

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33%)

1 - How much did you learn from this course?					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
A Great Deal	(5)	9	17.31%		3.63
A Lot	(4)	21	40.38%		
A Moderate Amount	(3)	16	30.77%		
A Little	(2)	6	11.54%		
Nothing	(1)	0	0.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
52/60 (86.67%)		3.63		0.91	4.00

2 - How many hours per week on average did you spend on this course including class meetings (whole numbers only)?					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
2	(2)	1	1.89%		6.13
3	(3)	4	7.55%		
4	(4)	11	20.75%		
5	(5)	12	22.64%		
6	(6)	7	13.21%		
7	(7)	6	11.32%		
8	(8)	3	5.66%		
10	(10)	6	11.32%		
12	(12)	2	3.77%		
15	(15)	1	1.89%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
53/60 (88.33%)		6.13		2.68	5.00

3 - How would you rate the course content overall?					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Excellent	(5)	16	30.19%		4.04
Good	(4)	25	47.17%		
Fair	(3)	10	18.87%		
Poor	(2)	2	3.77%		
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
53/60 (88.33%)		4.04		0.81	4.00

4 - The course effectively incorporated content (e.g. examples, case studies, guest speakers, etc.) from a diverse set of identities, countries, and if applicable, industries.					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	24	45.28%		4.32
Agree	(4)	24	45.28%		
Unsure	(3)	4	7.55%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	1	1.89%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
53/60 (88.33%)		4.32		0.78	4.00

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33%)

5 - I would characterize the course as:						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Directly Related to My Career	(3)	19	35.85%		2.21	
Not Directly Related to My Career	(2)	26	49.06%			
Unsure	(1)	8	15.09%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
53/60 (88.33%)			2.21		0.69	2.00

6 - My prior background in the subject is:						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Extensive	(3)	10	18.87%		1.83	
Moderate	(2)	24	45.28%			
Slight	(1)	19	35.85%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
53/60 (88.33%)			1.83		0.73	2.00

7 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the instruction in this course?						
Dan Iancu						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	30	56.60%		4.40	
Good	(4)	16	30.19%			
Fair	(3)	5	9.43%			
Poor	(2)	2	3.77%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
				0 25 50 100	Instructor	
Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
53/60 (88.33%)			4.40		0.82	5.00

8 - The instructor encouraged diverse perspectives and fostered an environment where all students felt welcome to participate.						
Dan Iancu						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Strongly Agree	(5)	35	70.00%		4.70	
Agree	(4)	15	30.00%			
Unsure	(3)	0	0.00%			
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			
				0 25 50 100	Instructor	
Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
50/60 (83.33%)			4.70		0.46	5.00

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33 %)

9 - What would you like to say about this course to a student who is considering taking it in the future? All responses are subject to Stanford's Terms of Use for Sites and may be subject to independent review before posting.

Response Rate	28/60 (46.67%)
---------------	----------------

- You likely won't come away from this class a python pro, but you will have a greater appreciation for the power of linear optimization via Gurobi
- You really need to know more of the engineering and linear optimization. I fell behind and to be honest got pretty cooked in this class and I think I didn't get much out of it because of it -- so you gotta be ready to seriously commit if you want to learn something, otherwise you'll just struggle your way through like I did. Dan is a great guy but if you fall behind there's nothing he can do to help you
- Don't take it unless you have strong coding background. It's really hard to follow otherwise.
- If you have any familiarity with coding, this is certainly the place to be. The professor rocks. The things you learn are cool. This is sbetter than excel.
- The professor is a really nice person but I'm not sure the course or the teaching methodology is effective. I don't think I learnt anything. Everyone races to use AI without understanding the fundamental principles.
- The most helpful element of this course was becoming empowered to solve future optimization/data problems with the help of LLMs. The content of the mini-cases were interesting, diverse, and applicable to the real world. Dan Iancu is a caring, intelligent, and thoughtful professor. Perhaps more thought could be put into how the materials is taught - while working in pairs can be helpful, I think lectures/more hand-holding by the professor early on in the quarter would be very helpful.
- This course doesn't really teach you to code with Python. It mainly teaches you how to formulate optimization problems (pen & paper) and how to prompt GPT to check your formulation and code it in Python.
- I wouldn't take it unless you are very interested in the subject. It should be an elective.
- Dan is a terrific and professor. If you are interested in a career in analytics, operations, or working in a data-centric role, you will learn a lot. Dan has found a great balance between technical content and applying it to tangible business situations. Dan also keeps the class fairly entertaining!
- it's fine. Largely a bunch of gpt prompting.
- Definately theres a very important
- This is not a coding course and you will be heavily using AI-tools, however there is still a lot of value in understanding the logic behind simulation and optimization which in my opinion has wide applications.
- Excellent class with a pretty difficult set of exams and cases. I would say that the professor is very good at instructing, however the method of learning in the class can be pretty intense. Every session is a short lecture followed by in person coding for the cases. This could get pretty difficult in terms of following along. I would say that there was a lot of good learning in this class.
- Very accessible class with advancements in generative AI, but the content itself is quite challenging. I still believe this is the best version of OSM to take if you have ANY minimal coding background or quant background.
- Don't rely on GPT to do the thinking for you. It is better to take a long time to process the cases in class conceptually than to just put answers on the Google Sheet that you obtained blindly from a chat bot.
- Dan is awesome! Definitely a heavy coding based class but helps being able to use chat gpt
- Advanced OSM is a good course to develop your critical thinking ability. If you a person who likes to learn by themselves and then apply the theory to solve real-world problems, this would be a really good class to do that. People who are not proficient in coding might feel lost if they do not brush it up - ChatGPT is allowed though, which makes generating code easy. Shoutout to the Professor - I thought Dan was quite considerate and very proactive at making this a fun learning experience.
- Course provides great foundation on optimization, with a good range of applications. I had little experience in coding, but it was fine going through it with support from LLMs.
- Advanced OSM is a great course. I had used optimization in my work to a decent extent (to solve mini-problems as part of larger projects) but it was great to learn how to properly specify and evaluate optimization models. My coding and LLM skills increased a lot. It was also useful to test the limits of the most popular LLM models and see which areas of the modelling they struggle with the most. Our professor, Dan Iancu is one of the most hardworking faculty members and his passion and care for his students really shines through.
- If you want to learn Python for data analytics, modeling, and optimization, this is the perfect course. The professor encourages the students to use AI tools, which allow for the complexity of the models to be much higher
- It can become an interesting course if you become very good at it. The level of python is not basic, if you're comfortable coding from scratch something, then consider doing the accel/base courses. The professor is quite nice and makes everything possible for you to learn, so 10 stars for him! Chatgpt makes it easy at first, but you have to know how to read what it's doing
- Dan clearly cares about this subject and puts a lot of thought / effort into his cases, all of which are decently interesting. However this is primarily a course on how to prompt ChatGPT (which is a skill in and of itself), vs. one on coding or optimization logic.
- I have no coding experience. I wanted to challenge myself. However, I think I learned more about how to prompt ChatGPT than how to code in python. I did, however, learn a great deal about modeling problems conceptually and thinking through different constraints and optimization issues. It is a great course, but you will feel pressure during the class if you don't have coding background.
- Even though they say it is not a coding class, it is, except you can use ChatGPT so that helps a bit. I had python experience coming in but still found the Gurobi part very confusing. Coding is NOT taught in class, and what is taught is pretty basic. I would say that is the hardest part about the class -- not knowing what exactly you are learning. Most of this is qualms about the setup of the class. Dan himself is a great instructor and the case studies in class are drawn from a diverse set of subject fields and very engaging. I wish the course format can be changed; doing a full problem set in class is not exactly effective. Also, I would strongly recommend the class be advertised more accurately as a coding class and for coding to be taught a bit better in class. While I appreciated getting proficient at prompt engineering, I constantly question what exactly I learned.
- I really enjoyed this course. I think it's ideal for students coming from a highly quantitative background who have decent prior python experience. I had seen almost all of the concepts before and found it really useful to have a chance to incorporate AI into my workflow to increase productivity.
- The course is beneficial if you are planning to be in operations and expect to work with data scientists. It is a lot of work if you dont have some programming experience. However, the most important skill needed is familiarity with math and logic.
- This was the intellectually most challenging class of the quarter. I appreciated the problem types and wished they were slightly less difficult. I also think the TAs should rather not all be there during class but rather offer more office hours combined with homeworks to have deadlines so that the need to find them is more distributed throughout the quarter.
- This course is hard, but if you apply yourself, it is worth it. Be prepared to work outside of class if you want to do well.

