

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 4350 Lec 1 CID: 17855
Instructor: Schalekamp
75 Responses, 107 Enrolled, 70.09% 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	3.32	74	0	2	54	10	8
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	74	1	2	11	25	35
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	4.27	74	0	3	8	29	34
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	4.41	74	0	2	7	24	41
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	4.34	74	1	2	10	19	42
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	4.35	74	1	2	11	16	44

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	4.31	74	0	2	11	23	38
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	3.33	69	8	12	15	17	17
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	3.83	69	4	6	14	19	26
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	3.83	69	4	8	11	19	27
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	3.91	69	2	7	13	20	27
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	2.62	73	6	30	24	12	1
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	4.12	73	1	1	16	25	30

<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 	4.08	73	0	2	18	25	28
<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 	4.33	73	1	1	7	28	36
<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 	4.25	73	1	2	12	21	37
<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 	4.64	73	0	0	3	20	50
<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 	4.03	73	1	7	12	22	31
<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. 	4.68	72	0	0	4	15	53

<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>	3.74	31	1	1	3	26	--
<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>	4.47	72	0	1	7	21	43
<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>	4.31	72	1	0	11	24	36

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 4350 Lec 1 CID: 17855
Instructor: Schalekamp
75 Responses, 107 Enrolled, 70.09% Response

Comments On Course Content

2315: Harder examples would be great

3104: Great course content with good examples and applications

3750: Loved the content of this course.

3885: Glad to have chosen this course! really interesting and helpful!

5113: n/a

6171: The course content was excellent -- very comprehensive walkthrough of game theory with a very appropriate difficulty level. Plenty of real-life examples and synthesis of content.

6888: Great all around. Textbook was absolutely critical to assist learning.

6901: Course content was great overall. Introduction (IESDS, Rationalisability, Nash Equilibria) was a bit gentle, and later units (multistage games, Bayesian Games, Auctions) were much more difficult, creating an unexpectedly steep difficulty gradient; however, the material itself was interesting and thought-provoking.

8766: Very stimulating and exciting course content. Reasonably challenging.

9089: There were many interesting examples to which we could apply what we had learned. Occasionally, the practicums would present material that seemed completely foreign to me, but fortunately that material never showed up on homeworks or exams.

10071: Game theory is constrained to boring examples at the beginning. Kind of unavoidable. Lecture notes are frustrating to review because they are too verbose. Writing out is helpful for students, absolutely, but greater care can be taken to be more concise and clear with wordings. Also, drawing or framing problems in clearer figures would be helpful for both lecture notes and homework solutions.

10967: The course curriculum was holistic and covered nearly all topics relevant to modern game theory applications..The assignments and homework supplemented what was taught in lectures. The programming assignment was a super add-on to this..

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 4350 Lec 1 CID: 17855
Instructor: Schalekamp
75 Responses, 107 Enrolled, 70.09% Response

Comments on Course Delivery

3408: delivery is quite clear

3885: Frans is the best!

5113: n/a

5348: The only thing we could improve is to spend less time on deriving all the formulas and just focus on the big ideas. This is not a probability/calculus course after all.

6171: Lectures were delivered excellently -- lecture notes were super well organized, the course was well organized, the lecturer did a great job to give context at the start and end of each lecture.

6888: Very engaging.

6901: Phenomenal! Lectures were incredibly fun, interactive, and humorous.

8766: Frans is one of the best instructors I've ever met. He manages to deliver content in such a funny and engaging way that I can get a good laugh in class while learning a lot. Going to class was actually exciting.

9089: Professor Schalekamp was an entertaining professor who made it easy to speak up and ask questions during class.

10967: Prof Frans knows how to make a course interesting. Sometimes a pinch of humor goes a long way in making students feel more engaged. The course content was also adequately covered with in-depth theory and sufficient examples...

Comments on laboratory component

3885: Programming assignment could be improved.

4933: More TAs would be nice

5113: n/a

5348: Discussion section is absolutely useless. I think half of the class stop going to them after the first few. TA might know what he is talking about but is just horrible at delivering his ideas to class. DIS202

6171: The labs felt a bit dry and like a chore to go to -- I appreciated getting a new perspective on the problem but almost which that the 5350 programming assignments could have been part of the labs or just having the labs be optional.

