

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
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	3.09	80	1	2	66	11	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	3.75	80	1	7	25	25	22
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	4.01	80	1	5	14	32	28
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	3.91	80	1	7	15	32	25
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	4.05	79	2	5	16	20	36
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	3.96	80	3	6	17	19	35

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	3.89	80	3	5	18	26	28
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	3.58	79	5	6	22	30	16
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	3.82	79	2	4	22	29	22
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	3.82	79	4	3	17	34	21
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	3.80	79	3	8	16	27	25
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	2.81	79	0	27	42	8	2
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	3.59	78	3	5	29	25	16

<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>	3.70	79	2	5	23	34	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>	3.91	79	1	2	25	26	25
<p>55. [Workload, Resources, Assignments &amp; Assessment] Exams &amp; Grading: Were exams and grading a fair and reasonable measure of your learning?</p> <p>1. No 2. Significant issues exist 3. Generally fair assessment of my learning 4. Well developed and fair 5. Yes, definitely</p>	3.65	79	5	9	18	24	23
<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>	4.46	78	1	0	3	32	42
<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>	3.95	79	1	2	20	33	23
<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>	4.42	79	0	1	8	27	43
<p>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?</p> <p>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 instructor(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)</p>	3.53	32	47	0	15	17	--

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	3.53	78	3	3	22	50	--
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	3.56	79	2	5	19	53	--
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	3.53	75	1	4	24	46	--
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	1.87	69	41	8	8	12	--
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.	3.30	79	12	9	21	17	20
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	4.05	79	2	6	12	25	34
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	3.96	78	2	5	17	24	30

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

**Comments On Course Content**

1658: Course content was very interesting and understandable. Great content.

---

1723: Great class, very good content wise

---

2343: More examples should be provided.

---

3421: none

---

4417: NA

---

5055: Frans made sure that every assignment encouraged us to think critically and creatively to solve problems. He used a variety of examples from different industries throughout the course to illustrate the material's real-world applications.

---

5364: more examples!! The nonlinear optimization unit was presented in such a confusing way.

---

5426: lack of examples in notes and class make it hard to understand the theoretical meaning of concepts

---

5672: My favorite ORIE class I've taken so far content-wise.

---

5778: I found some real-life applications of the course content to be helpful. However, I wish there were more, as the class can feel very theoretical at times.

---

5819: Recitations were very engaging ways to practice what I learned.

---

5831: This class embodied my favorite learning style. Introduce new concepts with small examples and then, generalize. I find this teaching style gives me the best understanding of the course material.

---

5933: Loved the content and found it very applicable to the field

---

6033: Course content was incredibly interesting. Optimization would have to be my favorite aspect of my ORIE education.

---

6267: Challenging material that was well taught

---

6427: I like the connection to real world problems.

---

6678: I took this course concurrently with CS 4820. There was a decent amount of overlap between the topics and I used my algorithms textbook to study for this class. It could be helpful to offer that resource to other students taking the class.

---

8515: Very specific and helpful.

---

8733: /

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

10044: Good.

---

10357: I particularly enjoyed the second half content of the course where problems dealing with linear programs that were very structured as applicable problems were assigned, this was the most rewarding portion.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

**Comments on Course Delivery**

1124: Content is organized and presented very well. I like that the professor does his best in making the content as accessible and easily understandable as possible through his teaching.

---

1658: The professor was very engaging, went at a great pace, explained things clearly, was super open to questions / comments, and was just overall a fantastic lecturer.

---

1723: One of the best lecturers I have had at Cornell.

---

3421: none

---

4417: NA

---

5055: I liked how Frans would write out key points to reinforce the material.

---

5364: There was no motivation to place the content in the context of our major. It would be very valuable if we actually had the chance to apply the material we learned to real-life as this material is applicable to real life but instead the focus of this course was on exams. As a junior in ORIE, I'm very disappointed in the lack of real-world projects my classes have done; the courses are so exam heavy in which students basically study for the exam and soon after forget the material. A real-life project would be more valuable in absorbing the material well as well as knowing how to apply it to real life.

---

5426: fine

---

5672: Prof. Frans was an excellent lecturer. He presented the material clearly and kept lectures engaging with light humor.

---

5778: I wish that lectures had more real-life examples or breakout time for students to talk about a problem. Copying notes can become a bit dry and prevent students from absorbing the material in real time when they are focused on copying the information from the blackboard.

---

5819: Good pace

---

5831: The lectures were very engaging and productive. I feel I learned a lot over the semester that I am eager to learn more about.