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV

Instructor: Dan lancu *

TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33%)

10 - Would you like to provide any other comments about this course? Will only be seen by the instructor.

Dan lancu

Response Rate	29/60 (48.33%)
----------------------	----------------

- I really liked the class where you forced us to audit chat gpt code - that is probably something that would be valuable to students if you incorporated it earlier in the quarter.
- Hi Dan! -- you really care about us students, thank you! I really appreciate that. I also recognize it's a challenging class to teach given the high degree of variance of foundational knowledge that students come in with. The course was hard for me to follow and materials were difficult to digest. Many students I talked with didn't know how to study for the material and found the in-class labs to be intimidating given the high varying degree of variance depending on students' prior coding and logic knowledge. The following are some ideas based on my experience that would improve the course learning experience: 1. More "repetitive", "graded" individual homework problems that cover the basics taught in class (also recording the lecture would be super helpful), 2. Follow on with weekly team mini-projects that require more deep analytical thinking and team problem solving skills. This is going to require more prep time for those students that are less comfortable with the material while not dragging down advanced students who can probably fly through home work problems. By doing individual homework, it helps set caliber on level of understanding, covering the fundamental concepts and basic arithmetics so that by the weekly mini- group projects, teams will have less variance in knowledge base to tackle problems together. In class labs have extreme variance in foundational knowledge and are super difficult to follow. 3. I found this 4 Part Udemey course offered by Gurobipy super helpful in better understand the class concepts and their worksheet problem and solutions really helped me grasp the basics better: <https://www.udemy.com/user/lindsay-montanari/> I'm happy to offer more feedback about my learning experience and would love to help contribute and better learn the material even after the course ends. Tony Shi (sharing my name in case you wanted to reach out)
- I enjoyed that Dan promoted the use of AI tools. In a world where that is the new norm for coding, I think figuring out how to integrate the models into our workflow was the most valuable part of the course. I would add a class that specifically teaches the best way to do this.
- I actually would have really, really loved to see more business-only related cases. The cases were somewhat social or ESG related at times, and even though that's a trend, it's not what I care about learning through. I want to optimize dollars and cents, and I want to know how that works way more. Conceptually, I loved learning about that more than something like food or child labor.
- Please consider having assignments which can use AI but pen and paper exams. I don't think anyone learns anything otherwise.
- I believe the advance in LLMs have made teaching this course very difficult, there is a clear difficulty of making problems difficult enough for LLMs not being able to solve them but simple enough so humans can understand. I suggest a whole rethink on the objectives of the course.
- Thanks so much Professor for a terrific quarter!
- Not sure I should've been placed in this course. I tried, but I kept falling behind. My coding knowledge was not good enough to manage keeping up, even with the help of ChatGPT. Even with a mechanical engineering background where I learned matlab extensively, not having learned python I felt supremely behind and even though this course was more conceptual I still felt I could never execute
- I would definitely suggest bringing back small homework assignments or submissions.
- I don't know how, but AI is challenging how useful this class is. I'm not sure how to fix it, but without a doubt, I feel it is very difficult to keep students engaged with the current form of evaluation.
- While the content was incredibly interesting, most of us felt the content was a bit too heavy and wished we spent more time on a fewer number of cases than cover so many cases. Each problem was quite loaded and given we were trying to rush through them, I felt the content got diluted. I loved how involved you were with the students and the genuine passion you have for the field. Given that, reducing the quantity of the content can have a huge impact on the quality and experience of students
- I don't like the idea of using chatgpt with in class exam.
- With advancements in generative AI, I think it is becoming too easy for students to rely heavily on it to do every part of the problem solving required in this course. For me, it helped that I had exposure to optimizations and simulation in the past, but in general, I know students who did fairly well but probably would not be able to do a basic model on paper without the help of ChatGPT/Claude.
- You are an amazing educator and I have truly enjoyed this class. My favorite part was that the cases were all realistic and started from a place where we can expand to understand a real world problem.
- You were an incredible instructor! This is definitely a hard class to teach
- I think you are a great teacher. While this class in itself is quite heavy, you made it a really fun learning experience. I liked how you took input from us students at all points in time, and conducted the class to suit our pace and ask. Thank you for a great class this quarter!
- The variety of cases (which are all super interesting and applicable) and your teaching method are great. One thing I'd say is that sometimes I miss having kind of a mental map / summary of what are the main concepts/methodologies we are learning. It's great to have so many practical examples, but sometimes I felt like "ok, what am I learning here exactly?". Also, I want to note that the change in pace after the midterm was very helpful!
- Thanks Dan, it was clear that you are one of the most hardworking faculty members and your passion and care for your students really shines through.
- It would be good to have home quizzes based on class concepts
- The bar for python is much higher than was presented in the first week of class. The exam was much higher because of the use of chatgpt, so previous exams were not quite representative so a heads of up would of helped. I'd be interesting to have a project to work on during a couple of weeks were we use real life data.
- I would prefer to have the cases as homework, and in-class to be true unstructured time (vs. open time for casework)
- I think you effectively managed the class. Sometimes when students asked questions that maybe were very basic, it felt that they were "shut down" and were asked to just come see you in office hours. But you did a great job explaining the materials in an intuitive way!
- Thank you for the excellent class. I had a great learning experience. I came into the course with a background in CS - but never worked with data and specifically - modeling, simulation, or optimization, and now I feel very comfortable tackling this type of problems. What I think made this class good: - The cases, data, and explanation were well written. It is clear that are the result of great efforts. I appreciate it. - Professor lancu is a true professional, both as a data scientist and as a lecturer. Engaging, informative, humorous, curious, and attentive. Professor's lancu's passion to the subject is contagious. - Working in class I often learned from my friends (how to use ChatGPT, debug code, and thinking process), and even made some friends. What I'd improve: - I think the cases, were heavy and loaded with questions. - I think the unrestrained usage of ChatGPT is problematic. I'd introduce this freedom later on in the course. - The combination of: many questions + time limitation in class + ChatGPT - made it tempting to run through the problems without thoroughly understanding what is going on. It was easy to lose pace of the class, without losing ability to execute (using ChatGPT). This gray zone is somewhat comfortable for MBAs, but this comes at a price of understanding of the class material. - I'd add some review session were you go over the entire process of tackling a case. This could be in class or with TAs. Thank you!
- Thanks for teaching a great course! I really enjoyed all of the concepts and liked the case method. This class did a great job of distilling more theoretical concepts into a practical tool kit to use when thinking about optimization.
- You are the man, Dan! Thank you for your care and support this entire quarter. I enjoyed coming to class to hear your perspectives on different topics. Hope to keep in touch with you in the future!
- Wonderful use of examples to introduce us to optimization consideration. The class moved at a challenging rate, if I was a bit more practiced with abstraction the class would have been very enjoyable.
- Please introduce class recordings I'm lost so often during class) and keep your office hours. I always joke that you are too smart to understand the peasant OSMer but I really appreciate how creatively and interestingly you are designing the class.
- Thank you very much for this course! Thank you so much for all your effort! Every class brought a new topic and case to work on and discuss, and I really appreciate how you made it even more interesting by creating new cases for us, like the bakery and chocolate examples. It really helped keep our interest alive! The surveys at the beginning of the lessons were also great they grabbed our attention and got us focused right from the start. Thank you for everything!
- I appreciated your work to make this class engaging. The academic material is hard, and the concepts are not easy, but you tried your best to make the class engaging. I appreciated this!

