

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021 Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1 CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

Question	Mean	Count	1	2	3	4	5
<p>11. [Course Content] How did you participate in this course? (Answer for the way you attended for most of the semester)</p> <p>1. Attended sessions online, approximately half synchronously and half asynchronously</p> <p>2. Attended most sessions synchronously online (i.e., via zoom)</p> <p>3. Attended most sessions asynchronously online (i.e., watched video recordings; completed modules)</p> <p>4. Attended a mix of online and in person class sessions</p> <p>5. Attended most sessions in person (i.e., in the classroom)</p>	2.23	112	15	63	29	3	2
<p>12. [Course Content] Content Organization: Did the course structure and organization facilitate your learning?</p> <p>1. Very disorganized, significantly hindered my learning</p> <p>2. Somewhat disorganized</p> <p>3. Adequately organized</p> <p>4. Well organized</p> <p>5. Very well organized and structured, significantly enhanced my learning</p>	4.06	110	3	2	19	47	39
<p>13. [Course Content] Synthesize &amp; Apply Content: This course challenged me to synthesize ideas, think critically about the content, and apply the material to unfamiliar topics and problems.</p> <p>1. Not at all</p> <p>2. Occasionally</p> <p>3. Every few classes</p> <p>4. Many classes and assignments</p> <p>5. Nearly every class and assignment</p>	3.96	110	0	9	18	51	32
<p>14. [Course Content] Examples &amp; Applications: Were the number and variety of examples and practical applications presented appropriate to the course content and for your learning style?</p> <p>1. No, almost no examples</p> <p>2. A few, but insufficient number and/or mostly trivial</p> <p>3. Some, but more or higher quality would have been helpful</p> <p>4. Yes, including some very good ones</p> <p>5. Excellent use of examples and applications that significantly increased my understanding of the material</p>	4.04	111	0	4	24	47	36
<p>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?</p> <p>1. No, usually poorly done</p> <p>2. Sometimes</p> <p>3. Usually adequate</p> <p>4. Usually good</p> <p>5. Nearly always very good</p>	4.17	110	1	5	17	38	49
<p>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)?</p> <p>1. No</p> <p>2. Somewhat</p> <p>3. Adequately</p> <p>4. Mostly</p> <p>5. Absolutely</p>	3.80	110	5	8	21	46	30

<p>23. [Course Delivery] Engagement: Did the lecturer present material in an engaging way, which improved your understanding of the course content?</p> <p>1. No, generally boring  2. Rarely engaging  3. Generally held my attention  4. Engaging  5. Very engaging and often required actively thinking about material</p>	3.84	111	5	6	28	35	37
<p>31. [Recitation or Discussion Section] Was the section effective in increasing your understanding of, and ability to use, the course material?</p> <p>1. No, usually poorly done  2. Sometimes  3. Usually adequate  4. Usually good  5. Nearly always very good</p>	3.69	108	5	17	17	36	33
<p>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)?</p> <p>1. Minimal value  2. Occasional value  3. Moderate value  4. Significant value  5. Very valuable, well worth time spent on them</p>	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>42. [Laboratory Expectations] Lab expectations (goals, tasks, reports, deadlines, etc.) were clear and realistic.</p> <p>1. Not at all  2. Partially  3. Adequately  4. Usually clear and realistic  5. Almost always very clear and realistic</p>	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>43. [Laboratory Resources] Lab resources (equipment, software, information, instructions, etc.) were sufficient to provide a positive experience.</p> <p>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</p>	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>44. [Laboratory Staffing] Support and help, during lab and for lab reports, were sufficient to successfully complete and analyze experiments.</p> <p>1. Rarely sufficient  2. Partially sufficient  3. Adequate  4. Almost always sufficient  5. Excellent, significantly enhanced the laboratory experience</p>	--	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>52. [Workload, Resources, Assignments &amp; 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.</p> <p>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</p>	3.94	110	2	2	30	43	33