---

5933: amazing professor! He gave clear examples that really helped understand the topics and was always open to answering all questions.

---

6033: Props to Prof Schalekamp for making the course as engaging as he did. The course is very proof based at times, which can be very dry and tedious material. I definitely loved hearing his perspective on the material and how he approached each problem.

---

6267: Prof Schalekamp is a great teacher

---

7355: I like Professor Schalekamp. He was an interesting lecturer, and presented the course material with a kind of energy that made learning much more enjoyable than other classes I have taken.

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

---

7915: Amazing <3 - loved going to lecture

---

8515: Very clear.

---

9433: Some lectures seemed to move at a pretty slow pace.

---

10044: Good.

---

10357: NA

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

**Comments on laboratory component**

283: Will Xiao was a really great TA

---

734: redundant material to homeworks

---

1723: When classes moved online, I was unprepared for the switch. During the first lab I was told my computer couldn't download AMPL and thus I was reliant on the lab computers. This made doing labs and homeworks very hard because I had to FaceTime friends that did have AMPL and work with them to solve questions.

---

3421: none

---

4417: NA

---

5055: Recitations really helped me augment my understanding of the course material and see the real world applications. One recitation I particularly liked was a recitation where Frans had us generate patterns to a cutting stock problem. It showed us how we could use two different optimization problems to efficiently solve a real world problem and reduce waste.

---

5364: It would be nice if TA's could give some kind of review on the material on the lab before we start the lab.

---

5426: Lab assignments included content that was never seen in lecture with the expectation to complete it with knowledge of what to do. TAs of the labs extremely unhelpful with explaining concepts or even what to do in the lab

---

5672: I thought sometimes lab was a bit redundant to the HWs and too long.

---

5778: Labs were generally well run. I enjoyed some and felt that I grasped material better and understood real-life applications better. In others, I felt the lab was useless and TAs were not helpful in explaining the material.

---

5819: Recitations were very engaging ways to practice what I learned.

---

5831: Recitations helped to build on understanding. Working through an example of cutting planes and column generation in the last few recitations was especially helpful.

---

5933: The labs really helped me understand the material very well and the TAs were always ready to help out

---

6033: I personally found these labs not all too helpful. They were often very rushed, leaving me with an incomplete grasp of the concepts from the lab.

---

6267: Sometimes we had to wait a long time to have our questions answered by a TA during recitation

---

6427: Some of the labs were too long for the allotted time.

---

7355: My lab TAs (Karen and Rujuta) were always helpful whenever I asked questions. They were honestly my best TAs since I took differential equations two and a half years ago.

---

8093: I had incredible TAs for my lab sections in-person and after switching to online.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

There is a bit of timing issues with recitations. We had two different schedules: at the beginning, Monday evenings was the first day of the "week", and after prelim 1, Wednesday sections were the first of the "week" (making Tuesday the last day). My section was on Tuesday. In the first case, we would be confused and struggle a lot only to go into lecture the following day to learn about the ideas we struggled to figure out. In the second case, we would be behind and have already done a harder version in the homework ("it would have been nice to do this before the hw" feeling).

---

8229: in my lab section only one of the TA's (William) was helpful.

---

8515: Labs are a little bit difficult.

---

9433: Some labs were a little long for the time given, meaning material was not focused on in the interest of finishing the assignment.

---

10044: Great.

---

10357: The recitation assignments were extremely valuable in further synthesizing the course material and enhancing understanding.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

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

620: Content we learned very loosely was reflected on the first prelim.

---

1723: n/a

---

1803: I liked the format of the prelim

---

3421: none

---

4417: NA

---

5055: Assignments were challenging but rewarding and really forced you to actually learn the course material.

---

5364: Exams and homeworks were not grading accurately and fairly. There were so many grading issues on my homework assignments. I once received a failing grade on a homework and when I asked for a regrade (because I was confident in my answers) the score was raised to an A (significant discrepancies). The exams were also graded unfairly; the last two problems of our exam were meant to be challenging however the graders graded them as if they were easy problems. For example, I mostly got one of the challenging problems except for a few minor notational things and received less than half credit on it - ridiculous.

---

5672: I found the problem sets and exams were excellent in engaging me in the course material. I most liked how they forced me to critically think and problem solve in new ways.

---

5778: I have had many issues with TAs grading my work completely. On two occasions, complete questions on a homework and exam simply were not graded when there was correct content to grade. When I asked TAs, they pointed me to other TAs or Piazza, where my questions were not addressed until Professor Schalekamp (kindly) regraded my assignment.