Stanford University
1252 GSB Fall 2024-2025

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV

Instructor: Dan Iancu *

TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33 %)

Stanford University
1252 GSB Fall 2024-2025

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33 %)

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?						
Arnav Mehta						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	8	17.78%			4.44
Good	(4)	7	15.56%			
Fair	(3)	1	2.22%			
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
N/A	(0)	29	64.44%			
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median	
45/60 (75.00%)			4.44	0.63	4.50	

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?						
John Onderdonk						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	11	25.00%			4.56
Good	(4)	6	13.64%			
Fair	(3)	1	2.27%			
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
N/A	(0)	26	59.09%			
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median	
44/60 (73.33%)			4.56	0.62	5.00	

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?						
Jordan Miller						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	13	26.53%			4.44
Good	(4)	10	20.41%			
Fair	(3)	2	4.08%			
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
N/A	(0)	24	48.98%			
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median	
49/60 (81.67%)			4.44	0.65	5.00	

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?						
Lauren Maymar						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	8	17.39%			4.35
Good	(4)	7	15.22%			
Fair	(3)	2	4.35%			
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
N/A	(0)	29	63.04%			
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median	
46/60 (76.67%)			4.35	0.70	4.00	

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV

Instructor: Dan Iancu *

TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33 %)

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?

Maisie Lynton

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	10	22.22%		4.42	
Good	(4)	7	15.56%			
Fair	(3)	2	4.44%			
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
N/A	(0)	26	57.78%			
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
45/60 (75.00%)				4.42	0.69	5.00

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?

Matt Mahowald

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	9	19.15%		4.39	
Good	(4)	7	14.89%			
Fair	(3)	2	4.26%			
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
N/A	(0)	29	61.70%			
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
47/60 (78.33%)				4.39	0.70	4.50

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?

Nicki Liang

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	8	17.78%		4.47	
Good	(4)	6	13.33%			
Fair	(3)	1	2.22%			
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
N/A	(0)	30	66.67%			
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
45/60 (75.00%)				4.47	0.64	5.00

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?

Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	11	23.91%		4.43	
Good	(4)	11	23.91%			
Fair	(3)	1	2.17%			
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
N/A	(0)	23	50.00%			
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
46/60 (76.67%)				4.43	0.59	4.00

Stanford University
1252 GSB Fall 2024-2025

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33 %)

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?					
Arnav Mehta, John Onderdonk, Jordan Miller, Lauren Maymar, Maisie Lynton, Matt Mahowald, Nicki Liang, Vasundhara Rakesh					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Excellent	(5)	78	21.25%		4.44
Good	(4)	61	16.62%		
Fair	(3)	12	3.27%		
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%		
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
N/A	(0)	216	58.86%		
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
			4.44	0.64	5.00

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?	
Arnav Mehta	
Response Rate	1/60 (1.67%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A - did not interact with this TA 	

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?	
John Onderdonk	
Response Rate	3/60 (5%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You're amazing John, thank you! • He is good? • N/A - did not interact with this TA 	

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?	
Jordan Miller	
Response Rate	3/60 (5%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You're amazing Jordan, thank you! • Really appreciate the office hour and review session - best one! • N/A - did not interact with this TA 	

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?	
Lauren Maymar	
Response Rate	1/60 (1.67%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A - did not interact with this TA 	

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?	
Maisie Lynton	
Response Rate	2/60 (3.33%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appreciated the helpful office hour. • N/A - did not interact with this TA 	

Stanford University
1252 GSB Fall 2024-2025

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33 %)

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?	
Matt Mahowald	
Response Rate	3/60 (5%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You're amazing Matt, thank you! • Your CA session was very useful. You added foundational understanding to the class content. Had I completed the midterm, I would have done very well thanks to you. • N/A - did not interact with this TA 	

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?	
Nicki Liang	
Response Rate	1/60 (1.67%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A - did not interact with this TA 	

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?	
Vasundhara Rakesh	
Response Rate	2/60 (3.33%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whenever she saw me outside class she asked me to schedule time to meet with her so she could help with understanding the concepts! • N/A - did not interact with this TA 	

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?	
Arnav Mehta, John Onderdonk, Jordan Miller, Lauren Maymar, Maisie Lynton, Matt Mahowald, Nicki Liang, Vasundhara Rakesh	
Response Rate	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You're amazing Matt, thank you! • You're amazing Jordan, thank you! • You're amazing John, thank you! • He is good? • Your CA session was very useful. You added foundational understanding to the class content. Had I completed the midterm, I would have done very well thanks to you. • Whenever she saw me outside class she asked me to schedule time to meet with her so she could help with understanding the concepts! • Really appreciate the office hour and review session - best one! • Appreciated the helpful office hour. • N/A - did not interact with this TA • N/A - did not interact with this TA • N/A - did not interact with this TA • N/A - did not interact with this TA • N/A - did not interact with this TA • N/A - did not interact with this TA • N/A - did not interact with this TA • N/A - did not interact with this TA • N/A - did not interact with this TA 	

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV

Instructor: Dan Iancu *

TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33 %)

13 - Formulating appropriate optimization or simulation models that capture some of the decision-making processes involved with a real-world context How well did you achieve this learning goal in this course?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means		
Extremely well	(5)	11	24.44%			3.67	Question
Very well	(4)	16	35.56%				
Moderately well	(3)	10	22.22%				
Slightly well	(2)	8	17.78%				
Not well at all	(1)	0	0.00%				
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median	
45/60 (75.00%)				3.67	1.04	4.00	

14 - Coding up an optimization or simulation model in Python How well did you achieve this learning goal in this course?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means		
Extremely well	(5)	9	17.65%			3.47	Question
Very well	(4)	18	35.29%				
Moderately well	(3)	15	29.41%				
Slightly well	(2)	6	11.76%				
Not well at all	(1)	3	5.88%				
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median	
51/60 (85.00%)				3.47	1.10	4.00	

15 - Interpreting the outputs from a model in a real-world context; revising the model to (re)align it with different objectives or perspectives How well did you achieve this learning goal in this course?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means		
Extremely well	(5)	8	16.00%			3.38	Question
Very well	(4)	17	34.00%				
Moderately well	(3)	14	28.00%				
Slightly well	(2)	8	16.00%				
Not well at all	(1)	3	6.00%				
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median	
50/60 (83.33%)				3.38	1.12	3.50	

16 - Interacting with an AI chatbot for aid in coding and / or in model-building How well did you achieve this learning goal in this course?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means		
Extremely well	(5)	22	44.00%			4.06	Question
Very well	(4)	12	24.00%				
Moderately well	(3)	13	26.00%				
Slightly well	(2)	3	6.00%				
Not well at all	(1)	0	0.00%				
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median	
50/60 (83.33%)				4.06	0.98	4.00	

