YOU SEE, I DON'T REALLY CARE ABOUT BIOLOGY. I DON'T EVEN CARE ABOUT CHEMISTRY! ALL I CARE ABOUT IS PASSING THE COURSE AND GETTING INTO MEDICAL SCHOOL! CAN YOU UNDERSTAND THAT?

MEDICAL SCIENCES COURSES

Introduction

We would like to thank the faculty and staff of the Medical Sciences departments and programs. We would also like to thank the Human Biology Students' Union (HBSU), Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology Students' Union (LMPSU), Molecular Genetics & Microbiology Students' Union (MGYSU), Neuroscience Association of Undergraduate Students (NAUS), Pharmacology & Toxicology Students' Association (PTSA), and the Undergraduate Physiology Students' Association (UPSA) for their help in summarizing the following evaluations.

Editor

ANATOMY

ANA 300Y1Y Human Anatomy & Histology

Instructor(s): M. Wiley; P. Stewart

Enr: 119			Resp: 91				Retake: 91%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Wiley:								
Presents	0	0	1	2	15	34	46	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	2	12	28	56	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	5	13	31	49	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	2	5	27	64	6.5
Stewart:								
Presents	0	0	1	12	35	23	26	5.6
Explains	0	2	1	21	24	24	25	5.5
Communicates	1	1	1	17	27	28	22	5.5
Teaching	0	2	2	15	30	23	25	5.5
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	12	33	27	26	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	4	30	40	18	6	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	2	8	13	24	52	6.1

Students described Wiley as interesting and approachable, and appreciated the level of detail in his lectures. Many felt he was the best instructor they've had. His lectures were described as engaging.

Students described Stewart as straight-forward. However some felt she spoke too quickly, but her notes were very organized.

Students in general, described the workload as being very heavy and demanding.

ANA 301H1S Human Embryology

Instructor(s): I. Taylor; M. Wiley

Enr: 494			Resp: 253				Retake: 95%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Taylor:								
Presents	0	0	1	4	21	31	40	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	3	11	34	49	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	1	7	31	59	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	2	11	29	55	6.3
Wiley:								
Presents	0	0	0	4	18	30	46	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	2	13	36	47	6.3
Communicates	1	0	0	3	16	36	42	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	2	11	32	52	6.3
Course:								
Workload	0	0	10	52	21	12	2	4.4
Difficulty	0	1	4	55	23	11	2	4.4
Learn Exp	1	0	0	9	25	27	35	5.9

Students agreed that "the course was easily best course in the sciences at UofT". It was very interesting, well-coordinated and fun. The tests and exam were fair, but long and a bit impossible to complete within the given time. Some didn't like the fact that each question was worth 1% of the mark for the course, which was a "large percentage for only one question resulting in unfair mark distributions".

Taylor was "masterful" - very hilarious, great examples, and really helpful and interesting, funny stories. His extended office hours around tests were much appreciated by many. Students thought his notes did not contain enough information, and he spoke too quickly at times.

Wiley was "awesome" - very clear, effective at explaining concepts and very organized. "He repeated key concepts over and over so students could get them". His notes needed better focussing on screen because these were very small and hard to read. Some students suggested integrating the slides and text notes together for easier studying.

"Both Wiley and Taylor combined made the course a fantastic experience." They successfully conveyed the social and human importance of embryology. Some warned that if multiple choice is not appealing to you, do not take the course as the questions were tricky. Overall, it was a highly recommended course.

HUMAN BIOLOGY

HMB 200H1S Introductory Human Behavioural Biology

Instructor(s): M. Ralph; M. Wall

Enr: 35			Resp: 26				Retake: 76%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Ralph:								
Presents	0	0	7	11	65	15	0	4.9
Explains	0	0	0	19	42	30	7	5.3
Communicates	0	0	3	26	38	15	15	5.1
Teaching	0	0	0	15	30	38	15	5.5
Wall:								
Presents	0	0	0	3	19	69	7	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	15	73	11	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	3	19	50	26	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	53	34	6.2
Course:								
Workload	0	11	7	65	15	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	7	19	65	7	0	0	3.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	34	30	26	8	5.1

Many students found both instructors extremely friendly and encouraging. They found the classroom engagement to be the highlight of their university experience so far.

Most thought Wall was the greatest lecturer they've ever had. Particular comments noted his "magic" in front of the class and enthusiasm for his students.

HMB 201H1S Introduction to Genes, Genetics & Biotechnology

Instructor(s): P. Thompson

Enr: 75			Resp: 47				Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	12	42	29	10	5.3
Explains	0	0	2	12	27	40	17	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	12	21	38	27	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	6	38	38	17	5.7
Workload	0	0	15	69	15	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	2	8	78	10	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	2	0	5	40	24	24	2	4.7

Students found the instructor extremely interactive and enthusiastic. They thought that the course was a refreshing change from their other courses. Students found the evaluations too easy and would have enjoyed more difficult challenges. Students also requested an official tutorial be added so they could further discuss and immerse themselves in the subject matter.

HMB 202H1F Introduction to Health and Disease

Instructor(s): M. Roksandic

Enr: 87　　　　　Resp: 71　　　　　Retake: 56%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	5	8	25	32	15	9	2	3.8
Explains	4	1	1	40	24	22	5	4.7
Communicates	0	2	0	23	22	32	18	5.4
Teaching	2	2	5	30	28	22	7	4.8
Workload	1	4	19	64	2	5	1	3.9
Difficulty	2	1	29	60	2	1	1	3.7
Learn Exp	7	7	25	39	13	3	1	3.6

Students found the course material extremely interesting. They found Roksandic's passion for the topics excited their own creativity and spurred them to read further.

Students found that the change of evaluation methods (from multiple-choice to short answer) was extremely beneficial.

HMB 265H1S General and Human Genetics

Instructor(s): M. French; M. Sauer

Enr: 956　　　　　Resp: 409　　　　　Retake: 41%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
French:								
Presents	1	1	4	15	34	34	7	5.2
Explains	1	3	3	18	35	32	5	5.0
Communicates	1	1	4	19	36	30	6	5.0
Teaching	0	2	3	15	34	32	10	5.2
Sauer:								
Presents	6	11	19	29	23	9	0	3.9
Explains	8	10	20	24	24	9	0	3.8
Communicates	3	3	6	20	33	26	5	4.8
Teaching	6	7	12	32	27	10	2	4.1
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	25	38	25	9	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	31	38	21	7	5.0
Learn Exp	4	5	10	43	24	10	1	4.2

Students enjoyed French's enthusiasm and the effort she put into the class. They felt her lecture style was conducive to learning and her application questions offered a thorough opportunity for understanding.