---

5819: Very reasonable workload

---

5831: The workload was reasonable and furthered understanding. Exams were also reasonable and really tested the understanding of different concepts.

---

5933: Assignments helped a lot to understand the material and did require some thought beyond just plugging and chugging what was learned in class.

---

6033: Since this course involves very wordy problems, there were sometimes semantic issues in problems that made them very hard to understand what was being asked of us. These issues were mitigated by attending office hours.

---

6267: For Prelim I, the time constraint made it very difficult to demonstrate my full understanding of the material. I felt that I could have done a lot better if I were given more time given the nature of the "design-type" problems on the first prelim.

---

7355: I found the class to be well laid out, and I was directly able to translate what I learned from lab/recitation to my homework, my understanding of the course material, and to the prelims.

---

8091: I thought testing in particular was very fair considering the circumstances. I greatly appreciate having the 24

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

hour time window compared to some other courses where I was still held to a 2 hour testing session in an unfamiliar and uncomfortable setting.

---

8229: The first exam was unreasonably hard

---

10003: The first prelim, in my opinion, was very unfair. I had studied a decent amount and felt that I understood the material presented in class and on homeworks, but was shocked when it got to the exam. It did not test our knowledge of what we had learned so far, rather it was testing quick thinking and the ability to come up with unique tricks/solutions to the problems, which was very stressful given the time constraint. I found the questions really difficult and became really stressed because they were not really focused on content we had learned--my stress level, the time constraints, and the difficulty made this exam near impossible. I understand that grades were adjusted slightly because of this, but this course is not curved and this severely affected my standing in the class. I suggest curving the course if the exams are going to be that difficult. It is unfair to the students to expect that kind of rigor in a timed exam and then not allow for an adequate curve when the average is a 50.

On a positive note, I think the professor realized this and made the second prelim much more reasonable.

---

10044: Great and helpful.

---

10357: I felt the first prelim structure was arbitrary and hard to study for, other content was fine.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

### Comments on Environment-Diversity

3421: none

---

4417: NA

---

5778: Sometimes, during my assigned lab time, I was made to feel like I was bothering my TAs with my questions. At times, I sensed annoyance and apathy towards me, which eventually made me dread going to lab. I did not feel included, particularly by my male TAs. I feel that having a more diverse and empathetic group of TAs could be helpful for students in the future.

---

5819: Professor has been very kind.

---

10357: NA

---

College of Engineering, Cornell University  
Course Evaluation Response Summary  
Semester: Spring 2020 Course Owner: ORIE  
Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1 CID: 10484  
Instructor: Schalekamp  
82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response

---

### Comments on Environment-Academic Integrity

364: 24hr prelim 2.

---

3421: none

---

4417: NA

---

5778: I believe that the 24-hour open book test opens itself up greatly to breaches of academic integrity. During the test period, I was asked by fellow students if they wanted to compare answers. While I did not respond to these texts, this gives me reason to believe that these individuals compared answers with other students and that there was not an even playing field for the exams.

---

10357: NA

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

**Comments on Remote Teaching - Aspects to Continue**

1124: Remote learning arrangements were good to replace in-person learning but none adds extra value when there is in-person instruction.

---

1723: n/a

---

3421: none

---

4417: NA

---

5055: I thought the recorded lectures were very helpful to go back and rewatch confusing parts.

---

5364: Definitely recording lectures! I really enjoyed being able to watch the lectures and pause to process concepts. I stopped going to lectures when they were in person because I wasn't able to learn from them, they were just too fast for me. I would always be struggling to write down formulas and notes while also rushing to process the concepts before he moved on.

---

5426: recorded lectures

---

5674: Recording lectures.

---

5778: Posting notes after class.

---

5819: Recorded lectures! They were very valuable when I wanted to rewatch them for consolidating my understanding

---

7355: I found it was easier for people to ask questions online. I don't exactly know how to replicate it, but overall the teaching felt a lot more personal when it was online.

---

8091: Online office hours

---

10357: Posting annotated lecture slides.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

### Comments on TA

283: Will Xiao was an excellent TA. He was understanding, well-prepared, and articulate. I was always able to solve recitation problems in a timely manner with him, as well as learn from it.

---

401: Varun Suriyanarayana—He always went above and beyond to help, and his explanations were very clear and thorough. He even emailed me several explanations for questions that I asked in office hours that he couldn't find the answer to right away.

