

## 78 GEOGRAPHY

### Introduction

The Toronto Undergraduate Geography Society (TUGS) is the geography student union. If you are taking a GGR course or are enrolled in a geography program, you are automatically a member of TUGS. Throughout the year, TUGS organizes events, career days and seminars of interest to all geography students. We also represent geography students on the Arts & Science Students' Union (ASSU) Council and on a number of other committees in the geography department. TUGS is a great link between the geography department and geography students, addressing the issues and needs of the undergraduates. In addition, we have an office with information on courses, lectures and events, as well as a file of old geography exams available for photocopying.

There are several ways to get involved with TUGS. You can be a class rep, or you can be a member of the Executive, or a volunteer, helping our Executive organize events, or you can just come out to our events during the year! TUGS is a great way to meet people, have fun and get more involved in the UofT community. Drop by our office in the basement of Sidney Smith Hall (room 613), equipped with a telephone, comfy couches and a microwave. We can also be reached online at <http://tugsonline.cjb.net> or by telephone at (416) 978-2057.

### TUGS Executive

#### GGR 100Y1Y Introduction to Physical Geography

Instructor(s): T. Davis

	Resp: 68							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	2	8	17	44	26	5.8
Explains	0	0	2	4	29	34	28	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	1	22	35	41	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	11	22	39	26	5.8
Workload	0	4	7	57	22	7	1	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	8	64	16	4	4	4.3
Learn Exp	0	1	5	39	28	16	8	4.8

Davis had an exciting and unique teaching style. Students found him to be well-organized. Students found the slides were an effective and enjoyable illustration of geographical concepts.

#### GGR 107Y1Y Environment, Food and People

Instructor(s): J. Galloway

	Resp: 152							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	1	2	15	22	36	21	5.5
Explains	0	0	3	9	27	33	24	5.6
Communicates	3	2	13	15	20	30	14	5.0
Teaching	0	1	2	14	23	36	21	5.5
Workload	2	4	11	64	15	1	0	3.9
Difficulty	1	5	17	61	11	0	0	3.8
Learn Exp	2	3	3	36	33	15	4	4.6

Galloway was congratulated for his easy to follow, interesting and enjoyable lectures. The course material gave a good introduction to students. Students felt that they did not have enough time to finish the midterm and many complained it was not graded fairly. The textbook was considered "not useful".

#### GGR 124Y1Y Urbanization, Contemporary Cities and Urban Life

Instructor(s): L. Bourne

	Resp: 111							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	5	23	45	24	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	6	20	48	24	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	2	14	36	45	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	3	10	47	38	6.2
Workload	0	2	6	72	14	3	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	4	8	61	23	1	0	4.1
Learn Exp	1	0	1	27	34	24	11	5.1

Many students praised Bourne's knowledge, friendliness and humour. His humour made classes interesting and enjoyable. Some students mentioned there was a lot of note taking. Students felt that the TA's were not helpful.

Instructor(s): C. Teixeira

	Resp: 88							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	1	8	12	32	25	16	5.2
Explains	1	0	1	9	22	32	32	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	8	5	86	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	5	15	34	44	6.2
Workload	1	0	9	67	16	4	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	1	11	72	15	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	1	2	32	17	34	10	5.1

Teixeira was a very enthusiastic instructor. The course material was presented clearly, with many examples. For those with difficulty, he never failed to help, "his door is always open." Students found the assignments fair, but felt that the research essay was too much for a first year course.

#### GGR 201H1S Geomorphology

Instructor(s): D. Carlyle-Moses

	Resp: 49							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	2	10	53	24	6	2	4.2
Explains	0	2	20	36	22	14	4	4.4
Communicates	0	4	16	28	36	14	0	4.4
Teaching	0	2	10	36	34	14	2	4.6
Workload	2	6	12	67	12	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	8	18	63	8	2	0	3.8
Learn Exp	2	5	15	52	15	7	2	4.1

Many of the students found the course to be disorganized and said that the instructor lacked enthusiasm. They found that the instructor read aloud the notes and reading material in lectures.

Some students found that this course should have required a prerequisite because of the mathematical nature of the labs. Also, some complained that there were many mistakes in the lab questions.

However, some said that the instructor attended to students' questions attentively. Many recognized that this year was the first time the instructor had taught the course.