Students felt that Sauer expanded their knowledge. They appreciated her acknowledgement of their intelligence by not being afraid to teach complicated and cutting edge topics. Students found further value in tutorials where they could apply their knowledge in a practical manner. Many looked forward to continued studies in genetics.

HMB 300H1S Human Behavioural Biology II

Instructor(s): F. Taverna; J. Savina

Enr: 24　　　　　Resp: 21　　　　　Retake: 90%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Taverna:								
Presents	0	0	0	9	23	52	14	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	4	28	57	9	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	52	14	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	9	23	42	23	5.8
Savina:								
Presents	0	0	0	9	38	42	9	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	9	23	61	4	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	9	28	47	14	5.7
Teaching	0	0	4	14	28	33	19	5.5
Course:								
Workload	0	0	4	66	14	14	0	4.4

Difficulty	0	0	0	61	33	4	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	31	26	31	10	5.2

Students loved the atmosphere of the course. They valued the cross-reactivity of the topics covered. They felt the small class allowed them to nurture a greater in-depth analysis of the subject matter.

HMB 301HF Biotechnology

Instructor(s): M. French; D. Gurfinkel

Enr: 78　　　　　Resp: 62　　　　　Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
French:								
Presents	0	0	0	3	15	38	42	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	1	15	38	44	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	1	6	31	60	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	3	5	41	50	6.4
Gurfinkel:								
Presents	0	0	0	6	29	31	32	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	1	24	40	32	6.0
Communicates	0	0	4	8	14	48	24	5.8
Teaching	0	0	1	6	11	41	38	6.1
Course:								
Workload	1	0	6	58	20	8	4	4.4
Difficulty	1	1	6	74	9	4	1	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	51	28	12	5.4

Most students described French as fantastic. They found her friendly, approachable, and very enthusiastic - stating that she went out of her way to provide and enjoyable experience. Students enjoyed French's mix of teaching style and the incorporation of guest lecturers and group activities. They appreciated the discussion of post graduate career options.

Students described Gurfinkel was enthusiastic and well-organized. They appreciated her clear communication of goals and expectations and found her assignments to be both fair and interesting. A few thought that her lecture material was a little dry, but overall, enjoyed having Gurfinkel as a lecturer.

Overall, students noted an excellent learning experience within a positive environment.

HMB 302H1F Vertebrate Histology and Histopathology

Instructor(s): R. Wilson

Enr: 86　　　　　Resp: 63　　　　　Retake: 75%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	9	24	43	19	5.7
Explains	0	0	1	4	25	49	19	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	3	7	49	39	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	4	25	42	26	5.9
Workload	0	0	1	30	42	20	4	5.0
Difficulty	0	1	0	42	39	12	3	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	3	22	37	20	16	5.3

Most students liked Wilson, citing him as the highlight of their university experience thus far. He organized the course effectively and was not only available to help but was also supportive and encouraging.

The students enjoyed the lab portion of the course and found the material easier to grasp with the practical component. Many students felt that this should become a mandatory course for all human biology students.

HMB 321H1F Topics in Genetics

Instructor(s): M. Sauer

Enr: 92　　　　　Resp: 64　　　　　Retake: 71%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	1	3	26	39	21	6	4.9
Explains	0	0	4	26	25	23	20	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	1	14	34	50	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	7	26	38	26	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	22	41	17	19	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	14	36	27	21	5.6
Learn Exp	0	2	0	25	34	16	20	5.3

Many students were pleased with the instructor's approachability, and willingness to answer questions both in person and online. The TAs were very helpful. The course's unique focus and format was a topic of concern for some students, but others found the change to be a refreshing break from earlier textbook-based courses. Some students were concerned about the amount of information presented, suggesting that the course material was too much for the lecture hours allotted.

HMB 420H1S Seminar in Human Behavioural Biology

Instructor(s): J. Einstein

Enr: 24			Resp: 22				Retake: 84%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	5	0	0	16	35	25	20	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	25	35	40	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	42	57	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	4	23	14	57	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	0	42	28	28	5.9
Difficulty	0	0	4	42	28	23	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	7	42	28	5.8

Students found Einstein to be quite refreshing and endearing. They thought the course was exciting and prepared them well for future aspirations. They enjoyed Einstein's willingness to discuss the material and actually get to know the students. The content peaked their interest and offered immense application.

HMB 438H1F Global Health and Human Rights

Instructor(s): P. Hamel

Enr: 36			Resp: 31				Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	16	45	25	9	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	12	35	32	19	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	9	38	51	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	12	22	41	22	5.7
Workload	0	0	12	64	19	3	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	6	64	16	12	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	13	16	33	36	5.9

A good number of students cited this course as the best ever, describing their learning experience as eye-opening, thought-provoking and invaluable. Students enjoyed the interactive environment, presentations, and guest speakers. Most students found Hamel to be inspiring, passionate, knowledgeable and accommodating, yet often hard to contact outside of scheduled lecture time.

Many expressed a need for more background or even pre-requisite courses in political science and/or international relations. Some also felt that feedback was not given within a reasonable time frame.

Instructor(s): P. Hamel

Enr: 25			Resp: 14				Retake: 85%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	35	42	14	7	4.9
Explains	0	0	0	21	35	28	14	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	7	21	21	50	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	14	35	28	21	5.6
Workload	0	0	15	61	23	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	14	71	14	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	15	23	46	15	5.6

IMMUNOLOGY

IMM 429H1F Developmental Immunology

Instructor(s): C. Guidos

Enr: 30			Resp: 17				Retake: 25%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	35	5	11	35	5	5	0	2.9
Explains	35	5	23	11	17	5	0	2.9
Communicates	17	17	0	5	35	17	5	4.0

Teaching	29	5	23	17	5	17	0	3.2
Workload	0	0	0	0	12	50	37	6.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	18	25	56	6.4
Learn Exp	18	18	9	27	9	18	0	3.5