<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimally</li> <li>2. Sometimes</li> <li>3. Usually</li> <li>4. Almost always</li> <li>5. Reliably and significantly increased my understanding and ability</li> </ol>	4.00	110	3	6	18	44	39
<p>55. [Workload, Resources, Assignments &amp; Assessment] Exams &amp; 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"> <li>1. No</li> <li>2. Significant issues exist</li> <li>3. Generally fair assessment of my learning</li> <li>4. Well developed and fair</li> <li>5. Yes, definitely</li> </ol>	3.55	110	3	13	39	30	25
<p>56. [Workload, Resources, Assignments &amp; Assessment] For classes with recorded lectures: How often did you return to recorded lectures for reference (i.e., after your initial participation in or viewing of a class session)?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Never</li> <li>2. Once or twice a month or less</li> <li>3. Weekly</li> <li>4. Daily or almost daily</li> <li>5. N/A (there were no recordings available)</li> </ol>	2.34	102	17	41	36	8	6
<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extremely non-inclusive with inappropriate comments and/or behaviors</li> <li>2. Actively not inclusive with certain students ignored, left out, or treated dismissively</li> <li>3. Passively not inclusive; comments or contributions by some students are valued less than those of other students</li> <li>4. Passively inclusive where everyone is welcome to participate, nothing specific to encourage or discourage anyone</li> <li>5. Actively inclusive, all are fully encouraged to participate and are supported</li> </ol>	4.45	108	1	0	3	49	55
<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"> <li>1. Almost no access and/or help was ineffective</li> <li>2. Limited access or value</li> <li>3. Acceptable access and help</li> <li>4. Good access with quality help</li> <li>5. Abundantly available high quality help</li> </ol>	4.02	110	1	7	19	45	38
<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"> <li>1. Blatant disregard for Academic Integrity</li> <li>2. No, violations clearly occurred that were not addressed</li> <li>3. Not strongly, violations could well have occurred (even if I am not aware of any)</li> <li>4. Yes, instructor took reasonable steps to maintain academic integrity</li> <li>5. Yes, academic integrity was clearly and intentionally maintained</li> </ol>	4.49	108	0	0	9	37	62

<p>81. [Interaction] To what extent did the instructor(s) provide opportunities to interact with other students in the course?</p> <p>1. The instructor explicitly prohibited working with other students.  2. The instructor allowed discussion of work with other students but did not facilitate it, submitted work was individual effort only.  3. The instructor encouraged interaction with other students and provided opportunities for this.  4. The instructor required interaction with other students or required groupwork for some of the work in the course.  5. Groupwork and/or interaction with other students was a very significant element of the course.</p>	2.80	107	0	56	30	7	14
<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>	3.86	109	2	7	19	57	24
<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>	3.74	109	3	5	31	48	22

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

### Comments On Course Content

400: Great organization, really helped me follow along. the lecture examples were very helpful, as well.

---

2613: Prof. Schalekamp used subheadings in his slide decks that made his lectures very easy to follow, both during and after the synchronous Zoom lectures.

---

3384: The course content is very interesting and gives good coverage of an introduction to statistics.

---

3802: the prelims are very hard and bizarre but only one sample prelim is given for practiced.

---

4693: The course content was covered at a good rate that helped with my learning of the course material.

---

4890: Course content was very good. The material covered was explained well.

---

6277: Very clear.

---

6709: This was a great course, I normally don't enjoy probability or statistics but the professor's enthusiasm made the material enjoyable.

---

6885: The content was very much covered in a way that angles towards people who learn from a conceptual angle. For those of us who learn via ample examples and being walked through questions, there was a significant lack of this style of content.

---

6936: The content is well organized, and expectations were made clear.

---

7130: I wish we had more sample problems for exams

---

7438: excellent. timely examples on disease/testing statistics. helped me feel more confident and comfortable in understanding and analyzing all the covid statistics flying around this semester. interesting because its one of the few courses ive taken that seems immediately useful in my life even outside of school, just in my life as a person. wasnt great grade-wise tbh in this course but glad i took it cuz man it seems useful

---

7869: amazing organization

---

8055: Awesome!

---

8078: Course content was applicable to real life and wasn't overly difficult to grasp.

---

8447: The course material seems very outdated. Examples not great.

---

8595: would appreciate more different types of examples done during lecture

---

9293: The course is well-structured with clear outlined slides and good examples.

---

9439: Professor Schalekamp made a review sheet for the confidence interval in replace for a missing recitation, but I find it would be helpful there is more resources like that we can refer to.

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

---

9738: I think some more difficult examples could have been presented during lecture, as there was quite a difficulty jumping from lecture material to the homework questions.

---

9739: Second half of the course held most of the challenging and more interesting content.