#### GGR 203H1S Introduction to Climatology

Instructor(s): D. Harvey

	Resp: 23							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	4	4	13	22	27	27	5.5
Explains	4	0	4	18	18	36	18	5.3
Communicates	0	0	5	0	20	20	55	6.2
Teaching	0	9	0	19	23	19	28	5.3
Workload	0	0	5	20	25	30	20	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	10	35	25	30	5.8
Learn Exp	0	5	0	41	11	17	23	5.1

Students commented on how difficult assignments were.

#### GGR 205H1F Introduction to Soil Science

Instructor(s): A. Davis

	Resp: 24							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	8	30	34	26	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	8	21	43	26	5.9
Communicates	4	0	0	13	8	17	56	6.0
Teaching	0	4	0	4	17	52	21	5.8
Workload	0	0	29	54	12	4	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	4	25	66	4	0	0	3.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	41	35	23	0	4.8

Davis had a great sense of humour and made potentially dry material interesting. The field trip was fun, useful component of the course.

**GGR 206H1F Introduction to Hydrology**

Instructor(s): J. Chen

	Resp: 18							Retake: 94%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	31	62	0	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	20	40	40	0	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	12	37	37	12	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	12	18	68	0	5.6
Workload	0	0	6	87	6	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	6	68	25	0	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	53	33	13	0	4.6

Chen was a very good and organized instructor.

**GGR 220Y1Y The Spatial Organization of Economic Activity**

Instructor(s): R. DiFrancesco

	Resp: 129							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	24	34	33	4	5.1
Explains	0	0	4	29	33	26	5	5.0
Communicates	1	3	10	25	37	19	2	4.6
Teaching	0	0	2	24	37	29	4	5.1
Workload	0	3	13	77	5	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	2	7	60	21	5	1	4.2
Learn Exp	0	1	5	63	19	8	0	4.3

DiFrancesco was organized and concise. Tutorials were unequal with respect to overall TA ability. A better knowledge of economic terms/concepts entering the class would have been beneficial. DiFrancesco was said to be very approachable, but could have showed a little more enthusiasm in the material.

**GGR 233Y1Y Environmental Management for Sustainable Development**

Instructor(s): S. Prudham

	Resp: 39							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	7	25	33	30	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	26	15	36	21	5.5
Communicates	0	0	5	12	17	46	17	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	7	28	36	26	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	58	25	12	2	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	2	74	20	0	2	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	32	25	25	16	5.3

Prudham tried to make lectures interesting and informative. He received many positive comments from students, such as "enthusiastic", "friendly", and "informative".

However, students felt that TA's were not helpful and that the assignments were difficult.

Overall, the class was enjoyable.

Instructor(s): M. Diamond

	Resp: 44							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	9	14	39	24	9	5.0
Explains	0	0	2	14	43	31	7	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	10	17	47	25	5.9
Teaching	0	0	7	5	37	47	2	5.3
Workload	0	0	0	43	38	15	2	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	59	25	13	2	4.6
Learn Exp	0	2	0	38	29	17	11	4.9

Overall, students felt that the material covered complex social and biophysical problems in sustainable development, including issues

encountered in everyday life. However, some students would have appreciated if the lecture material was available on the course website since it was difficult to follow in class.

**GGR 240Y1Y Historical Geography of the Americas**

Instructor(s): J. Leydon

	Resp: 53							Retake: 82%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	15	49	32	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	3	13	52	30	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	7	15	51	25	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	5	7	51	34	6.2
Workload	1	1	5	67	20	1	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	1	5	73	16	1	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	45	30	15	10	4.9

Overall, students thoroughly enjoyed this course. The lectures were well-planned and delivered. Students appreciated the instructor's humorous approach to material that may otherwise been uninteresting. Many students also felt that Leydon was approachable and engaging and his enthusiasm and dedication was inspiring.

**GGR 246H1F Geography of Canada**

Instructor(s): J. Leydon

	Resp: 115							Retake: 84%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	8	21	36	32	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	7	20	44	28	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	4	21	37	35	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	8	24	38	29	5.9
Workload	0	2	6	74	13	2	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	2	8	71	13	2	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	1	2	27	26	25	17	5.2

Leydon had a good sense of humour and he kept the class interested with his enthusiasm and passion. Several comments by students included that this course was something that every Canadian should take. One student summed up what the rest were saying: "Good times, Funny dude, Likes to joke, He is Irish."