IMM 435H1F Practical Immunology

Instructor(s): J. Jongstra-Bilen; A. Martin

Enr: 27			Resp: 22				Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Jongstra-Bilen:								
Presents	4	0	18	18	36	13	0	4.5
Explains	4	0	4	31	45	13	0	4.5
Communicates	4	4	4	22	40	22	0	4.6
Teaching	4	4	4	18	59	9	0	4.5
Martin:								
Presents	4	4	9	13	27	40	0	4.8
Explains	4	0	4	27	27	36	0	4.8
Communicates	4	0	9	31	31	22	0	4.5
Teaching	4	0	4	27	31	22	9	4.9
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	14	33	33	19	5.6
Difficulty	0	5	10	45	20	15	5	4.4
Learn Exp	11	0	5	16	27	33	5	4.7

LABORATORY MEDICINE & PATHOBIOLOGY

LMP 300Y1Y Introduction to Pathobiology

Instructor(s): D. Templeton; G. Denomme

Enr: 39			Resp: 38				Retake: 87%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Templeton:								
Presents	0	2	18	26	18	13	21	4.8
Explains	0	2	10	21	31	15	18	5.0
Communicates	0	2	2	13	23	28	28	5.6
Teaching	0	2	0	34	23	21	18	5.2
Denomme:								
Presents	0	0	2	19	30	27	19	5.4
Explains	0	0	8	21	45	8	16	5.0
Communicates	0	0	7	18	26	26	21	5.3
Teaching	0	0	0	26	39	18	15	5.2
Course:								
Workload	0	3	0	33	27	27	9	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	9	37	40	12	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	3	14	33	22	25	5.5

Students felt that some of Templeton's lecture material was a bit dense. However, the topics presented were very thought provoking.

Instructor(s): M. Johnston

Enr: 39			Resp: 37				Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	33	22	38	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	10	29	27	32	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	2	27	27	32	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	5	27	37	29	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	37	37	20	4	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	21	34	34	8	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	5	23	29	17	23	5.3

Students felt that Johnston was very engaging, convincing, as well as witty.

LMP 363H1F Principles of Pathobiology

Instructor(s): D. Sarma; G. Lee

Enr: 143			Resp: 87				Retake: 92%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Sarma:								
Presents	0	0	2	9	29	30	29	5.7
Explains	0	0	4	5	20	30	38	5.9

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Communicates	0	0	1	3	6	30	58	6.4
Teaching	0	0	1	3	13	31	50	6.3
Lee:								
Presents	0	0	0	3	9	45	40	6.2
Explains	0	0	1	3	14	31	48	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	1	7	37	54	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	2	9	42	45	6.3
Course:								
Workload	0	0	3	69	20	2	4	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	3	55	30	4	4	4.5
Learn Exp	0	1	0	16	26	25	30	5.7

Students really liked Sarma and described him as inspiring, enthusiastic, and approachable. Most students found his course to be interesting and engaging. "One of the best courses ever" was a recurring theme.

Lee was also liked by the students. Many said that he was an amazing instructor. His lectures were interesting, enjoyable and well-organized. The course was often described as one of the best experiences at UofT.

LMP 402H1F Inflammation and Infections

Instructor(s): M. McGavin

Enr: 46 Resp: 26 Retake: 91%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	30	42	26	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	3	34	26	34	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	3	15	50	30	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	3	23	42	30	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	53	26	11	7	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	38	30	23	7	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	9	31	36	22	5.7

Students found McGavin to be a very good instructor who was enthusiastic, knowledgeable and clear. The lecture material was very interesting. However, most students felt that the material was too dense, causing tests to be challenging. Given the high volume of material, students felt that having the lecture slides available ahead of time would have greatly enhanced the learning experience.

LMP 403H1S Immunopathology

Instructor(s): P. Shek; L. Zhang

Enr: 35 Resp: 18 Retake: 47%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Shek:								
Presents	0	0	0	2	61	5	5	4.9
Explains	0	0	5	44	38	11	6	4.6
Communicates	0	0	0	27	66	5	0	4.8
Teaching	0	0	5	38	44	11	0	4.6
Zhang:								
Presents	0	0	5	5	66	22	0	5.1
Explains	0	0	0	27	55	16	0	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	27	55	16	0	4.9
Teaching	0	0	0	22	66	11	0	4.9
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	61	22	11	5	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	5	38	33	16	5	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	7	50	28	14	0	4.5

LMP 404H1F Bone and Skeletal Disorders

Instructor(s): W. Vogel; D. Cole

Enr: 49 Resp: 37 Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Vogel:								
Presents	0	0	0	2	21	37	37	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	2	21	48	27	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	45	43	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	2	16	29	51	6.3
Cole:								
Presents	0	0	0	5	25	48	20	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	28	45	25	6.0

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Communicates	0	0	0	0	11	42	45	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	2	20	50	26	6.0
Course:								
Workload	0	0	8	50	30	11	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	5	38	44	11	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	25	29	37	6.0

Students really enjoyed this course. The material was interesting, well-organized, and covered a nice spectrum of topics. The students also found the guest speakers and student presentations informative. However, a frequent criticism was that students presentations were too long and took up too much class time. Regarding the final exam, students felt the weight of it was too high, and that the short answers were difficult. Nevertheless, students highly recommended this course.

Vogel was enthusiastic, knowledgeable, and organized. Furthermore, he was very approachable and helpful. He was an exceptional instructor who was highly supportive of students.

Students found Cole to be a very good lecturer who was very enthusiastic, funny, helpful and inspirational.

MOLECULAR GENETICS & MICROBIOLOGY

MGY 312H1Y Principles of Genetic Analysis

Instructor(s): B. Funnell; J. Brill; C. Boone

Enr: 31 Resp: 24 Retake: 78%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Funnell:								
Presents	0	0	4	9	22	50	13	5.6
Explains	0	0	4	22	36	31	4	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	13	45	31	9	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	20	37	33	8	5.3
Brill:								
Presents	0	0	9	13	59	13	4	4.9
Explains	0	0	4	18	45	27	4	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	18	50	31	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	12	58	12	16	5.3
Boone:								
Presents	0	4	4	36	40	9	4	4.6
Explains	0	0	4	40	36	13	4	4.7
Communicates	0	0	13	22	31	31	0	4.8
Teaching	0	0	4	39	39	17	0	4.7
Course:								
Workload	0	0	4	27	40	27	0	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	59	27	13	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	23	33	28	14	5.3

Students found the labs interesting and enjoyable. The instructors were attentive and well-organized. Some students argued that the course should have been worth a full credit.