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV

Instructor: Dan Iancu *

TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33%)

17 - How useful to you were the Cases?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Extremely useful	(5)	20	39.22%		4.08
Very useful	(4)	19	37.25%		
Moderately useful	(3)	8	15.69%		
Slightly useful	(2)	4	7.84%		
Not useful at all	(1)	0	0.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
51/60 (85.00%)		4.08		0.93	4.00

18 - How useful to you were the In-class discussions?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Extremely useful	(5)	11	22.00%		3.56
Very useful	(4)	19	38.00%		
Moderately useful	(3)	10	20.00%		
Slightly useful	(2)	7	14.00%		
Not useful at all	(1)	3	6.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
50/60 (83.33%)		3.56		1.16	4.00

19 - How useful to you were the In-class breakout groups?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Extremely useful	(5)	8	16.00%		2.78
Very useful	(4)	6	12.00%		
Moderately useful	(3)	14	28.00%		
Slightly useful	(2)	11	22.00%		
Not useful at all	(1)	11	22.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
50/60 (83.33%)		2.78		1.36	3.00

20 - How useful to you were the Lectures?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Extremely useful	(5)	14	27.45%		3.65
Very useful	(4)	16	31.37%		
Moderately useful	(3)	12	23.53%		
Slightly useful	(2)	7	13.73%		
Not useful at all	(1)	2	3.92%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
51/60 (85.00%)		3.65		1.15	4.00

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33%)

21 - How useful to you were the Problem sets?						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Extremely useful	(5)	10	20.41%			
Very useful	(4)	20	40.82%			
Moderately useful	(3)	9	18.37%			
Slightly useful	(2)	5	10.20%			
Not useful at all	(1)	5	10.20%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
49/60 (81.67%)			3.51		1.23	4.00

22 - If you were to consider KEEPING one or two things from the course, what would those be?	
Response Rate	29/60 (48.33%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In class case time • More extended lecture, slowing down the material, make sure understanding, break down math notations even in the beginning • Lectures where you go over the cases • Take-home cases • Cases • Using scalable and practical tools to conduct the modeling. I LOVED using Gurobipy, Python, LLMs, and Jupyter notebooks. ExcelSolver is obsolete in 2024, and I think every OSM class should use practical tools, so BIG THANK YOU for designing the course in a way that can be used outside of the classroom. • Keep the flipped classroom format - it makes the smaller part of the class which is typical lecture more impactful and punchy, which helps us retain the key concepts from instruction. • How to prompt gpt effectively • Keep problem sets and lectures • Professor enthusiams • The cases, and the correlation with real-world problems • - Instructor was great and one of the most genuine human being I've encountered at GSB and cares about learning • Python, Lecturers • Keep the cases as they are structured. • Dan instructing and the solutions he posted after each lecture (They were very in depth) • Cases, Chatbots • Use optimization in real world problems; interaction with LLMs • Lectures and problem sets • The cases provided • Use python + sticking to very real scenarios but it would be useful to make it even more realistically, even if this means covering less material • The mini cases are really engaging • The mini lectures before we start programming. • The diversity of the cases. • Keep - extensive cases with different optimization goals. In class work on cases. • Keep the theory aspect of the class • the cases (especially the impact related ones) and lecture slides • In class quiz (or exercises) • Dan's humor, case types (super creative) • The cases are great, they are real and applied, keep these 	

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33%)

23 - If you were to consider DROPPING one or two things from the course, what would those be?

Response Rate	32/60 (53.33%)
---------------	----------------

- Shorten lectures shorten cases so we can work more
- Get rid of flipped classroom, it's too hard to focus and learn within it
- in-class labs,
- Replace Final with a group project
- Nothing
- In class breakout groups
- Over reliance on Chat GPT
- The frequently of changing problem sets. I feel strongly we need to work all the way through, completing each problem set thoroughly, before moving onto the next one. I understand the cases were not ment to be 100% completed in class, but as I struggled with the material, I often left I didn't grasp concepts before moving onto new cases / topics.
- Would be nice to try and wrap up cases within a class versus extending out over multiple classes
- Too much math
- drop breakout groups. i couldn't learn anything in class
- Do not allow chatbots for exams, keep classes more simple
- Drop the coding aspect, as well as the use of AI tools
- - Reduce a few problems to increase time spent on the others
- ChatGPT in in-person exam
- Exams. May have more learning by doing projects
- Drop the Google sheet, but rather have group discuss how they arrive to their answer and what their reasoning.
- Some of the cases took longer than the allotted time. It would be helpful to actually walk through the literal code for some of the last few questions all together
- A topic or two - this course can be quite heavy for a quarter
- Some of the more advanced theory concepts; maybe exams (having assignments instead)
- In-class breakout groups
- The dynamic of the class I feel could be better
- maybe not cover as much material but be able to do a few things in a lot of depth
- The workload per class is just too much to cover during the class time.
- Spending a lot of time programming in class. Maybe limit the programming to one or two questions, and spend the rest of the time explaining in DETAILS how we arrived at the Q1 and Q2 answers.
- Can change exam format to homeworks. It is not very helpful to (1) try to do a full problem set in 30 minutes in class and (2) do two extremely long problems in exams. Basically this incentivizes students to straight up put everything into chatGPT and copy paste the answer.
- I think the class relies very heavily on chatbots. I'd find a more balanced approach - ones that gives some control back to the students. It's easy to go through the course with over-reliance on chatbots.
- Drop the coding aspect
- It would have been nice to have a more theoretical midterm.
- Not spending too much time on theory
- Flipped class, too technical
- This class should have homework. That is a provocative thing to say, but it is very challenging to learn the material without using it constantly.

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33 %)

24 - This course allowed the use of chatbots without any constraints. Considering the learning outcomes for the course, what do you think would be the best policy regarding the use of chatbots?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Do not allow chatbots for any task	(1)	3	6.12%		3.24	
Do not allow chatbots for modeling, but allow them for coding	(2)	13	26.53%			
Neutral	(3)	2	4.08%			
Allow chatbots for everything	(4)	31	63.27%			
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
49/60 (81.67%)				3.24	1.05	4.00

- I learned more when I put chatGPT to the side, but I never would have been able to code a model fast enough without its help. It was much easier for me to decipher when ChatGPT messed up if I took the time to work out the model myself before throwing it all into ChatGPT.
- It makes no sense to prohibit technology, will only make our education lag
- Do not allow chatbots for exams
- I think chatbots are effective but only to the extent you already understand how to do what you want it to do, which I think the majority of the class does NOT come knowing. I think the use of chatbots allows you to get through the course without really thinking critically about its content.
- helpful to discuss how to use chatbots earlier on in the course. tactics for prompt engineering and getting more correct responses.
- I think the chatbots are useful, but I mainly used them for the coding portion.
- Very helpful, and more practical
- I think using them is more similar to the reality we will live in. I personally have tried to understand the outputs from the model, especially the formulation ones, and I think it helped me learn. One bad thing is that someone can literally run the entire exam (or selected questions) through it and get a good or better grade than someone actively trying to do it and use LLMs as a support tool. I believe this situation affects the curve of the class.
- Key to allow them for everything, as I feel is the new reality we are facing. At the same time they are a very powerful tool to tackle very complex problems
- You still have to spend a lot of time understanding what chatgpt is trying to do and making sense of the answer. I think the really valuable skill is being in front of a business situation and being able to structure the problem as a business case, which is how we get it and feed it to GPT.
- It is training us for the world as it is, so why not teach us how to be exceptional with using the bots
- It's easy to go through the course with over-reliance on chatbots. That might lead to some loss of learning goals.
- I studied computer science in undergrad and then worked as a software engineer in big tech for several years prior to the GSB, so I've had a lot of experience with programming and also theoretical math/CS classes. I feel like the point of this class is lost with chatbots fully allowed. The first thing that most students do is upload the case PDF to ChatGPT and ask it for the answer. In the real world, problems will not be so well-defined that there's a PDF that can be uploaded to ChatGPT. In practice, chatbots can help with code completion, similar to Cursor, but not with the higher-level thinking or problem-solving. However, in this class, I think most students are using chatbots for both the higher-level thinking and the coding, and are giving up some learning along the way. I'd highly recommend you disallow chatbots to increase the value that students get from the class.
- This was a great opportunity to leverage AI. I plan to use this in my career so it was great to have the ability to leverage this tool. It would have been impossible to work through the cases in the time allotted without using AI -- very cool to see how much more efficient I could be. The only downside is for those without a quant/coding background.
- It's closest to the real world!