6888: Lab felt very disconnected from classroom experience. They were completely on different pages I found.

6901: Overall, a challenging, interesting reinforcement of the course content. I'd have preferred, however, more reliance on game-theoretic logic and less on calculus.

7576: Often the labs required us to answer questions about material that we hadn't learned and wouldn't learn for a while and there was little guidance on solving these questions. Additionally, we only received the solutions to one of the recitation assignments, so we had no way to evaluate our understanding of the assignments and learn how to solve the questions we had trouble with.

7833: laboratory section is not good. I saw student change section in my first laboratory section then find all sections have only one TA. Most student don't know which question she is talking

8766: Recitations were a good complement to normal lectures. However, it would be better if the recitations didn't cover topics ahead of the lecture schedules.

9089: The laboratory contributed little to the course. There was a little value from having practice problems to go over and being able to see a TA work through them, but many problems that were presented seemed like they had little to do with the material that had been presented during lecture. Even when they managed to resemble what we had been shown during class, they were long and uninteresting.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 4350 Lec 1 CID: 17855
Instructor: Schalekamp
75 Responses, 107 Enrolled, 70.09% Response

Comments on workload, resources, assignments, and assessments

2315: Could go over definitions more. Somewhat confused by information sets. Textbook is harder to follow later on which helped me at the beginning of the course

2316: Workload a little bit heavy, especially for the first half of the semester.

3104: I felt like I actually learned instead of just chasing a grade.

3885: Well organized.

5032: Exams gradings are not precise. I know some classmates got full marks on questions with wrong answers or wrong processes but correct answers - which is very unfair.

5113: n/a

6171: Very fair workload for a course of this level, I always felt adequately prepared for the assignments and assessments and never thought that any questions were unreasonable. At times, when we would learn a new concept the homework would have one or two too many questions that effectively asked the same thing and felt repetitive, but as a whole the assignments were a terrific way for me to apply what I had learned in lecture.

6888: The speed of grading was slow. When you are submitting a homework but the last 3 have not been graded, it is hard to judge whether you need to make adjustments in the effort you are putting into them.

6901: Exams themselves are fair, and a good measure of course content. However, "all or nothing" grading (partial credit exists, but is not especially generous) can be harsh.

8766: Very reasonable workload. Appreciate the assignment grading where the lowest one is dropped and each score is scaled by a factor >1 , really gives me room to explore and reason on my own and not be too afraid of making mistakes.

9089: In general, this class did well balancing workload and providing good resources for students. Occasionally, there would be a question that seemed "out of scope" for the class: for example, a recent homework required we calculate the expected value of the third highest draw out of n draws of a given random variable. This is significantly more difficult than the probability we had been working with for the rest of the semester, and I had significant difficulty with this problem.

9124: I wish there would have been more office hours each week especially later in the week.

10595: The workload of the class is kind of too crazy by having 9 assignments + programming assignments + 3 exams for the MEng version.

10967: The workload was adequate and assignments supplemented well with the lectures taught the day before..Overall it made the course quite strong in helping build concepts..

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 4350 Lec 1 CID: 17855
Instructor: Schalekamp
75 Responses, 107 Enrolled, 70.09% Response

Comments on Environment-Diversity

8766: No issues at all. Frans always includes everyone very well in class.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 4350 Lec 1 CID: 17855
Instructor: Schalekamp
75 Responses, 107 Enrolled, 70.09% Response

Comments on Environment-Assistance

45: Sometimes questions on ed aren't answered.

2315: Need alot more office hours at a better time

3104: TA was helpful and explained well.

4933: More TA Office Hours please

5113: Not enough office hours

6901: It would have been helpful if Prof. Schalekamp had more office hours at a time that had fewer conflicts, but he was easily accessible through appointments

7576: There were few office hours available, making it difficult to get help on some homework assignments when these office hours frequently conflicted with schedules.

8766: Ed discussions were frequently monitored and I was able to get answers pretty fast when I was confused about something.