MGY 376H1Y Microbiology Laboratory

Instructor(s): A. Bognar; M. Brown

Enr: 18 Resp: 17 Retake: 57%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Bognar:								
Presents	0	0	11	64	17	5	0	4.2
Explains	0	0	5	47	41	5	0	4.5
Communicates	0	0	17	58	11	11	0	4.2
Teaching	0	0	0	47	41	5	5	4.7
Brown:								
Presents	0	0	0	17	58	17	5	5.1
Explains	0	0	0	17	41	41	0	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	5	41	47	5	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	11	41	35	11	5.5
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	5	35	29	29	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	29	17	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	28	45	45	6.1

Generally students found the course very useful. Many mentioned that

the lab reports should have been worth more since they required a large proportion of time to complete.

MGY 377H1F Microbiology I: Bacteria

Instructor(s): S. Gray-Owen; J. Liu; J. Brumell

Enr: 276   Resp: 169   Retake: 81%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Gray-Owen:								
Presents	4	3	11	22	33	16	7	4.5
Explains	3	4	8	17	29	28	8	4.8
Communicates	0	0	2	10	21	47	16	5.6
Teaching	1	1	8	12	30	36	9	5.2
Liu:								
Presents	0	0	0	14	35	42	5	5.4
Explains	0	0	1	18	38	36	4	5.2
Communicates	0	1	6	26	34	28	1	4.9
Teaching	0	0	2	17	43	31	3	5.2
Brumell:								
Presents	0	0	2	11	30	39	15	5.5
Explains	0	0	2	12	31	36	16	5.5
Communicates	0	0	1	8	24	40	24	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	12	32	36	16	5.5
Course:								
Workload	0	0	2	54	29	10	1	4.5
Difficulty	0	2	0	45	36	11	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	2	0	29	43	21	1	4.9

Gray-Owen's slides were too full of images and heavy text. Too much information presented in the slides made the material presented less clear, disorganized and confusing. He needed to explain the concepts more concisely and in a clearer manner. His exam was challenging.

Liu presented the material in a clear and well-organized manner, with easy to follow slides. Many enjoyed his section of the course.

Although not many students wrote about Brumell, those who did said that he was a likeable teacher. He did a good job with interesting and well-organized slides. He was very enthusiastic and answered emails quickly.

The course itself had too much emphasis on memorizing material. Having two midterms with a large portion of the grade would have been better if balanced with an assignment.

MGY 428H1F Functional and Microbial Genomics

Instructor(s): T. Hughes; P. Roy

Enr: 31   Resp: 24   Retake: 54%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Hughes:								
Presents	0	0	4	8	21	43	21	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	8	26	43	21	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	4	21	43	30	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	4	39	34	21	5.7
Roy:								
Presents	0	0	8	13	21	52	4	5.3
Explains	0	0	4	13	52	26	4	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	13	17	47	21	5.8
Teaching	0	0	4	21	34	34	4	5.1
Course:								
Workload	0	0	8	43	26	17	4	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	4	56	30	8	0	4.4
Learn Exp	5	5	10	36	15	26	0	4.3

Hughes was very organize and approachable. He explained difficult concepts efficiently and effectively.

Roy was not as approachable. Quiz questions did not reflect general understanding of the assigned readings. A few students mentioned that he was intimidating at times in class.

The midterm was too long for the allotted time. Lecture notes should have been posted before lectures.

MGY 432H1F Laboratory in Molecular Genetics and Microbiology

Instructor(s): B. Blencowe; S. Gray-Owen

Enr: 39   Resp: 33   Retake: 70%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Blencowe:								
Presents	0	0	3	6	39	42	9	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	15	43	34	6	5.3
Communicates	0	3	0	18	30	42	6	5.3
Teaching	0	0	3	9	42	39	6	5.4
Gray-Owen:								
Presents	0	0	0	9	48	33	9	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	9	37	46	6	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	6	30	54	9	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	6	42	42	9	5.5
Course:								
Workload	3	0	0	24	42	24	6	5.0
Difficulty	3	0	0	59	31	6	0	4.3
Learn Exp	4	0	4	33	42	9	4	4.6

Some students felt that the microbiology section was disorganized and less "hands-on" compared to the genetics section. Overall, the course was very enjoyable and many students wished it were a full-year course.

MGY 434H1S Bacterial Signalling and Physiological Regulation

Instructor(s): A. Bognar

Enr: 17   Resp: 10   Retake: 62%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	10	0	20	50	10	10	4.8
Explains	0	0	10	30	20	30	10	5.0
Communicates	0	0	10	30	20	30	10	5.0
Teaching	0	0	10	10	20	50	10	5.4
Workload	10	0	10	40	10	20	10	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	30	10	10	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	42	28	14	14	5.0

Bognar was regarded as a good and fair instructor. Some students complained about the workload and that there was too much testable material.

MGY 440H1F Molecular Virology

Instructor(s): M. Brown

Enr: 40   Resp: 36   Retake: 76%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	5	5	20	23	20	23	5.2
Explains	2	0	0	17	23	29	26	5.5
Communicates	2	0	0	2	17	22	54	6.2
Teaching	0	0	2	22	22	37	14	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	37	28	22	11	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	2	48	28	14	5	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	7	28	25	25	14	5.1

Brown was a good teacher. She presented the material with enthusiasm and was very approachable. The choice of assigned readings was very interesting.

3 hours of class was a bit boring. It should have been divided into 3 separate hours per week. The term test was not difficult but were marked harshly. Students should have been given more strict guidelines for presentations. Overall, it was a good course.

MGY 445H1F Genetics Engineering for Prevention and Treatment of Disease

Instructor(s): S. Joshi

Enr: 38   Resp: 34   Retake: 50%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	11	20	20	35	5	2	4.0
Explains	2	8	20	23	32	8	2	4.1
Communicates	0	2	8	38	29	17	2	4.6
Teaching	5	5	5	35	38	5	2	4.2
Workload	3	3	6	42	36	6	3	4.4
Difficulty	3	0	0	33	33	24	6	4.9

Learn Exp	3	0	6	56	20	10	3	4.3

Joshi spoke quickly, which made it difficult to follow concepts and the difficult material. She was not organize and was inconsistent in her presentations. Powerpoint presentations would have been better than the use of overheads. She was approachable however.

Lectures were very dry and could have been more appealing.