**GGR 252H1F Marketing Geography**

Instructor(s): R. DiFrancesco

	Resp: 64							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	21	37	32	7	5.3
Explains	1	1	1	10	40	34	9	5.3
Communicates	0	1	12	18	34	25	7	4.9
Teaching	0	0	4	12	37	31	14	5.4
Workload	1	3	17	67	4	4	1	3.9
Difficulty	1	4	12	63	11	3	3	4.0
Learn Exp	2	4	8	36	31	17	0	4.4

Students rated the instructor as enthusiastic, but believed that the course could have been improved by using a wider range of media.

Non-geography students found the instructor fair as he did emphasize that all students, regardless of elective, must 'play on the same level playing field'.

Some students felt that the course was over-statistical, especially for the assignments.

**GGR 252H1S Marketing Geography**

Instructor(s): S. Swales

	Resp: 131							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	16	32	33	11	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	11	29	40	17	5.6
Communicates	0	0	3	11	23	32	30	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	10	28	39	20	5.7

## 80 GEOGRAPHY

Workload	0	7	14	68	4	3	0	3.8
Difficulty	2	4	13	68	6	4	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	8	41	28	13	8	4.7

Swales was a very enjoyable, enthusiastic and fun instructor. He posted slideshows and included the occasional comic strips to peak students' interests.

Instructor(s): S. Swales

Enr: 184	Resp: 96							Retake: 87%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	16	37	27	15	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	10	26	41	22	5.7
Communicates	0	0	2	8	23	42	24	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	14	21	40	23	5.7
Workload	0	3	7	68	13	3	4	4.2
Difficulty	0	3	13	66	10	2	4	4.1
Learn Exp	1	0	2	41	25	20	8	4.8

Most felt Swales was a very enthusiastic instructor who could keep interest in "extra-curricular" slideshows. Some felt that the tutorials were completely useless and should be done away with. Assignments were difficult.

### GGR 254H1S Geography USA

Instructor(s): R. Lewis

Enr: 168	Resp: 118							Retake: 82%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	18	42	26	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	9	17	42	29	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	7	19	30	42	6.4
Teaching	0	0	1	6	24	39	27	5.8
Workload	0	2	7	74	11	2	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	2	10	78	6	2	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	6	444	22	14	11	4.8

Many students thought Lewis was extremely enthusiastic and organized; one of the best instructors at UofT! The lectures were well-planned and he presented them with clarity.

Some students commented that assignments were difficult to do because of the lack of resources. Also, some said that tutorials were needed. Students liked the instructor's use of graphs, maps and figures, but wished they were accessible on the web.

### GGR 256H1F Recreational Geography

Instructor(s): A. Weaver

Enr: 79	Resp: 48							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	18	27	33	20	5.6
Explains	0	2	0	12	29	31	25	5.6
Communicates	0	4	0	8	29	29	29	5.7
Teaching	0	0	4	10	35	31	18	5.5
Workload	0	2	4	73	10	6	2	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	16	68	6	6	2	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	7	53	23	10	5	4.5

Students rated the instructor as good and the course as enjoyable.

### GGR 272H1F Geographic Information and Mapping I

Instructor(s): D. Boyes

Enr: 49	Resp: 41							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	10	15	46	25	5.8
Explains	0	0	2	23	17	38	17	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	12	23	41	23	5.7
Teaching	0	0	2	12	25	38	20	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	46	33	15	5	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	41	25	17	15	5.1

Learn Exp	0	0	3	36	42	15	3	4.8
-----------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	-----

Students were happy with the way the instructor communicated the lectures.

### GGR 272H1S Geographic Information and Mapping I

Instructor(s): D. Boyes

Enr: 50	Resp: 35							Retake: 87%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	5	20	28	42	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	5	20	45	28	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	8	20	40	31	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	5	28	42	22	5.8
Workload	0	0	2	38	41	11	5	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	2	40	42	14	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	17	28	39	14	5.5

Students found Boyes to be an enthusiastic and well-organized instructor. Assignments were found to be time consuming and at times, the equipment was unable to handle the demands.

### GGR 302H1F Quarternary Paleoclimatic Reconstruction

Instructor(s): D. Harvey

Enr: 6	Resp: 6							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	50	16	33	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	7.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	10	0	83	6.7
Workload	0	0	0	20	20	40	20	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	33	33	33	6.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5

Harvey was passionate and enthusiastic about the subject matter. He went above and beyond to ensure students got relevant and up-to-date information.

### GGR 305H1F Biogeography

Instructor(s): T. Davis

Enr: 47	Resp: 28							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	14	42	39	3	5.3
Explains	0	0	3	10	25	50	10	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	18	48	33	6.1
Teaching	0	3	0	3	39	35	17	5.6
Workload	0	0	10	85	3	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	78	10	10	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	39	43	13	4	4.8

Most students found that Davis was very enthusiastic and showed much interest in the course material. However, some students felt that the weighting of the paper was too high. The midterms were also very specific.