Course: F25-OIT-248-01: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 53/60 (88.33 %)

25 - Our course did not feature any homework. For future iterations, what do you think would be the best policy regarding homework?					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
No homework (keep current policy)	(1)	19	37.25%		2.33
Minimal, non-graded homework (every 2-3 weeks)	(2)	10	19.61%		
Non-graded homework, weekly	(3)	8	15.69%		
Graded homework, weekly	(4)	14	27.45%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
51/60 (85.00%)			2.33	1.24	2.00
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • actually i wanted to put graded homework every 2-3 weeks but this was not an option. • I think that instead of a midterm and a final, it would be interesting to have a longer, multi-step optimization and interpretation of results project that you could do over the course of a week. • Group homework graded for submission AND completion that tie to the cases and class content to drive student to think about the problem before class • The preparation before and review after class was very helpful! • I feel that would keep the onus on studying regularly where in the case of no homework, there is no onus on sticking to regular studying. We can have bi-weekly graded homework to keep us on our toes as well. • I think having homework would make it very difficult to balance with other courses (at least in my case, where I had Accelerated Accounting and Finance). I do think though there could be assignments as part of the final grade. • Minimal, graded homework would be a great option. • By having graded weekly homework (keeping it short), would allow us to consistently be on top of the topics of class. • graded HW every 2 weeks perhaps. • Some homework would make me learn more /put in a bit more outside of class • Would prefer to replace the exams with a few problem sets. Not weekly. • I'd rather want to have small homeworks to be submitted before the class that are not graded rather than doing everything in class. • The class should have homework, it is very challenging to learn this without problem sets to practice concepts. 					

26 - How useful was the session with the Guest Speaker (Ruben Lobel, from Waymo)					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Not at all useful	(1)	1	2.08%		3.83
Not that useful	(2)	1	2.08%		
Neutral	(3)	13	27.08%		
Useful	(4)	23	47.92%		
Very useful	(5)	10	20.83%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
48/60 (80.00%)			3.83	0.86	4.00

27 - You experienced two platforms for course-related announcements: the Ed platform and Canvas. How would you compare the two					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Canvas is better	(1)	28	54.90%		1.51
Neutral	(2)	20	39.22%		
Ed is better	(3)	3	5.88%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
51/60 (85.00%)			1.51	0.61	1.00

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV

Instructor: Dan Iancu *

TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15%)

1 - How much did you learn from this course?						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
A Great Deal	(5)	9	26.47%			
A Lot	(4)	8	23.53%			
A Moderate Amount	(3)	8	23.53%			
A Little	(2)	8	23.53%			
Nothing	(1)	1	2.94%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate		Mean		STD		Median
34/52 (65.38%)		3.47		1.21		3.50

2 - How many hours per week on average did you spend on this course including class meetings (whole numbers only)?						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
3	(3)	3	8.33%			
4	(4)	5	13.89%			
5	(5)	6	16.67%			
6	(6)	10	27.78%			
7	(7)	4	11.11%			
8	(8)	3	8.33%			
9	(9)	1	2.78%			
10	(10)	1	2.78%			
12	(12)	2	5.56%			
20	(20)	1	2.78%			
				0 25 50 100		Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD		Median
36/52 (69.23%)		6.50		3.18		6.00

3 - How would you rate the course content overall?						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	10	27.03%			
Good	(4)	13	35.14%			
Fair	(3)	11	29.73%			
Poor	(2)	1	2.70%			
Very Poor	(1)	2	5.41%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate		Mean		STD		Median
37/52 (71.15%)		3.76		1.06		4.00

4 - The course effectively incorporated content (e.g. examples, case studies, guest speakers, etc.) from a diverse set of identities, countries, and if applicable, industries.						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Strongly Agree	(5)	17	45.95%			
Agree	(4)	10	27.03%			
Unsure	(3)	5	13.51%			
Disagree	(2)	2	5.41%			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	3	8.11%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate		Mean		STD		Median
37/52 (71.15%)		3.97		1.26		4.00

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15%)

5 - I would characterize the course as:						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Directly Related to My Career	(3)	16	43.24%		2.30	
Not Directly Related to My Career	(2)	16	43.24%			
Unsure	(1)	5	13.51%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
37/52 (71.15%)			2.30		0.70	2.00

6 - My prior background in the subject is:						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Extensive	(3)	12	32.43%		2.14	
Moderate	(2)	18	48.65%			
Slight	(1)	7	18.92%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
37/52 (71.15%)			2.14		0.71	2.00

7 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the instruction in this course?						
Dan Iancu						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	17	45.95%		4.11	
Good	(4)	10	27.03%			
Fair	(3)	8	21.62%			
Poor	(2)	1	2.70%			
Very Poor	(1)	1	2.70%			
				0 25 50 100	Instructor	
Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
37/52 (71.15%)			4.11		1.02	4.00

8 - The instructor encouraged diverse perspectives and fostered an environment where all students felt welcome to participate.						
Dan Iancu						
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Strongly Agree	(5)	27	72.97%		4.68	
Agree	(4)	8	21.62%			
Unsure	(3)	2	5.41%			
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%			
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%			
				0 25 50 100	Instructor	
Response Rate			Mean		STD	Median
37/52 (71.15%)			4.68		0.58	5.00

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15%)

9 - What would you like to say about this course to a student who is considering taking it in the future? All responses are subject to Stanford's Terms of Use for Sites and may be subject to independent review before posting.