MGY 460H1S Plant Molecular Genetics

Instructor(s): P. McCourt; S. Cutler; T. Berleth

Enr: 14   Resp: 8   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
McCourt:								
Presents	0	0	0	25	0	50	25	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	25	50	25	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	12	25	37	25	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	25	0	62	12	5.6
Cutler:								
Presents	0	0	0	37	0	50	12	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	50	37	12	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	25	50	25	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	25	62	12	5.9
Berleth:								
Presents	0	0	0	12	25	37	25	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	12	0	62	25	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	50	37	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	75	25	6.2
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	71	14	0	14	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	71	14	0	14	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	0	40	40	6.0

Students considered McCourt a good lecturer, whose lectures were easy to follow and well-explained.

Cutler was considered to be a good lecturer who always ensured students understood the material. Students found the lecture notes provided very helpful.

Berleth explained material very well, answered questions well and was often available for individual consultation.

MGY 452H1S Genetic Analysis of Development: Flies and Mice

Instructor(s): H. Lipshitz; H. Krause; G. Boulianne

Enr: 7   Resp: 5   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Lipshitz:								
Presents	0	0	0	0	60	40	0	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	20	60	20	0	5.0
Teaching	0	0	0	20	60	20	0	5.0
Krause:								
Presents	0	0	0	0	60	40	0	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	60	40	0	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	20	40	40	0	5.2
Teaching	0	0	0	20	20	60	0	5.4
Boulianne:								
Presents	0	0	0	0	40	40	20	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	60	20	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	40	40	20	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	20	60	20	6.0
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	60	20	20	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	60	20	0	20	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	60	20	20	5.6

Students enjoyed the small class size and the open discussion They appreciated the opportunities to earn extra credit through presentations.

NEUROSCIENCE

NRS 201H1S Neuroscience

Instructor(s): J. Yeomans

Enr: 56   Resp: 29   Retake: 71%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	14	25	33	11	11	4.7
Explains	0	0	0	17	46	28	7	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	25	35	39	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	25	39	25	10	5.2
Workload	0	3	7	53	25	10	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	29	44	22	3	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	8	33	37	8	12	4.8

Students found the instructor to be very knowledgeable and enthusiastic. Many students would have preferred to have lecture slides posted before the lectures. Students felt that the essay questions were not an accurate reflection of students' knowledge due to the restricted time and the number of essay questions per test.

NRS 202H1S Neuroanatomy

Instructor(s): P. Stewart

Enr: 55   Resp: 43   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	9	34	55	6.5
Explains	0	0	2	0	13	44	36	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	4	6	37	51	6.3
Teaching	2	0	0	2	0	37	58	6.4
Workload	0	0	4	32	37	16	9	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	9	30	41	11	6	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	2	8	13	35	40	6.0

The majority of students felt that the instruct or was interesting, organized and generally amazing. The course was commonly cited as a favourite and students greatly appreciated the labs and software supplement. However, students did not find the tutorials particularly helpful.

NRS 302H1F Neuroscience Laboratory

Instructor(s): B. Murray; J. Yeomans

Enr: 34   Resp: 28   Retake: 51%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Murray:								
Presents	7	3	0	0	22	59	7	5.3
Explains	10	0	3	7	35	32	10	5.0
Communicates	0	3	0	7	17	39	32	5.9
Teaching	3	7	0	3	21	57	7	5.3
Yeomans:								
Presents	11	0	0	7	40	29	11	5.0
Explains	10	0	0	10	35	32	10	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	3	14	39	42	6.2
Teaching	10	0	0	3	28	46	10	5.2
Course:								
Workload	0	0	3	14	17	28	35	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	39	17	17	5.3
Learn Exp	12	0	4	24	28	28	4	4.6

Some students thought that tutorials would have been beneficial, to better prepare them for the course. Some felt that more material/supplies were needed to conduct the experiments. Updated equipment would also have helped.

Many felt the workload was too heavy. Lab reports were not returned in a timely manner. Better lab report directions were needed. Some instructions contracted the others, making it difficult to do reports.

NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES

NFS 382H1S Vitamin - Mineral Metabolism Throughout the Life Cycle

Instructor(s): D. Gurfinkel

Enr: 96   Resp: 67   Retake: 96%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	6	28	42	21	5.8
Explains	0	0	1	12	33	42	10	5.5
Communicates	0	0	1	18	19	48	12	5.5
Teaching	0	0	1	9	28	43	16	5.7
Workload	0	0	2	72	13	4	1	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	9	68	18	3	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	3	21	34	31	9	5.2

Students found this course to be very interesting as Gurfinkel was an engaging lecturer. She presented the material clearly and concisely. Gurfinkel took time to interact with students and was approachable. Some students found the marking scheme to be especially tough, but overall, this course was found to be a positive learning experience.

NFS 484H1F Advanced Nutrition

Instructor(s): C. Greenwood

Enr: 55   Resp: 31   Retake: 58%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	9	22	29	25	12	5.1
Explains	0	0	6	22	12	32	25	5.5
Communicates	0	0	3	9	22	35	29	5.8
Teaching	0	0	3	16	16	45	19	5.6
Workload	0	0	6	29	48	12	3	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	3	41	22	32	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	19	42	34	3	5.2

Greenwood was very knowledgeable and effective in answering questions. However, she sometimes rushed through the material and spoke too quickly.

NFS 486H1S Nutrition and Human Disease

Instructor(s): D.Ma

Enr: 67   Resp: 52   Retake: 84%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	0	11	23	23	29	5.7
Explains	0	0	1	11	31	29	25	5.6
Communicates	0	1	5	7	23	33	27	5.6
Teaching	0	0	3	0	17	43	35	6.1
Workload	0	0	11	64	15	5	1	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	11	70	11	30	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	3	36	33	21	6	4.9

Most students found the course to be interesting, however, some thought the material could have been covered in greater detail. Students found that the group work in this class enriched the learning experience although others found this to be an inappropriate form of evaluation.

Ma was a very good instructor, but he was somewhat unclear on requirements and due dates which caused some confusion.

NFS 487H1F Functional Foods and Nutrigenomics

Instructor(s): A. El-Sohemy

Enr: 74   Resp: 57   Retake: 92%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
El-Sohemy:								
Presents	0	1	3	12	26	33	21	5.5
Explains	0	1	1	10	26	30	28	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	8	26	26	36	5.9
Teaching	0	1	0	10	21	36	29	5.8
Workload	0	0	11	61	20	7	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	14	67	9	7	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	2	2	28	33	21	11	5.0

Students liked El-Sohemy's helpfulness, interesting lectures and pre-sentation skills. Guest lecturers were valuable as they gave students the latest insight into the current research in nutrition. Students preferred El-Sohemy directing the class, and suggested spacing out the assignments.