---

10063: The content of the course was great. As the course progressed, I found myself more and more being able to think about what we learn and how it may play a role in something that I witness casually.

---

10368: Wish there were more realistic examples

---

10505: N/A

---

10620: This is mostly the fault of the students and not the instructor, but there seemed to be a bit too much emphasis on how to perform certain calculus problems. Given that calculus was a prerequisite, one would expect that all students have a basic understanding of how to apply the necessary math. It was frustrating to have to slowly go through problems that involved basic calculus since the math was reasonably expected of an engineering student who has completed multivariable calculus.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

### Comments on Course Delivery

242: The lecturer is great, I just feel the content itself can be dry. Maybe less emphasis on the theory would help make the course more interesting, since I feel like I spent a lot of time just memorizing formulas and there was not as much application.

---

400: Mostly well done besides a few groggy lectures, did very well at clarifying students questions and understanding students overall.

---

1160: Professor is very engaging!

---

2613: Prof. Schalekamp is a very engaging lecturer - he is clearly happy about what he teaches, and he's very good at showing that in his lectures.

---

3384: The course delivery was good, especially considering that it was over zoom for its entirety.

---

3459: Often I felt like the lectures were very rushed-- I struggled to take notes and actually process information with the pace of the lectures. It would have been nicer to go slower and have more time to breathe and take in new content.

---

4693: The course was delivered well.

---

4761: I like how professor puts many interesting examples with nice illustrations on slides.

---

4890: Very good lectures. Felt more of like a discussion and gave us a 5 minute break which really helped break up a very long lecture.

---

6016: Professor Schalekamp is an AMAZING lecturer! Very engaging and makes statistics fun to learn about.

---

6277: I like how Prof. speaks.

---

6333: Really loved the Professor's snips of humor!

---

6361: Professor was very enthusiastic and up beat! Liked the short breaks for mental recovery and the nice stories

---

6709: One of the best instructors I have had yet, thank you for a great semester.

---

6885: The lectures weren't delivered in a very engaging manner, and this was made worse by the cramped handwriting of examples that often weren't worked all the way through during lecture. Trying to review these after the fact made learning from the examples even harder.

---

7438: pretty engaging. sometimes lost the connection to the course as a whole but the beginning and end little summaries were a great way to transition between lectures and tie stuff together

---

**IMPORTANT POSITIVE:** Profs willingness to adjust to a crazy semester and his care for our mental health was amazing and helped my learning immensely. i got a bunch of emails saying people cared and acknowledging this was a tough time, but this prof was one of the few who i felt took actual action that actually helped me and my classmates ie extra hw drops, a shortened hw, timely announcements on updates and accommodations, flexibility on a tough exam question, etc. He backed up what he said with `_action_`. Flowery speech only goes so far, and this prof had our

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

backs this semester. thanks. great lecturer and an even better person. thank you. seriously. tbh exams were sucky and this wasnt my best grade (lol) but srsly u and ur class overall was a bright spot in a tough semester. u respected us enough and had enough faith in us to give us hard questions but also backed us up in real, tangible, effective ways. You simultaneously cared about our education and about us as people, compromising on neither. In all my time as a student, I can think of only 1 other prof I would put on a similar level. 10/10. Thank you. (thank god this is anonymous- im such a sap lol)

oh also i liked the zoom chat haha. that little interactivity was fun and engaging

---

7512: Really appreciated the pace of lectures.

---

7869: Professor Frans is a great lecturer. He knows how to present his materials and engage students.

---

8055: It was good, especially because professor gave us a break.

---

8078: Some lectures were a little bit dry but often times than not Frans taught the class very well and kept me learning.

---

8224: I'm a mechanical engineer fulfilling my math requirement. I did not see where this class would help me, especially having worked in the field.

---

9293: The lecturer presents the material in a very clear and engaging way, which makes the material easy to understand.

---

9439: Professor Schalekamp should not keep saying "you know" during lecture. I find it annoyed because I don't know the materials, that's why I am attending lecture to learn. It would be helpful to encourage participants with students instead of lecturing 90 minutes with 5 minutes break and everyone with camera off.

---

9739: It was easier for me to learn by reviewing the slides after class; having them posted was very helpful.