10071: TA's office hours were too short and infrequent, or otherwise disorganized. This is a product of the material and the homework solutions do not help, but the TA was unable to make answers to questions on the homework clear. It's not an easy thing to do, granted, because the solutions to the homework are not good and notation is mind-boggling in this class.

10595: It would be great if there can be more office hours throughout the week. Given only 3 regular office hours + recitation sections sometimes makes me hardly find a time to participate.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 4350 Lec 1 CID: 17855
Instructor: Schalekamp
75 Responses, 107 Enrolled, 70.09% Response

Comments on Environment-Academic Integrity

8766: I remember doing a question about cheating in the first prelim - it was a very fun, remarkable and convincing message about academic integrity.

10071: Not like I would know.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 4350 Lec 1 CID: 17855
Instructor: Schalekamp
75 Responses, 107 Enrolled, 70.09% Response

Comments on TA

3642: Tianci Tan

10230: Haici Tan

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 4350 Lec 1 CID: 17855
Instructor: Schalekamp
75 Responses, 107 Enrolled, 70.09% Response

Comments on Strengths

2316: Very detailed introduction and derivation of the concepts. Clear examples. Nice professor.

3107: Best course this semester. Super clear lecture and notes.

3750: This was a very fun course and was taught excellently I thought. The content was engaging and often had very interesting applications

4366: Very clear lecturing ability, well-structured course content and roadmap. Clear expectations as well, for the most part (except for the project)

5113: Having lecture notes and videos to refer back to

5348: Very well-organized lectures

6171: Professor Schalekamp is amazing -- I've had him a few times now and absolutely love his teaching style. His lecture notes are always so clear and concise, he's very upfront about his expectations, and in general does a great job at making courses difficult and engaging while being very reasonable.

6888: Teacher engagement was effective, and the textbook was very good

6901: Prof. Schalekamp's sense of humor, knowledge, intelligence, and commitment to a fair, thorough course were immensely helpful to my learning and engagement. He joked towards the end of the course that we can use these course evaluations to affect his salary; I suggest (€7.59M/yr).

8766: It was a very good introduction to game theory - a generally very hard topic - taught at a reasonable level of difficulty with lenient grading in exams based on reasoning.

8790: Professor did an excellent job at breaking down the meaning of the notation in this course, as it could get confusing at times, and the lectures would be very thorough and well-organized. Fostered a great environment in class, which motivated people to ask questions, and the resulting discussions from these questions further added to my understanding of material. One of the best professors I've ever had.

9089: Professor Schalekamp's friendly and approachable nature did much to improve my experience in this course.

9124: Lectures, and especially the video recordings so I could go back and watch!!

10595: The course goes over a lot of interesting topics, which is also one of the reasons why I take this course.

10967: Depth of coverage and quality of teaching content. Not to mention a powerful course delivery

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2022 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 4350 Lec 1 CID: 17855
Instructor: Schalekamp
75 Responses, 107 Enrolled, 70.09% Response

Comments on Weaknesses

3750: N/A

4097: No solution to recitation exercises.

5032: Recitations feel useless - TA can't explain the question very well and students are just brainlessly copying the answer.

5113: Recitation

6171: To me, the only thing I didn't love about the course was the labs. I see the value in extra practice problems, but would have loved for these to be more difficult, more programming based, or have some more energy surrounding them. I get that the content is different from other lab-based courses I took with Professor Schalekamp (3120 and 3310), but I loved those labs and found them very useful while this courses lab sections weren't the best.

6888: Lab time was not utilized effectively. Too disconnected from class and not clear sharing of strategies or skills.

6901: Prof. Schalekamp does not have any weaknesses, aside from the timing of his office hours.

8766: Not that I think of.

9089: The content of the laboratory sessions needs to be reevaluated or removed entirely.

9124: The recitation section was often very confusing and I do not think the problems were explained that well. I don't think recitation significantly improved my learning or engagement in the course.

9697: The discussion section left much to be desired, communication was not encouraged enough and it just felt like more work rather than mutual problem solving and engagement

10595: The course has too much workload. It would be great if the schedule can be reorganized to make the workload spread out more equally. Besides, it is also a good idea to go over fewer contents than just simply rushing through too many topics within one semester. The assignments are so hard that the TAs deserve a solution beforehand in order to answer questions during office hours.