Response Rate	22/52 (42.31%)
----------------------	----------------

- This class was interesting and had a lot of hands-on cases and applications.
- I thoroughly enjoyed this class and the very practical approach Dan brought - allowing us to use AI bots as an aid. I feel strongly that even as someone with very little coding background I learned far more in this class than I would have in other levels. That is in large part due to Dan, he brought a light and fun energy, interesting and socially relevant cases, and an attitude oriented at having his students learn and grow. I wish every professor at GSB was like him! Truly.
- Great survey course of optimization and lots of practice. Chat GPT made it much easier.
- I really liked this class, though it was hard to find the line between not enough and too much ChatGPT in solving problems. I loved Dan, he cares a lot about students' learning and did a pretty good job managing a relatively confusing subject and the mix of case work and lecture in class. I thought the course material was super interesting and despite some moderate programming background was not things I had learned before. I would definitely recommend taking advanced OSM with Dan if you have any programming background coming into GSB, you'll learn a lot and the class is enjoyable.
- I still don't understand how this course relates at all to a business education. The professor is definitely caring and supportive, but I am not sure I got anything out of the course. The flipped classroom model meant that we had to teach ourselves the content, and students were simply lost during class. I wish we had more classroom time devoted to a more traditional lecture format, and then homework assignments to apply the content.
- This class moves at a very fast pace, and requires significant time outside of the classroom. The content is highly practical, but it requires decent prior knowledge in python but AI bots help significantly with ramping up.
- If you already know python, take the base one
- Advanced OSM has been a class that is correlated to how much time you put into it; it can be challenging with the flipped classroom model especially when you have not prepped for class, but when you do put in the work, the class can be very rewarding.
- Course is challenging for someone without prior coding experience but not impossible.
- I would not recommend taking this course. Iancu is a really nice and approachable professor, but the class is just not set up or taught well. We have a new case almost every class so the volume of context you have to understand before you even get into the content is so high it just doesn't make any sense. There should be maximum one case a week in order to really be able to learn. I did pick up some concepts when the professor gave his wrap ups, but I don't feel like I learned anything from the cases.
- One of my favorite core courses at GSB by far! I love how forward leaning Dan Iancu is about leveraging AI tools to solve Optimization, Simulation and Modeling problems.
- The things you learn the most is how to leverage chatbots to solve the problems
- Valuable and worth taking
- Taking this class was my biggest regret this quarter. I enrolled because I was excited about the opportunity to practice prompt engineering and solve optimization problems using Python. However, I found the pace of the material to be overwhelming, making it difficult to absorb and truly learn the concepts. I noticed that many classmates felt similarly. Some students, myself included, relied on well-trained AI models to succeed on exams, which limited our understanding of the content. For context, I don't have a technical background but have taken two computer science classes during undergrad. That said, I also heard from peers with engineering experience who shared similar concerns. I really appreciated Iancu's approachability and genuine care for his students, which made a positive impact. However, I think the course could benefit from a more structured approach to help students fully engage with and retain the material.
- The professor is extremely nice and kind and knows a lot on the content. The content however doesn't seem too relevant to what we will do post graduation in most cases, and it doesn't necessarily give a good thinking framework. It also feels unfair that when you know the content, you try to do it with your knowledge without using chatgpt you have no benefit over people who clearly don't understand what's happening and use chatgpt. For people who have CS backgrounds it would be useful to have some class where you learn excel, and for people who don't have a CS background it could be useful to learn python. Those seem like more relevant skills in the workspace and complementary to what we have.
- Advanced OSM is a great course. Dan is a great instructor who does some really interesting research in addition to the course material. Additionally, I really enjoyed the use of AI in this course. It is unlikely we will be ever writing code from scratch again, so learning how to prompt ChatGPT etc. is a really useful skill. That being said, the use of AI can also mean students choose not to learn the course content and instead just copy paste into ChatGPT. Like much of business school, you will get as much out of this course as you put in.
- It requires a significant level of comfort with python and coding. It is also quantitatively challenging and has a lot of in-class exercises. The professor is really good, but you will have to put in a lot of the work yourself. Take it only if you have sufficient interest and background in the topic
- It felt like most of the class had no idea what was happening and just used ChatGPT to answer everything. Dan is incredibly sweet but the pace was very fast and slides often had too much mathematical notation. While the topics are actually very interesting, class can be really stressful because the case is long and you usually only get through half of it in class (really depends on how friendly chatGPT is being that day).
- Very good!
- The course is great for people who have the intellectual curiosity to explore more the concepts of models, simulation, optimization, and how it applies to the real world. Professor Dan is brilliant and kind, a very technical person who is genuinely committed to support MBA students
- While you don't need an extensive coding background in the course, it is nice to have a moderate background.
- Professor Dan Iancu is not only the nicest, but also the smartest professor I have met at the GSB. I did an Optimization class in college and used to think that big data is boring, because it was dry. But taking Professor Iancu's class has revived my interest in data analytics. He uses interesting case study problems to illustrate the concepts and demonstrate the value of Optimization and Simulation Modeling. Interesting case studies that he created include: making decisions on EV manufacturing (Tesla); matching riders and passengers for ride-sharing trips (Uber); selling flight tickets as an airline (United Airlines); etc. I can definitely see myself using what he taught in my job in future.

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan lancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15%)

10 - Would you like to provide any other comments about this course? Will only be seen by the instructor.

Dan lancu

Response Rate	14/52 (26.92%)
---------------	----------------

- You're a fantastic teacher and I wish there were some more of the videos like you did the first few weeks to help us prep more for class so that the flipped style didn't feel so chaotic and rushed.
- Thank you for being the most engaging and kind professor I've had so far at the GSB. I truly felt you were invested in my learning while creating a fun environment. I wish all professors had your attitude!
- Thank you so much for being such a great instructor! You cultivated a true learning environment and made us all excited to come to class to solve hard problems with a positive mindset!
- Thank you for being a caring and patient instructor. It is clear that you are passionate about the subject and helping students learn. I recognize and appreciate the effort you put in improving the class throughout the quarter.
- Great care demonstrated for students and very interesting examples. Seems like the instructor has put in genuine effort into the course, but would like the content post midterms to be less challenging or more slower paced.
- Thank you for your course! You created a kind environment where students felt like they could ask questions and share. One thing I will say however is that with there being new case almost every class so the volume of context you have to understand before you even get into the content is so high it just doesn't make any sense. There should be maximum one case a week in order to really be able to learn the math and the concepts you are actually trying to teach us. I definitely learned when you lectured! But honestly don't feel like I learned much from the cases.
- The professor was really dedicated to the course and tried to foster a good learning environment. The cases were also well drafted and interesting.
- Thank you for providing such a fun learning environment! I'm still terrified for the exam, but I learned so much throughout this course.
- The professor is very kind and motivated in the content he teaches.
- I enjoyed learning the different conceptual methods of optimization, but felt that sometimes the discussions about the real-life cases dragged on quite a lot and took away from the time given to other crucial concepts in the class. I feel that the real-life case study should be given as pre-class prep, probably as a video, and class should focus more time on the case. Also, in most cases, we did not get beyond solving Q2 in the class, which meant we had to work through the remaining questions ourselves. It would be great if more time was spent on solving through the questions, and the questions were solved in a sequential manner i.e, give 10 mins to solve Q1, explain Q1, then give 10 mins to solve Q2 and so on instead of giving 50 mins to solve all questions at once.
- I'd recommend rethinking usage of ChatGPT in this class and maybe structuring the bulk of content to be more about discussing modeling techniques on paper (with no usage of ChatGPT allowed). The concepts taught in this class are actually incredibly interesting, but the pace is so fast and the class environment so stressful that I think it can get lost.
- Very good and patient teaching!
- Thanks for the many efforts made to make the class engagement. I learned a lot both from systems modelling and also how to leverage AI copilots. I feel this course is the first experience of what will be the future of work and productivity.
- n/a

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?

Arnav Mehta

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	10	35.71%		4.57	
Good	(4)	2	7.14%			
Fair	(3)	2	7.14%			
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
N/A	(0)	14	50.00%			
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
28/52 (53.85%)				4.57	0.76	5.00

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?