---

10269: I thought Professor Schalekamp did an excellent job explaining all topics and concepts. He clearly defined everything and then provided clear and helpful examples to illustrate the concept. These examples were very helpful to look back on when doing the assignments, and he always explained the examples well and thoroughly answered questions.

---

10368: I wish the material could maybe be more discussion based somehow instead of just a lecture.

---

10505: N/A

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

**Comments on the recitation or discussion section**

242: Billy is a very knowledgeable and helpful TA!

---

400: They really helped me learn how to apply concepts to various scenarios.

---

2613: Recitations were often simply ways to deliver problem sets; Although they were good review sessions, I stopped going to them halfway through the semester after realizing I could do the problems asynchronously without the distractions that other students' questions would provide.

---

3384: My discussion section was DIS 203 on Wednesdays from 9:40 - 10:55. The TAs were very helpful to give hints for the recitation assignments.

---

4693: The Recitation was helpful in expanding my understanding of the course (Wed 9:40).

---

4701: The recitations were completely pointless. Didn't reinforce any course content or topics. (Thursday 11:45am)

---

4761: Friday DIS 205, Heming Li

The TAs in this section are very patient and are willing to provide personalized help to enhance our understanding.

---

4890: My TA and discussion was incredible. Monday at 1pm with Billy. He was always so kind and willing to help and explain the discussion questions.

---

6016: Discussion was incredibly helpful! I attended Monday discussions at 1PM.

---

6277: Good.

---

6709: I would've preferred the TA to just work through the discussion problems with us instead of us doing them on our own.

---

6885: Recitation essentially equated to everybody showing up, quietly working on the recitation, and then leaving. The TA's didn't have much more information than was on the sheets. Going wasn't a great use of time.

---

7130: Tonghua is amazing!

---

7207: I would appreciate if the TAs were more hands on during discussion but I understand how it is difficult with COVID.

---

7438: felt kinda confusing at times but was useful in understanding material. due dates for recitation problems were confusing/unexpected tho and i sometimes missed submissions for work that i had done. that was frustrating and my fault but also, due sat night? y, weird time lol

---

8055: I did discussion worksheets on my own time.

---

8224: I had Billy. Very good TA, always helpful.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

8595: recitation problems were useful in getting a deeper understanding of the material and improving ability to apply knowledge to solving problems, doing recitation problems helped with homework (Tues 2:45)

---

9293: (Session DIS 204) The recitation problem set is well designed. I only attended the first few sessions, however. I didn't like the structure of the session, and I can figure out the practice problems myself.

---

9439: I attended Monday recitation. I don't like the way recitation is run because everyone have their camera off and silent. Basically students do not collaborate and do their own work. When you asked for help in the TA, they put you in breakout room. I do not see the point of this because other students might have the same questions, and it would be more effectively to answer it to the entire class.

---

9653: didn't really go to the recitations, just did the labs on my own

---

9739: Recitation assignments sometimes felt similar to the homeworks.

---

10505: Felt too much like office hours

---

10620: My interactions with TAs were limited to occasions where I didn't understand a question on the recitation worksheet, but the worksheets themselves were great.

---

College of Engineering, Cornell University  
Course Evaluation Response Summary  
Semester: Spring 2021 Course Owner: ORIE  
Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1 CID: 10099  
Instructor: Schalekamp  
114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response

---

**[Workload] How many hours per week on average did you spend doing work associated with this course outside of scheduled class time?**

154: 2-5 hours

---

242: 4

---

400: 4

---

708: 14

---

1098: 4

---

1134: 7

---

1155: 3

---

1379: 7

---

2297: 4

---

2351: 4

---

2577: 8

---

2613: 5

---

2711: 4

---

3384: 5

---

3391: 4

---

3459: 5

---

3578: 3

---

3597: 5

---

3653: 4

---

3656: 15

---

3781: 6

---

3802: 15

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

3965: 3-4

4693: 10

4701: 10

4761: 6

4890: 6

5653: 9

5944: 3.5

6190: 6

6277: 4 hours.