Davis communicated well and had a good sense of humour.

### GGR 314H1F Global Warming

Instructor(s): D. Harvey

Enr: 78	Resp: 42							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	9	21	35	30	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	9	19	49	23	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	2	7	25	65	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	4	24	36	34	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	41	38	12	7	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	37	25	32	5	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	13	30	41	13	5.6

Many students said Harvey was a very knowledgeable instructor.



## 82 GEOGRAPHY

### GGR 342H1S The Changing Geography of Southeast Asia

Instructor(s): A. Daniere

	Enr: 93							Resp: 49							Retake: 86%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	2	4	20	36	28	8																5.1
Explains	0	0	4	14	28	34	18																5.5
Communicates	0	0	2	12	18	37	29																5.8
Teaching	0	0	2	12	31	43	10																5.5
Workload	0	0	4	55	34	6	0																4.4
Difficulty	0	0	4	67	22	6	0																4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	5	41	30	11	11																4.8

Most thought Daniere was very enthusiastic, but unorganized and spoke too quickly. Online notes or overheads would have been effective.

### GGR 357H1S Geography of Housing and Housing Policy

Instructor(s): C. Teixeira

	Enr: 75							Resp: 61							Retake: 81%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	3	25	25	31	15																5.3
Explains	0	0	5	8	26	36	23																5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	26	66																6.6
Teaching	0	0	3	6	20	35	35																5.9
Workload	0	0	0	77	15	6	0																4.3
Difficulty	0	0	1	86	10	1	0																4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	2	20	45	27	4																5.1

Teixeira was found to be a very enthusiastic and passionate instructor. He was also very considerate, always willing to give up his time to meet with students.

### GGR 364H1S Historical Geography of Ethnic Groups in Canada

Instructor(s): J. Leydon

	Enr: 85							Resp: 55							Retake: 84%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	0	3	44	51																6.5
Explains	0	0	0	1	7	43	47																6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	3	9	50	36																6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	9	50	39																6.3
Workload	0	0	1	83	12	0	1																4.2
Difficulty	0	0	5	77	14	1	0																4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	46	26	4																5.1

Leydon made the lectures interesting and enjoyable. Students found him to be well-organized and he was willing and available for extra help.

Students found the course workbook to be of very poor reproduction in terms of quality of maps, etc.

### GGR 371H1S Advanced Quantitative Methods in Geography

Instructor(s): R. DiFrancesco

	Enr: 12							Resp: 7							Retake: 100%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	0	4	57	28																6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	14	42	42																6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	28	57	14																5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	14	57	28																6.1
Workload	0	0	0	28	71	0	0																4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	14	28	57	0																5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	40	20	40																6.0

Overall, students thought DiFrancesco was good and the assignments were useful in understanding the software. However, additional material for assignments was desired by some students.

### GGR 373H1F Advanced Geographic Information Systems

Instructor(s): D. Boyes

	Enr: 22							Resp: 16							Retake: 50%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	6	0	6	18	18	37	12																5.1
Explains	0	0	6	0	46	46	0																5.3
Communicates	0	0	6	0	18	37	37																6.0
Teaching	0	0	6	18	56	18	0																4.9
Workload	0	0	0	0	25	12	62																6.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	37	12	50																6.1
Learn Exp	0	0	11	22	33	33	0																4.9

The consensus was that the assignments were overly difficult and exceedingly time consuming for the marks they were worth. Boyes zipped through the Powerpoint slides as he apologized for too much content. One student commented, "If he knows there's too much content, then put in less content!". Another student found it difficult to listen and grasp new concepts while taking notes and keeping up with the slides. It was also suggested that students be given handouts of the slides in order to be able to just listen and take notes to fill in the gaps. As well, it was felt that the midterm test did not reflect what was emphasized in class.

On the upside, Boyes was approachable, amicable dedicated and enthusiastic.

### GGR 373H1S Advanced Geographic Information Systems

Instructor(s): D. Boyes

	Enr: 47							Resp: 29							Retake: 92%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	3	17	55	24																6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	27	58	13																5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	31	31	34																6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	31	58	10																5.8
Workload	0	3	0	41	34	20	0																4.7
Difficulty	0	0	3	51	24	17	3																4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	32	28	32	8																5.2

Boyes was a well-planned and organized lecturer. Powerpoint presentations were found to be helpful and thorough. Boyes was found to be enthusiastic and had a sense of humour. He was able to relate to students and was very approachable.