John Onderdonk

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Excellent	(5)	20	60.61%		4.54	
Good	(4)	5	15.15%			
Fair	(3)	1	3.03%			
Poor	(2)	2	6.06%			
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%			
N/A	(0)	5	15.15%			
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
33/52 (63.46%)				4.54	0.88	5.00

Stanford University
1252 GSB Fall 2024-2025

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15 %)

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?					
Jordan Miller					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Excellent	(5)	11	37.93%		4.56
Good	(4)	3	10.34%		
Fair	(3)	2	6.90%		
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%		
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
N/A	(0)	13	44.83%		
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
29/52 (55.77%)			4.56	0.73	5.00

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?					
Lauren Maymar					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Excellent	(5)	14	48.28%		4.50
Good	(4)	5	17.24%		
Fair	(3)	3	10.34%		
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%		
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
N/A	(0)	7	24.14%		
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
29/52 (55.77%)			4.50	0.74	5.00

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?					
Maisie Lynton					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Excellent	(5)	13	43.33%		4.58
Good	(4)	4	13.33%		
Fair	(3)	2	6.67%		
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%		
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
N/A	(0)	11	36.67%		
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
30/52 (57.69%)			4.58	0.69	5.00

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?					
Matt Mahowald					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Excellent	(5)	18	58.06%		4.61
Good	(4)	1	3.23%		
Fair	(3)	4	12.90%		
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%		
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
N/A	(0)	8	25.81%		
Response Rate			Mean	STD	Median
31/52 (59.62%)			4.61	0.78	5.00

Stanford University
1252 GSB Fall 2024-2025

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15%)

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?					
Nicki Liang					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Excellent	(5)	10	34.48%		4.50
Good	(4)	4	13.79%		
Fair	(3)	2	6.90%		
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%		
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
N/A	(0)	13	44.83%		
Response Rate			29/52 (55.77%)	Mean	4.50
				STD	0.73
				Median	5.00

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?					
Vasundhara Rakesh					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Excellent	(5)	11	39.29%		4.56
Good	(4)	3	10.71%		
Fair	(3)	2	7.14%		
Poor	(2)	0	0.00%		
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
N/A	(0)	12	42.86%		
Response Rate			28/52 (53.85%)	Mean	4.56
				STD	0.73
				Median	5.00

11 - Overall, how would you describe the quality of the course assistant's teaching in this course?					
Arnav Mehta, John Onderdonk, Jordan Miller, Lauren Maymar, Maisie Lynton, Matt Mahowald, Nicki Liang, Vasundhara Rakesh					
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Excellent	(5)	107	45.15%		4.55
Good	(4)	27	11.39%		
Fair	(3)	18	7.59%		
Poor	(2)	2	0.84%		
Very Poor	(1)	0	0.00%		
N/A	(0)	83	35.02%		
Response Rate				Mean	4.55
				STD	0.75
				Median	5.00

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?	
Arnav Mehta	
Response Rate	1/52 (1.92%)
• n/a	

Stanford University
1252 GSB Fall 2024-2025

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15 %)

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?

John Onderdonk

Response Rate	5/52 (9.62%)
----------------------	--------------

- You're so kind and helpful.
- Simply the BEST!
- Always present and willing to help
- John is the only reason I am surviving this class. He is great at explaining the concepts step by step and helping me stick with problems when they are challenging. He also clearly cares about us as people, which is nice.
- n/a

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?

Jordan Miller

Response Rate	1/52 (1.92%)
----------------------	--------------

- n/a

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?

Lauren Maymar

Response Rate	2/52 (3.85%)
----------------------	--------------

- Great at explaining concepts and breaking them down into steps that I can understand. Very helpful during class exercises.
- n/a

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?

Maisie Lynton

Response Rate	2/52 (3.85%)
----------------------	--------------

- Always present and ready to help
- n/a

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?

Matt Mahowald

Response Rate	2/52 (3.85%)
----------------------	--------------

- Really good grasp of the topics and an excellent teacher
- n/a

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?

Nicki Liang

Response Rate	1/52 (1.92%)
----------------------	--------------

- n/a

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?

Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate	1/52 (1.92%)
----------------------	--------------

- n/a

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV

Instructor: Dan Iancu *

TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15%)

12 - Please comment on the course assistant with regards to effectiveness and attitude toward students. What are their strengths as an instructor? What suggestions do you have for improvement?

Arnav Mehta, John Onderdonk, Jordan Miller, Lauren Maymar, Maisie Lynton, Matt Mahowald, Nicki Liang, Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate

- You're so kind and helpful.
- Simply the BEST!
- Always present and ready to help
- Always present and willing to help
- Great at explaining concepts and breaking them down into steps that I can understand. Very helpful during class exercises.
- John is the only reason I am surviving this class. He is great at explaining the concepts step by step and helping me stick with problems when they are challenging. He also clearly cares about us as people, which is nice.
- Really good grasp of the topics and an excellent teacher
- n/a

13 - Formulating appropriate optimization or simulation models that capture some of the decision-making processes involved with a real-world context How well did you achieve this learning goal in this course?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Extremely well	(5)	10	28.57%			
Very well	(4)	14	40.00%			
Moderately well	(3)	9	25.71%			
Slightly well	(2)	1	2.86%			
Not well at all	(1)	1	2.86%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
35/52 (67.31%)				3.89	0.96	4.00

14 - Coding up an optimization or simulation model in Python How well did you achieve this learning goal in this course?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Extremely well	(5)	8	22.22%			
Very well	(4)	13	36.11%			
Moderately well	(3)	12	33.33%			
Slightly well	(2)	1	2.78%			
Not well at all	(1)	2	5.56%			
				0 25 50 100	Question	
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
36/52 (69.23%)				3.67	1.04	4.00

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV

Instructor: Dan Iancu *

TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15 %)

15 - Interpreting the outputs from a model in a real-world context; revising the model to (re)align it with different objectives or perspectives How well did you achieve this learning goal in this course?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Extremely well	(5)	10	27.78%		3.94
Very well	(4)	17	47.22%		
Moderately well	(3)	7	19.44%		
Slightly well	(2)	1	2.78%		
Not well at all	(1)	1	2.78%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
36/52 (69.23%)		3.94		0.92	4.00

16 - Interacting with an AI chatbot for aid in coding and / or in model-building How well did you achieve this learning goal in this course?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Extremely well	(5)	17	48.57%		4.20
Very well	(4)	10	28.57%		
Moderately well	(3)	6	17.14%		
Slightly well	(2)	2	5.71%		
Not well at all	(1)	0	0.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
35/52 (67.31%)		4.20		0.93	4.00

17 - How useful to you were the Cases?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Extremely useful	(5)	9	25.00%		3.78
Very useful	(4)	16	44.44%		
Moderately useful	(3)	7	19.44%		
Slightly useful	(2)	2	5.56%		
Not useful at all	(1)	2	5.56%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
36/52 (69.23%)		3.78		1.07	4.00

18 - How useful to you were the In-class discussions?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Extremely useful	(5)	6	16.67%		3.39
Very useful	(4)	11	30.56%		
Moderately useful	(3)	12	33.33%		
Slightly useful	(2)	5	13.89%		
Not useful at all	(1)	2	5.56%		
				0 25 50 100	Question
Response Rate		Mean		STD	Median
36/52 (69.23%)		3.39		1.10	3.00

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV

Instructor: Dan Iancu *

TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh

Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15 %)

19 - How useful to you were the In-class breakout groups?									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Extremely useful	(5)	6	17.14%		 3.06				
Very useful	(4)	8	22.86%						
Moderately useful	(3)	9	25.71%						
Slightly useful	(2)	6	17.14%						
Not useful at all	(1)	6	17.14%						
				0 25 50 100	Question				
Response Rate				Mean	STD		Median		
35/52 (67.31%)				3.06	1.35		3.00		

20 - How useful to you were the Lectures?									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Extremely useful	(5)	13	36.11%		 3.72				
Very useful	(4)	5	13.89%						
Moderately useful	(3)	13	36.11%						
Slightly useful	(2)	5	13.89%						
Not useful at all	(1)	0	0.00%						
				0 25 50 100	Question				
Response Rate				Mean	STD		Median		
36/52 (69.23%)				3.72	1.11		3.50		

21 - How useful to you were the Problem sets?									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Extremely useful	(5)	7	20.59%		 3.59				
Very useful	(4)	16	47.06%						
Moderately useful	(3)	5	14.71%						
Slightly useful	(2)	2	5.88%						
Not useful at all	(1)	4	11.76%						
				0 25 50 100	Question				
Response Rate				Mean	STD		Median		
34/52 (65.38%)				3.59	1.23		4.00		

Stanford University
1252 GSB Fall 2024-2025

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15%)

22 - If you were to consider KEEPING one or two things from the course, what would those be?