6361: 5

6642: 10

6709: 3-5

6885: 15

6936: 5

7094: 4

7130: 3-5

7207: 8

7351: 5

7438: 13

7497: 4

7512: 3-4

7517: 4

7571: 5 hr

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

7869: 4

---

8055: 10

---

8078: 10

---

8085: 6-9

---

8104: 5

---

8224: 4

---

8370: 5

---

8411: 10

---

8595: 6-8

---

9293: 5

---

9435: 2

---

9439: 9

---

9653: 1.5

---

9656: 1

---

9738: 4-6 hours

---

9739: 5

---

10063: 6 hours a week

---

10158: 3

---

10269: 4

---

10368: 6

---

10505: 5-6

---

10620: 3-4

---

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

242: I do not think the exams were fair assessments of learning. The first exam was more so, but the second exam was drastically different from both practice prelims and problems given throughout the course, and the difficulty was unnecessary and not a good measurement of a student's understanding of statistics, but instead measured a student's ability to do complex calculus (which is not the focus of this course). I also find that assignments are unpredictable in difficulty, as in problems will suddenly spike in difficulty, seemingly arbitrarily, and students are not given any preparation for how to solve these.

---

400: Good workload and assessments

---

708: Grade was based on exams too much - wished there was more time for feedback on homework prior to examination

---

1134: I feel like I need more time for the second prelim.

---

2613: Workload for this class is very manageable; Prof. Schalekamp did a good job balancing the amount of time required relative to the amount learned.

---

3384: The workload is good for the amount of course material covered in the week. There are lots of good resources available to the student, such as office hours and ED discussion. The assignments are similar to practice examples given during class, along with some new ideas that require more thinking. The assessments are a good coverage of what is being taught in class.

---

3653: Awesome balance of assignments in this class and exams were very fair.

---

4693: The workload for this class was fair for the amount of material that was covered.

---

4701: I have never answered so any questions on homework correctly and received no credit. Questions were written vaguely and if you didn't show exactly what the TA template showed you were docked points even though correct answers were given and formulas/concepts used. TAs were unresponsive about how they graded homework or unwilling to take a second look.

---

4890: Workload was alright but there is a homework released EVERY week basically so it is quite a bit to keep up with. The first assessment was fair but I feel like the second prelim was quite difficult and deviated a lot from examples we did in lecture or discussion or homework.

---

5944: The exams were focused around one topic and had multiple questions on said topic rather than covering the content we were told to prepare for

---

6277: I like to work on stats.

---

6361: Second prelim was really unexpected on my part! I had studied so hard but still didn't do well. I wish we could get grade boundaries after exams so we could estimate our class grades

---

6885: The assignments were valuable for learning the course material. However, exam grading wasn't generally curved, and the one exam that was curved was curved to a flat C. The massive emphasis on exams in the course (70%) actively punished those who performed better in a controlled environment than under pressure of exams, and

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

made this an absolutely miserable class for me this semester. Assuming Professor Schalekamp structures his other classes this way, I would actively avoid taking them in the future.

---

6910: I find it a bit far-fetched that all exams were done with no calculator, no notes, and no formula sheets. We were taught how to use R Studio, an electronic program used for statistics problems. Homework would require the use of a calculator, yet exams were so removed from the format of everything else in the course. To review for exams, we were only given one document of practice problems each. They were multiple choice, when the exams weren't even multiple choice. There were no previous prelims to reference from. The exams were so far removed from everything we had learned in terms of format.

---

7002: I used recorded lectures for the last week b/c I got sick from the covid shot so record lectures were helpful.

---

7130: Prelim 2 was really hard. I don't think we had material on that level of difficulty, so it was left field for almost everyone. I hope future exams are not like that.

---

7207: I believe the exams were drastically different than the level of homeworks and in class examples which has made it extremely challenging.

---

7438: recordings helpful for review. some exam questions just seemed uh for lack of a better word mean? prelim 2 q5 im looking @ u. realized my first method (z) was wrong, then tried t, realized that was wrong but didnt know what else to try because that wasnt something we really practiced and just spent so much time on that i ran out of time for other things and spent the rest of the exam sad that i got so stuck. im still confused on how to do that one  
update: thanks for giving us points back on that, just saw that- neat & looks like i wasnt the only one thrown by that. didnt mean to bash u on that tbh im more mad at myself on how i did on that exam

---

8055: Prelim 2 was a bit too hard.

---

8078: Workload was fair and plus Frans added a homework drop that I believe the entire class needed so thank you for that.

---

8104: first and second exams were very inconsistent to one another (second was way more challenging)

---

8224: I would read the slides. Some of the slides could've had key equations boxed or processes more clearly stated, instead of "... " in an example.