---

1723: n/a

---

3421: none

---

4417: NA

---

4589: Will Xiao is an amazing TA. He is extremely helpful and is able to explain concepts very easily. I know whenever I go to him, I will have my questions answered in no time. He is so smart and it really allows him to have a great handle of the course material and help me to better understand what is going on. I truly wish every TA was as good as Will. I don't think I have ever met a TA as good as him. He is also goes above and beyond and will respond to my emails even though he doesn't need to do it.

---

5055: Karen - he made a point to learn people's names and then help them understand the importance of the course material and its applications instead of just teaching us what we needed to know for the homework. The night before the second prelim I came to his office hours and told him I was struggling with dynamic programming. He carefully walked me through the content and then gave me really helpful tips for approaching these kinds of problems.

---

5364: Rujuta Desai because she is always very helpful in office hours and during lab. She explains concepts very well and is also really nice and pleasant to talk to. Compared to the other TA's for this course, she is so much more eager to help and so much more kind and approachable.

---

5672: Varun. Went above and beyond to help with problem set. He would respond to email questions when no one would respond on Piazza and there were no office hours.

---

5778: William is a very understanding TA who has a gift for breaking down content without making students feel dumb. His kindness and flexibility has made a difference in my learning for the semester.

---

8093: Varun Suriyanarayana  
I had him as a TA for ORIE 3300 as well, and he is consistently reliable. I can trust leaving his office hours with my questions answered and a better understanding of subject matters.

---

8229: William. He was very committed to helping students and explained things so well.

---

9171: Varun and Karen

---

10044: Karen Grigorian

---

10357: NA

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

### Comments on Strengths

283: Professor Frans is a very charismatic, kind professor. He took in consideration the situations of many people during these difficult times and shifted the focus from grades to learning for the sake of learning. It was a huge weight off of my back and made me feel better about my ability to pass the course.

---

401: Great lecturer. Very clear and accessible.

---

620: It was always interesting to learn from the professor. He had a great attitude and sense of humor.

---

1168: Lectures followed the "textbook" relatively well, which made it easy to reinforce learning by studying the textbook. However there were times where they didn't align, which made things confusing.

---

1723: Great lecturer and very good at connecting with his students. Also does a phenomenal job of showing students how the material relates to the real world.

---

3421: I love you Frans

---

4417: Homework, recitation, lecture content and delivery

---

5055: While it can be frustrating at times, Frans likes to answer some of our homework questions by simply telling us to think. This helps us learn the course content thoroughly instead of him just giving away the answers. I am very thankful for how he did this and encouraged us to think creatively because he is preparing us better for the real world. Of course Frans would give us hints and help us along the way but he did it in a manner that fostered this creative thinking.

---

5672: Good lectures with better assignments and exams.

---

5819: Professor encouraged us to ask questions and made it a very safe environment to do so without feeling judged.

---

5831: Again, Prof. Schalekamp embodies my favorite teaching style. Each lecture was very educational and motivated me to dive deeper into many topics. I hope to take another class with him before my time at Cornell is over.

---

6033: Professor Schalekamp is a very nice and knowledgeable professor. I really enjoyed his teaching.

---

6267: Lecturing abilities, interesting material and applications

---

6427: He was very funny.

---

8093: I like the content of this course. Also my first time going to professor office hours which was much less scary than it sounds.

---

8389: Prof. Frans does a great job of engaging the class and making the material interesting.

---

9171: It's a lot like opt 1, but more thinking about how to structure and encode problems and less brute computation which is nice.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2020      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1      CID: 10484**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response**

---

9433: Professor was very good at lecturing. He displayed enthusiasm for the material and provided clear explanations.

---

10044: Clear instruction delievery and assignments.

---

10357: NA

---

College of Engineering, Cornell University  
Course Evaluation Response Summary  
Semester: Spring 2020 Course Owner: ORIE  
Course: ORIE 3310 Lec 1 CID: 10484  
Instructor: Schalekamp  
82 Responses, 105 Enrolled, 78.10% Response

---

### Comments on Weaknesses

620: There would occasionally be mistakes in the lectures leading to mass amounts of confusion.

---

1723: N/A

---

3421: none

---

4417: NA

---

5364: I really think getting rid of one of the exams and replacing it with a real-world project would be very valuable to students taking this course.

---

5778: I found the course disorganized and dry. The lack of academic integrity surrounding exams concerns me for future online instruction of this course. TAs were generally not helpful and unsympathetic to students, from my experience, and discouraged enthusiasm for course content.

---

10357: NA

---