NFS 488H1S Nutrition Toxicology

Instructor(s): A. El-Sohemy

Enr: 120   Resp: 80   Retake: 89%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	6	24	45	22	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	3	27	40	27	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	3	18	43	34	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	2	17	57	28	6.1
Workload	0	0	15	66	15	3	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	13	70	13	2	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	29	29	29	12	5.3

Overall, students thought the instructor was a good person and a good teacher. The class was well-organized. It was also an interesting course, which was comprised of a guest lecturer which was well-received by students. Students wished that his overhead slides were made into Powerpoint presentations, to make lecture notes more readable. Also, this class included a group presentation which students believed was pointless because they didn't get to present it. Overall, the class was interesting.

NFS 490H1S Socio Cultural Aspects of Nutrition

Instructor(s): S. Parker

Enr: 120   Resp: 73   Retake: 94%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	12	21	40	28	5.9
Explains	0	0	1	12	27	35	22	5.7
Communicates	1	2	8	14	28	34	10	5.1
Teaching	0	0	1	12	22	44	18	5.7
Workload	1	0	5	62	22	5	1	4.3
Difficulty	2	1	14	67	14	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	1	1	22	38	20	15	5.2

The students thought the course was interesting overall. The material was thought-provoking and generally applicable to real life. Parker was a very good instructor but showed some disinterest in some of the material which made those particular classes bland. Overall, students enjoyed this class.

PHARMACY

PHC 300Y1Y1 Molecular Pharmacology

Instructor(s): J. Utrecht

Enr: 18   Resp: 10   Retake: 25%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	22	33	22	11	11	4.6
Explains	0	11	11	22	22	22	11	4.7
Communicates	0	0	22	22	11	33	11	4.9
Teaching	0	0	22	22	33	22	0	4.6
Workload	0	0	0	11	22	55	11	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	11	22	55	11	5.7
Learn Exp	0	0	25	30	12	0	12	4.2

Students felt that Utrecht sped through the material making the concepts very difficult to grasp. Many were left confused at the end of his section (which he finished early).

PHC 320H1S Medicinal Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Dubins

Enr: 29   Resp: 15   Retake: 92%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	6	53	33	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	6	6	33	53	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	6	0	20	73	6.6
Teaching	0	0	6	0	6	33	53	6.3

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Workload	0	0	13	66	20	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	6	66	26	0	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	7	15	23	30	23	5.5

Students found this course to be extremely interesting. Dubins made the material come alive with engaging and enthusiastic lectures. Students found him approachable as he was always available for consultations.

PHARMACOLOGY & TOXICOLOGY

PCL 201H1S Introduction to Pharmacology: Pharmacokinetic Principles

Instructor(s): W.M. Burnham

Enr: 475   Resp: 233   Retake: 96%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	5	13	29	13	16	5.3
Explains	1	0	1	10	27	34	23	5.6
Communicates	0	0	1	9	22	36	28	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	8	21	37	31	5.9
Workload	1	5	20	58	9	3	1	3.8
Difficulty	2	3	24	59	7	2	1	3.8
Learn Exp	0	0	1	27	21	31	17	5.4

Students found Burnham to be an extremely interesting lecturer. He was enthusiastic and knowledgeable and took care to answer all questions. However, he spoke very quietly making it difficult for some students to hear him. Although students found the lectures interesting, lecture notes were often disorganized and many had trouble seeing them due to their size.

Students found the course material interesting but it was difficult to follow the speed of the lectures as there were many examples that weren't in his notes. Overall, students found this to be an excellent course.

PHYSIOLOGY

PSL 201Y1Y Basic Human Physiology

Instructor(s): K. Banks; M. Schreiber

Enr: 237   Resp: 62   Retake: 74%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Banks:								
Presents	0	0	5	10	35	38	11	5.4
Explains	1	1	3	15	25	48	5	5.2
Communicates	13	8	13	18	18	20	8	4.1
Teaching	4	3	8	13	34	27	8	4.9
Schreiber:								
Presents	0	3	3	11	33	35	11	5.3
Explains	1	1	1	10	29	43	12	5.4
Communicates	1	1	0	10	20	44	20	5.6
Teaching	0	0	3	10	33	35	16	5.5
Course:								
Workload	0	3	7	42	26	8	10	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	7	40	27	18	7	4.8
Learn Exp	0	5	5	20	30	22	17	5.1

Students found the course material informative and interesting with very broad coverage. Many found the amount expected to be learned challenging - and the tests not reflective of the material. Tutorials were helpful but not offered at convenient times.

Students felt Banks explained the material well but showed not enthusiasm.

Schreiber was a good instructor but talked too fast and needed better, more informative slides.

PSL 300H1F Human Physiology I

Instructor(s): V. Watt; W. Mackay

Enr: 17   Resp: 11   Retake: 70%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Watt:								
Presents	0	9	9	36	9	18	18	4.7
Explains	0	0	27	18	18	9	27	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	18	27	27	27	5.6
Teaching	0	9	9	9	36	18	18	5.0
Mackay:								
Presents	0	9	0	18	36	0	36	5.3
Explains	0	9	9	18	9	18	36	5.3
Communicates	9	9	9	18	18	27	9	4.5
Teaching	0	18	0	9	27	18	27	5.1
Course:								
Workload	9	0	0	45	9	27	9	4.6
Difficulty	9	0	9	27	9	27	18	4.8
Learn Exp	14	0	14	14	0	28	28	4.9

Watt was considered to be fun and enthusiastic. However a few students thought that her slides needed to be more organized.

Most students found that Mackay's lectures were thorough and easy to understand. They thought the Neuro 101 was a good reference book, however, the material was a bit advanced for some.