---

8595: workload was reasonable, some exam problems were difficult

---

9293: The workload is just adequate.

---

9439: At the beginning, I don't like the way the Professor Schalekamp let ourselves figuring out R by our own. As a beginner, I felt frustrated when I asked TA for help, but I still do not understand what to do. To me, this is unfair compared to students who has experienced with R. There is one R coding question on HW 1 that I have trouble on, and I could not figure out how to do it, and the lecture does not seem to cover it as well. Also, I would prefer handwrite the hw rather than typing because we have to be comfortable with handwrite when we take the exam as well.

---

9739: Sometimes the recitation assignments felt unnecessary.

---

10063: The homework was made very well suited for practice. Considering the class is not curved, prelim 1 felt like the perfect exam that tested if you knew the material but was of reasonable difficulty given the depth of the class. Prelim 2, was much harder and a bit unreasonable. Not only that, but led to panic when seeing it knowing that it would

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

be uncurved. Overall though, I really really love the content!! Definitely one of my favorite courses this semester if not the best!

---

10259: Forcing us to memorize a number of equations for each exam does not feel like a proper way to measure our ability. Many engineering and mathematics classes give students a formula sheet or let them bring a cheat sheet for a reason; in the stress of the exam, I found myself likely to forget or mix up the numerous, very similar equations

---

10505: N/A

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

**Comments on Environment-Diversity**

4693: No issues.

---

4890: I thought there was a great diverse course staff which really helps with feelings of inclusivity.

---

6277: Good.

---

7438: not an issue, positive comment. prof took steps to be actively inclusive, something i dont always see in math/science (as a girl). usually it just gets as good as passive inclusion. ive never really felt explicitly excluded in classes (just brush off an all too common lack of female classmates in stem) but in this class i felt actively included. the explicitly non-binary inclusive comment following an early, gender-focused in-class example was cool acknowledgement (something i mighta missed tbh as a cis woman) and set a great tone for me that stuck thru the semester. pretty rare to see (unfortunately) and a pleasant surprise tbh. kudos prof

---

8055: No problems

---

9739: Professor Schalekamp showed very little compassion. The final exam has both an online and in person version but no matter how politely you ask, even with good reason Schalekamp was power hungry and made no exceptions to in-person students that needed to go home early and take the exam online. This was very inconvenient considering that the final was given on a late date.

---

10505: N/A

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

### Comments on Environment-Assistance

2613: TA office hours were plentiful; there was never a time I had to wait a long time to get a question answered.

---

3802: not a lot of oh are friendly to different time zone

---

4693: I didn't really attend office hours, but when I needed to it was always easy for me to get help.

---

4890: I thought there were a great amount of office hours for this course especially since there was a homework due each week.

---

6277: TAs are accessible.

---

6709: Would've liked a few more office hours concentrated near when homeworks were due, but generally good office hours.

---

6885: The Ed wasn't too actively maintained, with questions about homeworks and PSets that weren't posted multiple days before the deadline often just going unanswered. Trying to ask a question within 24 hours of the due date of a PSet was generally a lost cause.

---

7002: lots of office hours...thank you!

---

7438: tas helpful. ex: OH were great for hw assistance. i used ed very little, i think live help is better for math

---

8055: The TA were very helpful.

---

8224: I went to recitations for help. All my questions were answered and helped my performance in the class.

---

8595: would appreciate having office hours on Thursdays, I understand that the hw is due on Thursdays but often times I was not able to start the hw early in the week and get the help I needed due to assignments for other classes being due earlier

---

9293: The reply speed on Ed is a bit slow...

---

9439: The TA doesn't have their office hour listed on Canvas calendar and Zoom. One TA Qiaochu changed her office hour multiple times, and she doesn't seem to be on call when it is her office hour. I felt frustrated when seeing Zoom saying waiting for host to start a meeting. This happens several times to me. Elva Gao doesn't have her office hour listed on Zoom or Canvas calendar, how do we know if she actually hold office hour?

---

10505: N/A

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

### **Comments on Environment-Academic Integrity**

4693: No issues.

---

6016: Having the class take an in person exam without calculators or cheat sheets when a portion of the class can take it online and easily cheat seems unfair.

---

6277: Very organized.

