College of Engineering, Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Fall 2023 Course Owner: ECE

Course: ECE 4361 Lab 401 CID: 10827

Instructor: Xing

4 Responses, 6 Enrolled, 66.67% 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? | 3.25 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 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 | | | | | | | |
| 12. [Course Content] Content Organization: Did the course structure and | | | | | | | |
| organization facilitate your learning? | 3.50 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 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 | | | | | | | |
| 13. [Course Content] Synthesize & Apply Content: This course challenged | | | | | | | |
| me to synthesize ideas, think critically about the content, and apply the | 4.00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 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 | | | | | | | |
| 14. [Course Content] Examples & Applications: Were the number and | | | | | | | |
| variety of examples and practical applications presented appropriate to the | 4.25 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| 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 | | | _ | | | | |
| 21. [Course Delivery] Lectures: As a whole, were lectures clear, well- | | | | | | | |
| structured, free of significant or frequent errors, and did they appropriately | 4.00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| cover the course content? | | | | | | | |
| 1. No, usually poorly done | | | | | | | |
| 2. Sometimes | | | | | | | |
| 3. Usually adequate | | | | | | | |
| 4. Usually good | | | | | | | |
| 5. Nearly always very good | | | | | | | |
| 22. [Course Delivery] Context: Did the lecturer motivate the course content | | | | | | | |
| and place it in the context of your major or your overall engineering | 4.25 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| education (beyond fulfilling a degree requirement)? | | | | | | | |
| 1. No | | | | | | | |
| 2. Somewhat | | | | | | | |
| 3. Adequately | | | | | | | |
| 4. Mostly | | | | | | | |
| 5. Absolutely | 1 | | | | | | |