Response Rate	18/52 (34.62%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I loved the cases and how relevant they were to real world problems. I also loved your explanations. • The types of cases! I was exciting to work on socially relevant (e.g., sustainable sourcing, carbon projects) and tangible (e.g., uber routing) examples! I also really enjoyed reviewing the first couple questions at the end. • Cases • Quality of cases, opportunity to improve AI-assisted workflow • 1) practical cases from all different industries • Python for optimization • Case approach and flipped classroom • Chatbots • Cases • Focusing on leveraging AI chatbots to solve problems, in class problem solving • the flexibility of the professor and the real life applications of what we see • Lectures, emphasis on critically thinking about problems and pen and paper solutions • Cases, use of AI for coding • Using chatGPT to solve programmatic problems. Understanding optimization problems conceptually. The practice sets and Midterm and Final review sessions • Topics and cases -- but I would shorten the number of questions in each case by 30% • Learning how to work with AI copilots. Examples of how ar concepts applied to real world • Case studies • The cases and the in class lectures. 	

23 - If you were to consider DROPPING one or two things from the course, what would those be?

Response Rate	17/52 (32.69%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A. I would add some more at home videos/prep before class • I struggled with the lectures in the 2nd half of the class as they got very technical. To the extent possible, it would be really helpful to ground the math in a tangible example (whether the case or other simple example) • Flipped classroom model • Would try to find an open source gurobi if possible • 1) In class collaboration, 2) high grade weight of class participation • excessive amount of cases • It is too fast paced and would cover less content • Please please please reduce the number of cases. No one has time to pre-read and pre-prepare a new case every single class. • Exams • The Midterm was VERY LONG - even with chatbots and 3 hours I struggled to finish • Long problem sets, discussions that didn't add a lot to learning • As much use of AI. I sometimes wish we spent more time ensuring we understood the cases conceptually before jumping into building the models • The overly complicated math parts. • ChatGPT • Some cases were redundant. I would drop Montecarlo and replace iwth more machine learning • Google sheets • I know Professor Iancu is trying to minimize our work outside of class. But I do think I would enjoy solving a few simple questions on a problem set before coming to class, so that I can better follow his lectures. I wouldn't mind having some simple, low-stakes assignment (beyond reading the cases ahead of time) that will give a taster of what Professor Iancu will be teaching in class. 	

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15%)

24 - This course allowed the use of chatbots without any constraints. Considering the learning outcomes for the course, what do you think would be the best policy regarding the use of chatbots?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
Do not allow chatbots for any task	(1)	0	0.00%		3.47	
Do not allow chatbots for modeling, but allow them for coding	(2)	8	22.22%	█		
Neutral	(3)	3	8.33%	█		
Allow chatbots for everything	(4)	25	69.44%	█		
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
36/52 (69.23%)				3.47	0.84	4.00

- I think for this class to be the most practical for me moving forward it should allow chatbots fully! That's what we'll be doing in our careers.
- Feels like in the real world we will be able to use chatbots for everything - so the valuable skills are around being able to understand conceptually so you can prompt properly, and then check outputs. This class was very helpful in that
- I don't think this is the precise framing of the policy I would prefer, but something in between open season and allowing only for coding seems right to me. Not allowing chatbots for coding tasks seems like adding pointless busywork. At the same time, allowing for modeling risks not requiring students actually learn the course material. I do think having both class sessions and exam questions that more clearly target model formulation in the absence of ChatGPT (not just "do it on pencil/paper" but maybe cold calling to present modeling rationale?) would be helpful.
- The use of chatbots has completely transformed learning experience and enabled me to learn so much more than I would have been able to otherwise. In addition, it enabled the class to better reflect the real world, focusing our learning experience on what matters the most.
- I don't know how to fix it but it's terrible.
- Depending on what the objective of the content is, maybe helping people think about the modelling without chatbots first and then 'implement' (coding) with the chatbots.
- Easy to get lazy
- I wish we had more time in class to work through modeling conceptually before jumping into building the optimization model. I also wish we focused a bit more on problems we might encounter in our day jobs and realistically how we would actually bring these models into our day jobs.
- Perhaps the most transcendental learning was to discover chatbots, test them, and learn how to use them while combining them to achieve good results. I believe this will be the future of knowledge work very soon and I feel the class taught me the most about how to leverage AI for my work and life as it forced me to explore and iterate with many different approaches
- I still got my butt kicked during the midterms with the chatbots. I think how Professor Iancu has leveraged AI chatbots should be a model for all other Stanford classes to emulate.

25 - Our course did not feature any homework. For future iterations, what do you think would be the best policy regarding homework?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means	
No homework (keep current policy)	(1)	18	50.00%	█	1.89	
Minimal, non-graded homework (every 2-3 weeks)	(2)	10	27.78%	█		
Non-graded homework, weekly	(3)	2	5.56%	█		
Graded homework, weekly	(4)	6	16.67%	█		
Response Rate				Mean	STD	Median
36/52 (69.23%)				1.89	1.12	1.50

- If you're going to add homework, it has to be graded (at least on completion) or people generally won't do it. I thought this class was fine without homework but adding it would be okay too.
- Maybe some homework would help keep people engaged and up to date to course content - but making it too complex and long would discourage people to do it.
- Make prep work required and assessed, homework optional
- If you do non-graded, people don't do it. But doing a near zero amount of points so it doesn't cause stress (ex. 1pt per homework, or graded for completion)
- I might replace the exam or one of the exams with a project.
- I know Professor Iancu is trying to minimize our work outside of class. But I do think I would enjoy solving a few simple questions on a problem set before coming to class, so that I can better follow his lectures. I wouldn't mind having some simple, low-stakes assignment (beyond reading the cases ahead of time) that will give a taste of what Professor Iancu will be teaching in class.

Course: F25-OIT-248-02: OSM ADV
Instructor: Dan Iancu *
TA: Lauren Maymar, Matt Mahowald, Jordan Miller, Maisie Lynton, Arnav Mehta, Nicki Liang, John Onderdonk, Vasundhara Rakesh
Response Rate: 37/52 (71.15%)

26 - How useful was the session with the Guest Speaker (Ruben Lobel, from Waymo)

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Not at all useful	(1)	1	2.78%			3.89			
Not that useful	(2)	1	2.78%						
Neutral	(3)	11	30.56%	█					
Useful	(4)	11	30.56%	█					
Very useful	(5)	12	33.33%	█					
				0 25 50 100	Question				
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median	
36/52 (69.23%)				3.89		1.01		4.00	

27 - You experienced two platforms for course-related announcements: the Ed platform and Canvas. How would you compare the two

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means				
Canvas is better	(1)	31	86.11%	██████████		1.14			
Neutral	(2)	5	13.89%	█					
Ed is better	(3)	0	0.00%						
				0 25 50 100	Question				
Response Rate				Mean		STD		Median	
36/52 (69.23%)				1.14		0.35		1.00	