---

7438: idk any issues. was worried with the exam being online and in person but it went surprisingly well i think

---

8055: no problems

---

9739: Online exams were proctored.

---

10505: N/A

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

**Comments on TA**

154: Cher Xu, Tonghua Tian, Maggie (Hemeng) Li  
All were great/passionate/compassionate TAs and really deserve to be awarded for their hard work!

---

3802: N/A

---

4693: None

---

4890: Billy Zhengxu Jin - He was extremely kind and never made me feel dumb for asking any question and created a great environment for learning in discussion and in office hours !!

---

7002: Billy Jin. He's amazing and broke down concepts well. I did homework early just to go to his office hours.

---

7130: Tonghua carried this class. Give her an award.

---

8055: None in particular

---

8595: Billy - He was my recitation TA and I really appreciated how he explained topics. He often helped me derive equations to understand how they came about and explained concepts well.

---

10063: I would like to nominate Nalu Concepcion. Throughout my time in the class, Nalu was unlike most TAs that I find in engineering. Nalu not only made sure to help you understand how to solve the problem but also the thinking process behind it to understand the concepts better. Furthermore, when getting assistance from her, I never felt judged for my questions but rather encouraged to learn, which I once again don't find in many engineering TAs. On top of that, even if her time was up, she clearly did not rush her assistance as a result and instead maintained her thoroughness in helping. It was this unique character, friendliness, and quality of explanation that made me feel compelled to take the time to nominate her.

---

10213: Rachel was incredibly helpful

---

10505: N/A

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

### Comments on Strengths

154: discussions, homework, recitation, AEW

---

242: The recitation exercises

---

400: The lecture slides being available before the lecture really helped me follow along. I also benefitted greatly from the recitations.

---

2351: The discussions gave us good practice on the topics we learn in lecture. Also, Prof Schalekamp actively encouraged us to ask questions and stop him whenever needed.

---

2711: being synchronous

---

3578: The summary sheets at the beginning of each discussion section

---

3802: N/A

---

4693: The online lecture videos

---

4890: Discussion section, homework problems, and attending lecture.

---

6277: The lectures and assignments on using R.

---

6885: The recorded lectures were more accessible than some other courses, which I appreciated as somebody who makes frequent reference to previous material.

---

6977: Problem sets

---

7002: I liked the discussion was asych. I liked how lecture participation wasn't graded b/c I wasn't scared to be wrong.

---

7094: the lecture slides were very high quality since they contained all of the material

---

7130: Recorded lectures

---

7438: IMPORTANT POSITIVE: Profs willingness to adjust to a crazy semester and his care for our mental health was amazing and helped my learning immensely. i got a bunch of emails saying people cared and acknowledging this was a tough time, but this prof was one of the few who i felt took actual action that actually helped me and my classmates ie extra hw drops, a shortened hw, timely announcements on updates and accommodations, flexibility on a tough exam question, etc. He backed up what he said with \_action\_. Flowery speech only goes so far, and this prof had our backs this semester. thanks. great lecturer and an even better person. thank you. seriously. tbh exams were sucky and this wasnt my best grade (lol) but srsly u and ur class overall was a bright spot in a tough semester. u respected us enough and had enough faith in us to give us hard questions but also backed us up in real, tangible, effective ways. You simultaneously cared about our education and about us as people, compromising on neither. In all my time as a student, I can think of only 1 other prof I would put on a similar level. 10/10. Thank you. (thank god this is anonymous- im such a sap lol)

also, examples in lecture were great, and recitation questions and the little starting summaries (lecture and recitation

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

ws) were helpful building understanding and helping learn lecture material

---

7517: The recitations were very helpful in reviewing what was taught in lecture and really enhanced my understanding. The homeworks were a more challenging version of the recitation assignments and really helped challenge my knowledge of what I had learned.

---

8055: The homeworks and recitations helped in my understanding

---

8078: Online lectures being recorded and uploaded for future review allowed for a lot of flexibility with my tough schedule.

---

8104: recitations and homeworks

---

8224: The annotated slides were my go-to.

---

8370: The homework assignments were most beneficial to my learning

---

8595: recorded lectures, online office hours

---

9293: The practice with R links the math to real-world applications really well. It makes the course engaging to me.

---

9653: The posted annotated slides were very helpful. I would definitely recommend keeping this for next semester.

