make sure I understood them.

7398: The course grading is very fair and accommodating.

7961: I enjoyed the homework because it really made me think. At times I feel as though it was graded more harshly than I would have liked to have seen considering it accounts for so much of your grade, but that is the only complaint that I have about it. The homework related to the week's course packet readings and lectures very well; this was appreciated.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% Response

Comments on Environment-Diversity

7961: None.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% Response

Comments on Environment-Assistance

1913: Great TAs.

3229: TA's are very helpful! I went to office hours a few times and they answered my questions helpfully and quickly.

6116: I attended both in-person and Zoom office hours and found both to be very helpful.

7961: There were plenty of opportunities to utilize office hours, but I don't know how effective some of the office hours times were. I know TA's are busy so they need to find times that work into their schedule, but I can't imagine a nighttime office hours on Saturday night ever being utilized for example.

10847: The TA's are amazing! Especially Willem and Henry they are so kind and helpful!!

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% Response

Comments on Environment-Academic Integrity

7961: I didn't see any issues.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% Response

Comments on TA

360: Henry

1913: Henry - He goes above and beyond in explaining labs and any question we ask. He stays longer in office hours to go over any issues we have.

3422: Henry was awesome. I would try to go to every one of his office hours when I realized how big of a help he was and he made understanding the tough topics within this course much easier.

4312: I would like to nominate Willem van Osselaer. Just by talking with him, you can tell that he is very passionate about the topic. He is very accessible both in the lab and outside of it. The way he teaches is also excellent: he doesn't give you the answer, but he gives you enough hints to guide you in the right direction. With him as a TA, I don't feel stupid or embarrassed to ask a question.

5002: Willem van Osselaer. He not only seems very passionate about the course content, but also excited to teach it to others.

6116: I want to nominate Willem van Osselaer for a teaching award since he was very helpful in lab and in office hours, and is overall very invested and enthusiastic in teaching the material.

7063: Henry Robbins - he was incredibly engaging and passionate about the information. He knows how to break down problems and effectively explain information.

7398: I would like to nominate Ashley Jiang because of her thoughtful help and demonstrated effort in helping students learn the material. She was very smart and well-versed with all of the course content.

7961: N/A

10754: Rebekah Westerlind. She was incredibly helpful and friendly during recitation sessions. Even though my lab sessions were early on Monday mornings, she made lab more enjoyable with her friendly attitude and her willingness to teach and help. Whenever I had questions with the lab or the homework, she would put in her best effort to explain the course concepts and guide me towards a solution. Moreover, she was always very welcoming during office hours and helped my learning in the course tremendously.

10847: Henry Robbins!! He is so good at explaining difficult concepts in an easy manner and goes above and beyond to help me and all of my peers.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% Response

Comments on Strengths

1913: Great encouragement from professor and TAs.

3229: I believe the homework assignments were the most crucial part in critical thinking in this course. They really challenge you to think and apply the things you've learned.

3422: I think the lecture and office hours and the quality of the TA's were the most helpful.

4312: The homework were particularly very helpful. They are at the appropriate difficulty. They are also much more application-based.

6116: There was a lot of support, and if I was ever confused, there were many resources that I could turn to for help.

7398: The TAs at Office Hours were very helpful in understanding the concepts and completing assignments.

7961: I think the lectures were very well done and engaging. I appreciate all the examples we did in class, because its one thing to be lectured on how to approach a problem, and it's another thing to actually do the problem yourself.

10754: Labs and homeworks

10847: Office Hours were super helpful

11345: The lectures introduced and explained the main concepts of the course solidly. The homework and labs were helpful in allowing us to review and practice what we learned. Some questions were closer to review of lecture content while others encouraged us to explore the concepts deeper, think in a different light, and connect the concepts to applications closer to the real world.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ENGRI 1101 Lec 1 CID: 9841
Instructor: Schalekamp
25 Responses, 46 Enrolled, 54.35% Response

Comments on Weaknesses

1913: Labs are very long and discouraging. Some homeworks are too long.

3229: No, nothing else I could think of.

3422: I think that sometimes we would not go into stuff hard enough in class that would be covered on the homework assignments and I feel some of the notation would be better explained in class rather than in the reading.

4312: The labs are a little bit out of sync sometimes. What I mean by this is that it feels as if they do not have a clear agreement on the pre-requisites. For example, the course said that there won't be too much knowledge of python needed, but clearly in some labs, python knowledge is required to be able to do it. There were some technical issues as well.

6116: One area of weakness was that we didn't learn about how to use the OR tools functions when doing some of the labs, so I was occasionally confused about how to add constraints when we did linear programming.

7398: I had not observed any notable weaknesses.

7961: I didn't see any weaknesses.

10847: Lectures towards the end of the semester are difficult.