PSL 301H1S/JBO 302Y1Y/PSL 302Y1Y Human Physiology

Instructor(s): W. Mackay; V. Watt

Enr: 783   Resp: 348   Retake: 58%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Mackay:								
Presents	4	3	13	25	23	22	6	4.5
Explains	5	6	18	23	22	17	6	4.3
Communicates	11	7	22	22	21	11	2	3.8
Teaching	5	5	14	28	24	17	4	4.3
Watt:								
Presents	1	1	5	23	27	29	11	5.1
Explains	0	2	6	16	28	30	14	5.2
Communicates	0	0	3	7	24	39	25	5.7
Teaching	1	0	2	22	28	30	12	5.2
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	26	29	26	14	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	12	32	33	20	5.6
Learn Exp	2	2	9	33	24	17	10	4.7

Students felt that Mackay's lecture notes were not very clear and could have benefitted from more examples. Also, students thought that the lectures could have been more interesting.

Students felt that Watt was a good teacher, who seemed to genuinely cared about the students' understanding of the material. Despite this, many students complained that she needed to be more organized, and often skipped explaining slides in lectures, yet still expected students to know the material. Also, students felt that more tutorials should have been implemented, maybe once a week.

Instructor(s): C. Perumalla; N. Jones

Enr: 542   Resp: 183   Retake: 57%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Perumalla:								
Presents	1	0	1	8	29	40	18	5.6
Explains	1	1	0	7	28	41	19	5.6
Communicates	1	0	0	9	22	41	24	5.7
Teaching	1	0	0	10	28	42	17	5.6
Jones:								
Presents	0	0	1	8	23	40	26	5.8
Explains	0	0	1	5	26	39	26	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	7	22	37	31	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	5	25	45	23	5.8
Course:								
Workload	0	0	1	24	38	20	13	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	1	14	34	28	21	5.5
Learn Exp	4	1	17	30	26	21	7	4.7

Most students found Perumalla to be good overall, his enthusiasm and humour were appreciated. He had good slides and explained concepts clearly. In general students thought tests were hard and a lot of memorization was required. Many students enjoyed this section of the course.

Jones was a very clear lecturer. Her problem-based learning section

at the end of the lectures was a good idea and it was very interactive. Overall, a good instructor.

PSL 303Y1Y Topics in Cellular, Molecular and Organismic Physiology

Instructor(s): D. Tweed; P. Backx

Enr: 45   Resp: 35   Retake: 80%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Tweed:								
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	34	65	6.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	34	65	6.7
Communicates	0	0	0	2	0	31	65	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	2	25	71	6.7
Backx:								
Presents	0	0	2	8	40	31	17	5.5
Explains	0	0	2	5	31	40	20	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	5	14	45	34	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	6	21	43	28	5.9
Horner:								
Presents	0	0	3	3	25	43	25	5.8
Explains	0	0	6	6	37	21	28	5.6
Communicates	0	3	3	12	34	21	25	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	12	37	28	21	5.6
Course:								
Workload	0	0	3	48	29	16	3	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	45	22	6	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	24	34	24	5.7

Tweed's lectures were regarded as outstanding. His notable patience, clarity and enthusiasm made the material highly enjoyable. The use of animated demos was also considered effective in teaching the more difficult concepts.

Backx's lectures were enjoyed by the majority of students. He was very approachable and answered questions effectively.

Instructor(s): P. Brubaker; J. MacDonald

Enr: 41   Resp: 36   Retake: 71%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Brubaker:								
Presents	0	0	5	11	19	30	33	5.8
Explains	0	0	2	2	8	47	38	6.2
Communicates	0	0	2	0	13	33	50	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	5	5	50	38	6.2
MacDonald:								
Presents	0	0	5	16	30	30	16	5.4
Explains	0	0	2	11	30	33	22	5.6
Communicates	0	0	5	11	16	47	19	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	8	33	33	25	5.8
Course:								
Workload	0	0	8	44	27	16	2	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	36	22	11	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	33	40	6	5.3

Brubaker was a very good lecturer. The small class size encouraged questions and discussions. The material was very interesting and good preparation for graduate studies. However, some students felt that the test did not reflect the material.

MacDonald was a good lecturer. However, some students felt his notes could have been more organized.

PSL 350H1S Mammalian Molecular Biology

Instructor(s): V. Watt

Enr: 92   Resp: 63   Retake: 47%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	6	4	22	24	22	17	5.0
Explains	0	3	6	19	34	22	13	5.1
Communicates	1	0	0	9	25	32	30	5.8
Teaching	1	1	4	25	29	25	11	5.0
Workload	0	0	1	72	16	6	3	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	31	11	4	4.7

Learn Exp	4	0	4	50	26	10	6	4.5

Most students commented on the fact that Watt was unorganized in terms of posting her lecture notes - which were ALWAYS posted up in the morning of the class. Some students praised Watt for her enthusiasm. Too much time was spent discussing administrative matters and not enough about the course material.

The term test was believed to be unfair - especially with the ambiguous and irrelevant multiple choice questions. Questions were thought to not be too relevant to the material/concepts covered in class, making it hard to do well on the test. Students did appreciate the small group sessions and enjoyed the seminar experience. There was some negative feedback about having to submit the written assignment to "Turnitin.com". **[IMPORTANT Editor Note: Students do _not_ have to use "turnitin.com" - CONTACT ASSU for details.]**

PSL 372H1F Mammalian Physiology Laboratory

Instructor(s): C. Perumalla

Enr: 139   Resp: 130   Retake: 51%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	8	29	34	23	5	4.9
Explains	0	0	6	29	36	29	2	5.0
Communicates	0	0	2	18	26	32	20	5.5
Teaching	0	0	4	20	23	33	18	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	4	16	30	47	6.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	4	19	47	26	5.9
Learn Exp	0	1	2	14	35	28	17	5.4

The majority of students found the course load extremely heavy for a half year course. Students felt that the course helped them understand the material from PSL 302 better. Many students recommended that there should have been some formal lectures to better explain the material.

The labs were thought to be too time-consuming, and the expectations for the lab reports and the exam were not clearly outlined. The course provided the students with a self-learning environment.

Perumalla was very enthusiastic and very helpful in answering questions during the labs.

PSL 374H1S Advanced Physiology Laboratory

Instructor(s): C. Perumalla

Enr: 46   Resp: 43   Retake: 67%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	2	16	26	45	7	5.3
Explains	0	4	2	16	30	35	9	5.2
Communicates	2	0	4	2	25	39	25	5.7
Teaching	0	0	4	11	18	39	25	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	0	14	36	48	6.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	9	20	51	18	5.8
Learn Exp	0	0	5	19	30	22	22	5.4

The lab reports were challenging and required a lot of time and effort to receive an A. However, the TAs were very helpful and readily approachable. It was an excellent learning experience especially for preparation to enter graduate or medical school. The rabbit surgery lab was intense, but the most rewarding challenge in the course.