---

9738: I think that the review of lecture materials that was provided in the recitation worksheets and sometimes by my TA at the beginning of recitation were especially useful in reviewing and enhancing understanding.

---

9739: Lecture slides being posted after class.

---

9810: This course continuously looked back on past lessons to help connect the new content to what was already discussed.

---

10063: One of the aspects of the course that I found helpful to my learning was the quality of the examples. The examples always gave me a sense of practicality. Although I would casually look at my situations and do all the stats calculations, I really understand where I can use this material and why it is of significance.

---

10158: The little breaks in lectures that the professor gave to everyone were really nice to let me reset and refresh myself, helped me pay attention in lecture more.

---

10505: The hw assignments were the most helpful.

---

10620: I think I just enjoyed the content quite a bit. It isn't the easiest of the classes, but I never dreaded any work for the class.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

### Comments on Weaknesses

154: better lectures, less boring (hard to do cause statistics is boring in my opinion)

---

242: A formula sheet on exams. I spent a lot of time just memorizing formulas for exams, which is a frustrating waste of time since in the real world, formulas are readily available, and it is frustrating to lose points because I misremembered a formula, rather than because I didn't understand the concepts.

---

400: If the recitations weren't cutoff two-thirds of the way through.

---

2711: different assignments other than just homework

---

3578: more engaging lectures

---

3802: N/A

---

4693: None

---

4701: Group work, recitations where we did something to reinforce learning, examples.

---

4890: Perhaps engaging more with Ed discussion board.

---

5653: More consistent use of in-class polls.

---

6277: Lectures and fun assignments.

---

6885: Better usage of examples would have been helpful, as there was often material on exams or homeworks that wasn't given examples of in lecture. As somebody who learns by watching, this made this course's content particularly painful to learn well.

---

6977: More poll questions during class might be better.

---

7094: less weight on exams

---

7438: more of an intro in recitation ie maybe going thru the little summary? that would be a good time to ask questions before starting to get everyone started on the right foot. sometimes i would spend the first half of recitation confused before catching on.

---

7517: An opportunity to work with other students

---

8055: More practice exams

---

8224: Notes on the annotated slides or study guides/cheat cheats with equations or processes would've facilitated my learning and performance in the course. I'm not sure that much of anything could've made me return to showing up to lecture except graded participation.

---

8370: Potentially working with other students would have helped improve my learning.

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

---

9739: Discussion sections were solely a review session of the material covered and no recitation assignments.

---

9810: I think an active student collaboration in the discussion sections would have improved my learning and engagement. Granted, this was likely possible when this course was in person, the virtual form of this course was not conducive for active student collaboration in the discussion sections.

---

10063: Better practice exams

---

10158: I cannot think of anything that would have helped at this time.

---

10505: N/A

---

**College of Engineering, Cornell University**  
**Course Evaluation Response Summary**  
**Semester: Spring 2021      Course Owner: ORIE**  
**Course: ENGRD 2700 Lec 1      CID: 10099**  
**Instructor: Schalekamp**  
**114 Responses, 193 Enrolled, 59.07% Response**

---

**If relevant, please comment on any especially effective use of technology in this course and/or any use of technology that was problematic, ineffective or hindered learning.**

154: use of technology such as R, and writing on tablet/ipad was very effective/efficient

---

3802: N/A

---

4693: None

---

7094: none, the online lectures worked fine

---

7438: nope. pretty good. sometimes some of the little canvas links to join lectures didn't work but the calendar links were always good

---

8055: None

---

8224: Every once in a while, the Professor's internet would cut out. Nbd at all.

---

9439: Professor Schalekamp should answered to Ed post. He answered Ed at the beginning of the semester, but stopped in the middle of semester. Then the Ed was maintained and answered by the TA. I was frustrated when TA generally do not response Ed in a timely manner, which is not helpful in learning. And when it does, one TA named Nalu Concepcion always put (!) exclamation punctuation in her response, seems like she is yelling to the students all the time.

---

9810: The initial introduction to R felt very rushed and was not overly applicable to the rest of the uses of R across the rest of the course. This did not set a good standard for how discussion sections were structured and overall expectations of the class workload.

---

10063: We learn R, but truly it is shown to barely be needed throughout the class. I think that this could possibly be used more, but I understand that this may come with overloading the student. In which case, I don't think it is a worthwhile investment.

---

10505: N/A

---