| 23. [Course Delivery] Engagement: Did the lecturer present material in an | 4.00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| engaging way, which improved your understanding of the course content? 1. No, generally boring | 4.00 | 7 | | O | ' | _ | ' |
| 2. Rarely engaging | | | | | | | |
| Generally held my attention | | | | | | | |
| 4. Engaging | | | | | | | |
| 5. Very engaging and often required actively thinking about material | | | | | | | |
| 31. [Recitation or Discussion Section] Was the section effective in | | | | | | | |
| increasing your understanding of, and ability to use, the course material? | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1. No, usually poorly done | | | | | | | |
| 2. Sometimes | | | | | | | |
| 3. Usually adequate | | | | | | | |
| 4. Usually good | | | | | | | |
| 5. Nearly always very good | | | | | | | |
| 41. [Laboratory Section] Lab Activities: How valuable were laboratory | | | | | | | |
| activities in enhancing your learning in this course (e.g., taught specific | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 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 | | | | | | | |
| Very valuable, well worth time spent on them | | | | | | | |
| 42. [Laboratory Section] Lab expectations: Were lab expectations (goals, | | | | | | | |
| tasks, reports, deadlines, etc.) clear and realistic? | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1. Not at all | | | | | | - | |
| 2. Partially | | | | | | | |
| 3. Adequately | | | | | | | |
| 4. Usually clear and realistic | | | | | | | |
| Almost always very clear and realistic | | | | | | | |
| 43. [Laboratory Section] Lab resources: Were lab resources (equipment, | | | | | | | |
| software, information, instructions, etc.) sufficient to provide a positive | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| experience? | | | | | | | |
| Rarely sufficient, severely detracted from the experience | | | | | | | |
| 2. Sometimes sufficient | | | | | | | |
| 3. Usually sufficient | | | | | | | |
| 4. Almost always sufficient | | | | | | | |
| Excellent resources that enhanced the laboratory experience | | | | | | | |
| 44. [Laboratory Section] Lab Staffing: Support and help, during lab and for | | | | | | | |
| lab reports, were sufficient to successfully complete and analyze | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| experiments. | | | | | | - | |
| 1. Rarely sufficient | | | | | | | |
| Partially sufficient | | | | | | | |
| 3. Adequate | | | | | | | |
| 4. Almost always sufficient | | | | | | | |
| Excellent, significantly enhanced the laboratory experience | | | | | | | |
| 51. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Workload: How | | | | | | | |
| many hours per week, on average, did you spend doing work associated | 1.75 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| with this course outside of scheduled class time? | | • | | | | - | |
| 1. <3 hours | | | | | | | |
| 2. 3-6 | | | | | | | |
| 3. 7-10 | | | | | | | |
| 4. 11-15 | | | | | | | |
| 5. >15 hours | | | | | | | |
| 52. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Workload Value: | | | | | | | |
| The time spent on various assignments (homework, lab reports, coding, | 3.50 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| projects) was reasonable for the amount it improved my understanding of | | | | | | | |
| the course content. | | | | | | | |
| Little value relative to the time required | | | | | | | |
| 2. Some value | | | | | | | |
| Reasonable value for the time spent | | | | | | | |
| Good value for time spent | | | | | | | |
| 5. Excellent value to time ratio | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| 53. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Resources: How | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| valuable were outside of class-time resources (e.g., readings, videos, | 3.75 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 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 | | | | 1 | | | |
| 54. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Value of | 4.05 | | _ | _ | _ | | |
| Assignments: Independent of the time required, overall, did assignments | 4.25 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| (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 | | | | | | | |
| Reliably and significantly increased my understanding and ability | | | _ | | | | |
| 55. [Workload, Resources, Assignments & Assessment] Exams & Grading: | | | _ | _ | | | _ |
| Were exams and grading a fair and reasonable measure of your learning? | 4.25 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| (Exams: clear, well written, range of content and difficulty. Grading: fair, | | | | | | | |
| prompt.) | | | | | | | |
| 1. No | | | | | | | |
| 2. Significant issues exist | | | | | | | |
| Generally fair assessment of my learning | | | | | | | |
| 4. Well developed and fair | | | | | | | |
| 5. Yes, definitely | | | _ | | | | |
| 61. [Course Environment] Diversity & Inclusion: To what extent have the | | | | | | | |
| professors and teaching staff fostered an inclusive environment such that | 5.00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| the class is welcoming to all, everyone is encouraged to participate, none | | | | | | | |
| are made to feel different, and all are treated fairly? | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | |
| 62. [Course Environment] Access to Assistance: Was there sufficient | | | | | | | |
| access to assistance (through office hours, online forums, in-class or | 4.75 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 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 | | | | | | | |
| 63. [Course Environment] Academic Integrity: Was the code of academic | | | | | | | |
| integrity maintained in the class (e.g. with respect to cheating, copying, | 4.75 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| plagiarism, use of unauthorized sources, etc.)? | | | | | | | |
| | | | = | | | | |
| Blatant disregard for Academic Integrity | | | | | | | |
| Blatant disregard for Academic Integrity No. Violations clearly occurred that were not addressed. | | | | | | | |
| 2. No. Violations clearly occurred that were not addressed. | | | | | | | |
| 2. No. Violations clearly occurred that were not addressed.3. Not strongly. Violations could well have occurred (even if I am not aware | | | | | | | |
| No. Violations clearly occurred that were not addressed. Not strongly. Violations could well have occurred (even if I am not aware of any). | | | | | | | |
| No. Violations clearly occurred that were not addressed. Not strongly. Violations could well have occurred (even if I am not aware of any). Yes. Instructor took reasonable steps to maintain academic integrity. | | | | | | | |
| No. Violations clearly occurred that were not addressed. Not strongly. Violations could well have occurred (even if I am not aware of any). Yes. Instructor took reasonable steps to maintain academic integrity. Yes. Academic integrity was clearly and intentionally maintained. | | 1 | ī | I | | | |
| No. Violations clearly occurred that were not addressed. Not strongly. Violations could well have occurred (even if I am not aware of any). Yes. Instructor took reasonable steps to maintain academic integrity. Yes. Academic integrity was clearly and intentionally maintained. [Comparison to Other Courses] Instructor: Rate the overall teaching | 3.50 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| No. Violations clearly occurred that were not addressed. Not strongly. Violations could well have occurred (even if I am not aware of any). Yes. Instructor took reasonable steps to maintain academic integrity. Yes. Academic integrity was clearly and intentionally maintained. [Comparison to Other Courses] Instructor: Rate the overall teaching effectiveness of your lecturer compared to others at Cornell. | 3.50 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| No. Violations clearly occurred that were not addressed. Not strongly. Violations could well have occurred (even if I am not aware of any). Yes. Instructor took reasonable steps to maintain academic integrity. Yes. Academic integrity was clearly and intentionally maintained. [Comparison to Other Courses] Instructor: Rate the overall teaching | 3.50 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |

| 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? | 4.25 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 = Poorly, not educational | | | _ | | | | |
| 5 = Excellently, extremely educational | | | | | | | |