Perumalla was a very helpful instructor and always available for extra help. In general, the lab exercises were fun and worthwhile.

PSL 425H1F Integrative Metabolism and its Endocrine Regulation

Instructor(s): I. Fantus

Enr: 29   Resp: 18   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	5	0	27	27	16	16	5	4.2
Explains	5	0	29	17	23	17	5	4.3
Communicates	5	5	5	16	38	22	5	4.7
Teaching	5	0	5	29	23	29	5	4.8
Workload	0	0	8	33	41	8	8	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	41	25	25	8	5.0

| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 37 | 12 | 37 | 5.8 |

PSL 440Y1Y Neuroscience I: Systems and Behaviour

Instructor(s): J. Dostrovsky; D. Broussard

Enr: 36 — Resp: 33 — Retake: 84%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Dostrovsky:								
Presents	0	0	0	21	42	21	15	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	33	33	21	12	5.1
Communicates	6	9	12	33	12	18	9	4.3
Teaching	3	0	6	36	21	24	9	4.8
Broussard:								
Presents	0	0	0	15	34	43	6	5.4
Explains	0	0	3	6	40	46	3	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	15	34	43	6	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	12	41	41	3	5.4
Course:								
Workload	0	3	0	59	14	18	3	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	7	53	19	15	3	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	40	10	10	4.9

Instructor(s): P. Stewart

Enr: 36 — Resp: 33 — Retake: 88%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	3	3	33	57	6.4
Explains	0	0	3	3	12	33	48	6.2
Communicates	0	0	6	6	15	30	42	6.0
Teaching	0	0	6	0	9	39	45	6.2
Workload	0	4	0	48	16	28	4	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	4	41	25	25	4	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	42	14	14	5.1

Stewart was a good lecturer who was praised for her organization and excellent use of multimedia. However, some students felt that the course was a review of previously taught neurology material and suggested that it should be removed as a Neurology specialist option.

PSL 452H1F Membrane Physiology

Instructor(s): R. Tsushima

Enr: 10 — Resp: 5 — Retake: 40%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	80	20	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	80	0	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	40	40	20	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	20	0	80	0	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	40	40	20	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	40	0	60	0	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	20	0	60	20	0	4.8

Instructor(s): Z-P. Feng

Enr: 10 — Resp: 5 — Retake: 50%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	40	20	40	0	5.0
Explains	0	0	60	20	20	0	0	3.6
Communicates	0	0	0	60	0	40	0	4.8
Teaching	0	20	20	20	20	20	0	4.0
Workload	0	0	0	50	25	25	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	0	50	0	5.0
Learn Exp	25	0	0	0	50	25	0	4.2

PSL 460H1F Molecular Physiology

Instructor(s): V. Watt

Enr: 20 — Resp: 20 — Retake: 89%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	5	60	25	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	5	5	50	40	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	30	70	6.7

Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	45	50	6.4
Workload	0	0	5	75	15	5	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	65	20	10	5	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	5	22	27	27	16	5.3

The overall consensus was that Watt was a very personable instructor. Considering the small class size, this really helped make the course interactive and the students feel comfortable - especially during student presentations. Her enthusiasm for the course material made the course very enjoyable. Interesting guest speakers and use of very recent scientific articles made the lectures pertinent.

Although some students felt the course jumped around from topic to topic - they found them all very interesting.

PSL 462H1S Molecular Aspects of Cardiovascular Function

Instructor(s): R. Tsushima; S. Heximer

Enr: 13 — Resp: 11 — Retake: 81%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Tsushima:								
Presents	0	0	0	0	9	72	18	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	27	63	9	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	36	54	9	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	336	54	9	5.7
Heximer:								
Presents	0	0	0	9	9	72	9	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	9	9	72	9	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	9	18	54	18	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	27	72	0	5.7
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	27	45	9	18	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	36	18	18	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	18	27	36	18	5.5

Students thought that the course could have been more organized in terms of room allocation and website. Also, lectures ran over time and made students late for the next class.

Some thought that the course was poorly structured but did enjoy the different guest lecturers. Certain lectures were intense and students generally found the course to be very informative and challenging.

PSL 470H1S Cardiovascular Physiology

Instructor(s): C. Wittnich; L. Adamson; B. Langille

Enr: 45 — Resp: 25 — Retake: 86%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Wittnich:								
Presents	0	0	4	12	20	52	12	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	4	20	50	25	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	8	40	52	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	4	32	48	16	5.8
Adamson:								
Presents	0	0	0	8	24	56	12	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	8	12	66	12	5.8
Communicate	0	0	8	8	40	32	12	5.3
Teaching	0	0	4	4	28	52	12	5.6
Langille:								
Presents	0	4	0	14	47	33	0	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	23	42	28	4	5.1
Communicates	0	0	4	14	52	23	4	5.0
Teaching	0	0	9	9	52	23	4	5.0
Course:								
Workload	0	0	8	65	21	0	4	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	4	47	34	8	4	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	22	36	22	18	5.4

Students thought Wittnich was fun and exciting. Adamson was an interesting and clearly experienced lecturer. In general, students found the course very interesting and informative.

PSL 472H1S Sleep Physiology and Chronobiology

Instructor(s): R. Horner

Enr: 22   Resp: 17   Retake: 76%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	29	47	17	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	11	23	52	11	5.6
Communicates	0	0	5	17	11	47	17	5.5
Teaching	5	0	5	0	41	29	17	5.3
Workload	0	0	5	58	23	5	5	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	41	29	29	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	7	28	7	42	14	5.3

Most students found the course material extremely interesting and practical. Some found the fill-in-the-blanks format of the lecture notes distracting and difficult to keep up with the instructor's pace. The midterms were found to be a time crunch by most.

Horner was very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. His focus on classroom discussions and participation made the lectures more engaging. He was well-organized and approachable.

PSL 497H1F Scientific Communication

Instructor(s): V. Watt

Enr: 16   Resp: 15   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	14	21	21	42	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	7	28	7	57	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	7	7	85	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	26	20	53	6.3
Workload	0	0	7	21	21	28	21	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	8	66	25	0	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	0	33	50	6.2

The workload was thought to be heavy, requiring quite a few hours per week more than other courses. Students would have liked assignments to be marked and returned faster. This course was enjoyable and interesting with material that was applicable outside the course.