TA's were found to be ineffective in answering questions and providing instructions.

### GGR 390H1F Field Methods

Instructor(s): J. Desloges; T. Davis

	Enr: 23							Resp: 22							Retake: 72%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<u>Desloges:</u>																							
Presents	0	0	0	11	23	58	5																5.6
Explains	0	0	0	11	29	47	11																5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	75	12																6.0
Teaching	0	0	5	0	5	70	17																5.9
<u>Davis:</u>																							
Presents	0	0	4	4	33	47	9																5.5
Explains	0	0	4	9	23	52	9																5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	19	57	23																6.0
Teaching	0	0	4	0	9	66	19																6.0
<u>Course:</u>																							
Workload	0	0	0	31	31	31	5																5.1
Difficulty	0	0	5	42	47	0	5																4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	38	7	30	23																5.4

Students had high praise for the field experience. Students felt that relevant readings should have been made available before the field trip. The field component was well-organized and an excellent experience overall.

**GGR 391H1S Research Design**

Instructor(s): C. Teixeira

	Enr: 69							Resp: 55	Retake: 85%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	14	27	41	16	5.6	
Explains	0	0	0	3	27	44	24	5.9	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	32	52	6.4	
Teaching	0	0	0	3	18	40	37	6.1	
Workload	0	0	3	59	24	11	1	4.5	
Difficulty	0	0	11	68	20	0	0	4.1	
Learn Exp	0	0	5	25	38	27	2	5.0	

Most students enjoyed this class. Students enjoyed the enthusiasm of the instructor and guest speakers. Many thought the instructor did a good job at getting to know people during office hours where he would extensively help them. However, there were a few students that thought there were too many examples and not enough theory.

**GGR 393H1F Environmental Impact Assessment**

Instructor(s): E. Ligeti

	Enr: 8							Resp: 8	Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	14	28	14	42	5.9	
Explains	0	0	0	14	14	28	42	6.0	
Communicates	0	0	14	0	0	42	42	6.0	
Teaching	0	0	0	14	14	42	28	5.9	
Workload	0	0	0	71	14	14	0	4.4	
Difficulty	0	0	0	57	42	0	0	4.4	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	20	60	0	5.4	

Students felt that the course went well, and that the instructor was very nice. Students enjoyed the guest speakers who provided interesting discussion in several areas. Some students felt that the textbook material used made the course less valuable and interesting.

**GGR 400H1S The North American Suburb since 1945**

Instructor(s): J. Hall

	Enr: 22							Resp: 17	Retake: 78%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	5	11	11	35	23	11	4.9	
Explains	0	0	5	11	41	29	11	5.3	
Communicates	0	0	0	11	23	52	11	5.6	
Teaching	0	0	0	17	17	58	5	5.5	
Workload	0	5	5	64	23	0	0	4.1	
Difficulty	0	0	5	82	5	5	0	4.1	
Learn Exp	0	0	7	30	15	46	0	5.0	

Most students found the course enjoyable but some students found the lack of structure in the class frustrating.

**GGR 415H1S Resource and Environmental Planning**

Instructor(s): C. Hostovsky

	Enr: 53							Resp: 33	Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	3	0	21	15	39	15	6	4.6	
Explains	0	0	6	30	21	24	18	5.2	
Communicates	0	0	0	9	27	30	33	5.9	
Teaching	0	3	9	21	18	36	12	5.1	
Workload	3	3	6	74	6	6	0	4.0	
Difficulty	0	3	9	51	29	6	0	4.3	
Learn Exp	0	14	4	28	19	19	14	4.7	

Hostovsky was found to be a very enthusiastic instructor. Students found that he was approachable and always willing to answer questions.

**GGR 418H1S Political Economy of Natural Resources**

Instructor(s): S. Prudham

	Enr: 27							Resp: 21	Retake: 94%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	10	25	50	15	5.7	
Explains	0	0	0	10	25	50	15	5.7	
Communicates	0	0	0	10	15	45	30	5.9	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	19	47	33	6.1	
Workload	0	0	0	35	30	25	10	5.1	
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	50	10	10	5.0	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	17	17	41	23	5.7	

Students found the student-driven seminar structure a valuable means of acquiring diverse perspectives on the course material. However, they felt that it would have been helpful to receive regular feedback about their individual participation in the course. Also, there was a feeling that the grade distribution should have had less proportioned for the essay (40%).

