

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 **Course Owner: ORIE**
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 **CID: 11017**
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% 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	36	0	3	27	3	3
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	4.17	36	1	1	7	9	18
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	4.11	36	2	2	2	14	16
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	4.39	36	1	1	3	9	22
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	4.34	35	2	1	1	10	21
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	4.20	35	2	2	2	10	19
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	4.23	35	3	1	2	8	21

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	4.31	35	1	1	2	13	18
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	--	0	0	0	0	0	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	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	2.72	36	1	19	9	3	4
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	4.11	36	1	1	7	11	16
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	4.03	36	1	1	10	8	16

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	4.17	35	1	1	6	10	17
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	4.17	36	1	1	7	9	18
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	4.61	36	1	0	0	10	25
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	4.31	35	0	2	2	14	17
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	4.71	35	1	0	0	6	28
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	4.25	36	1	3	2	10	20
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	4.19	36	0	4	4	9	19

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 **Course Owner: ORIE**
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 **CID: 11017**
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% Response

Comments On Course Content

2042: It's clear and vivid, and easy to understand.

2897: Very applicable monte carlo simulation, and helps me review my statistics and python programming.

10316: I honestly hope a dean or someone in charge is reading this. This hands down the worst class ever taken while at Cornell. Ok I get it, the Professor is smart but his teaching ability is a shame. I will not go into details because it is a waste of time. My experience was a 0/10 and genuine waste of time. Content was messy and huge mess. TA's were horrible and did not speak english! What horrible teaching staff. I will make sure to go to hell with this review and escalate this further. I wish you all the best because you need all the help you can get.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 CID: 11017
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% Response

Comments on Course Delivery

2897: Very good!

10316: Horrible, lecture notes look like my 6 year old sister wrote it. huge mess and disorganized.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 CID: 11017
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% Response

Comments on Environment-Academic Integrity

10316: I ask you to do one thing, block WeChat and have students speak english. the amount of cheating was unreal. Many academic violations were broken INCLUDING FROM THE TEACHING ASSISTANTS.

I HAVE EVIDENCE! :)

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 CID: 11017
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% Response

Comments on Environment-Assistance

10316: What a joke of question. Little to no help available.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 CID: 11017
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% Response

Comments on Environment-Diversity

10316: I am considering pursuing legal action after my experience in this class. I have a meeting set up with my counsel to discuss a class-action law suit. Because my experience stands behind a lot of students in the course. Man I will raise hell to you and your department. I wish you all the best because you really need the help. I really hope someone in charge is reading this.

Extremely racist in the course. Us Indian students do not cheat but you can see all the Chinese students cheating on WeChat.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 **Course Owner: ORIE**
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 **CID: 11017**
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% Response

Comments on Strengths

2897: Very clear lessons. Detail-oriented style with many examples. Reasonable homeworks and excellent recitation.

10119: Very useful contents and good coding questions in the assignments!

10316: I'll give you credit in one area and that is you are a funny guy. But your careless personality makes students stress out a lot.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 **Course Owner: ORIE**
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 **CID: 11017**
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% Response

Comments on TA

2897: Jiayue Wan(jw2529) and Yuxuan Liu (yl2999). They have prepared recitation lessons very well, giving us exercises on both python and statistics. They give very clear and detailed demonstration and their teaching style are even better than many lecturers in Cornell. Meanwhile, they are very kind to help us understand and cope with puzzles.

I should say, they should have spent a lot of time for us better understanding the course materials. They deserve the teaching award.

10119: The TAs are all very nice, especially Wan Jiayue. He can always explain the problems very clearly and is well prepared.

10316: Is this a joke, there should be a box for worst TA award nomination.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 **Course Owner: ORIE**
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 **CID: 11017**
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% Response

Comments on the recitation or discussion section

2042: We can do useful practice using Jupyter Notebook and the answers are quickly posted for us to correct our mistakes.

2897: Jiayue Wan(jw2529): excellent TA
Yuxuan Liu (yl2999): excellent TA

10316: What a waste of time. The TA's was more than horrible. I WOULD NEVER BELIEVE IN MY LIFE THAT I WOULD BE AT A LOSS BEING ABLE TO SPEAK ENGLISH IN AN AMERICAN UNIVERSITY. If I spoke Chinese I would have an A+ and not an B+.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 CID: 11017
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% Response

Comments on Weaknesses

2042: I think it could be better for us to do a small project in the first eight weeks (for ORIE 5581) to deeper our understanding.

2319: Too many students enrolled in this course, and the classroom was too crowded.

10316: I CAN NOT WAIT TO PURSUE LEGAL ACTION. HORRIBLE COURSE. WASTE OF TIME. HORRIBLE PROFESSOR.

College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2019 Course Owner: ORIE
Course: ORIE 5581 Lec 1 CID: 11017
Instructor: Schalekamp
37 Responses, 76 Enrolled, 48.68% Response

Comments on workload, resources, assignments, and assessments

2897: reasonable

10316: What a waste of time everything was. Homework was a gigantic mess. Horrible teaching by TA's. TA'S LEARN TO SPEAK ENGLISH.