**GGR 421H1S History of Geographical Thought**

Instructor(s): J. Galloway

	Enr: 18							Resp: 13	Retake: 58%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	8	0	33	41	16	0	4.6	
Explains	0	0	0	25	25	50	0	5.2	
Communicates	0	0	0	8	25	41	25	5.8	
Teaching	0	0	0	33	16	41	8	5.2	
Workload	0	0	7	69	15	7	0	4.2	
Difficulty	0	0	8	66	25	0	0	4.2	
Learn Exp	0	0	12	62	0	25	0	4.4	

Overall, Galloway was a good lecturer and was very knowledgeable. He communicated course material effectively and gave an in-depth understanding of the broad course content.

Some students felt that a few of the readings were too long and that biographies of authors were not useful as presentations. One student pointed out that geographical thought from other than a western point of view should have been included in some manner. Most students would have liked more structured guidelines and expectations, better guidance and more legible written comments.

**GGR 431H1F Regional Dynamics**

Instructor(s): M. Gertler

	Enr: 27							Resp: 19	Retake: 43%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	5	44	50	0	5.4	
Explains	0	0	0	5	38	44	11	5.6	
Communicates	0	0	0	15	52	26	5	5.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	11	38	44	5	5.4	
Workload	0	0	0	16	44	33	5	5.3	
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	44	22	0	4.9	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	44	22	22	11	5.0	

All comments about Gertler were complimentary and included comments such as "very interesting and experienced", "pleasure to learn from", "great class". The low retake percentage may be associated with a demanding term paper required in the course worth 55% of the final grade.

**GGR 435H1S Technology, Toronto, and Global Warming**

Instructor(s): D. Harvey

	Enr: 8							Resp: 7	Retake: 85%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	14	28	42	14	5.6	
Explains	0	0	0	0	42	14	42	6.0	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	14	85	6.9	
Teaching	0	0	0	14	0	71	14	5.9	
Workload	0	0	0	28	57	14	0	4.9	

## 84 GEOGRAPHY

Difficulty	0	0	0	57	42	0	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	50	33	16	5.7

### GGR 452H1F Space, Power, Geography: Understanding Spatiality

Instructor(s): S. Ruddick

Enr: 23	Resp: 19							Retake: 82%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	10	10	31	31	15	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	5	31	36	26	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	10	10	47	31	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	5	21	52	21	5.9
Workload	0	0	5	36	36	15	5	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	42	36	10	10	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	8	25	25	33	8	5.1

Students felt that the instructor was a very enthusiastic and engaging lecturer. Overall, the course was interesting and organized. However, some students felt that there were too many required readings.

### GGR 462H1S Geographic Information Systems

Instructor(s): D. Boyes; J. Chen

Enr: 11	Resp: 10							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Boyes:</u>								
Presents	0	11	11	11	44	11	11	4.7
Explains	0	0	0	55	22	22	0	4.7
Communicates	0	0	12	12	25	37	12	5.2
Teaching	0	0	11	22	22	33	11	5.1
<u>Chen:</u>								
Presents	0	10	0	10	60	20	0	4.8
Explains	0	0	0	50	30	20	0	4.7
Communicates	0	0	0	10	40	40	10	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	11	44	44	0	5.3
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	0	10	30	60	6.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	40	20	20	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	0	42	58	6.6

Boyes was a good instructor who was easily accessible for consultation.

Chen was a good instructor who explained everything in detail. He provided helpful feedback and was readily available for help.

Although students were very enthusiastic about taking this course, they did say it was A LOT of work. The web design section came too early in the course and it would have been good to include a project management section. Students felt that they needed more access to the GIS lab, more printing credits and more powerful computers to cut down on the long data processing time.

### GGR 473H1F Cartographic Design

Instructor(s): B. Moldofsky

Enr: 11	Resp: 9							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	22	22	44	0	11	4.6
Explains	0	0	12	25	37	12	12	4.9
Communicates	0	12	0	37	25	25	0	4.5
Teaching	0	0	12	37	25	25	0	4.6
Workload	0	0	0	11	33	22	33	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	66	22	11	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	16	33	33	0	16	4.7

Several students found the course very interesting and considered it a good learning experience. It was assumed that students had prior knowledge of Arc GIS and Corel. Students generally commented on the excruciating length of time required to complete assignments, and that this was not reflected in the final marking scheme. It was also felt that there was not enough time allotted between assignment due dates.