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), Immunology Students' Association (IMMSA), 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 and Histology

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

Enr: 158		Resp: 109				Retake: 92%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Koeberle:							
Presents	0	0	0	2	18	44	32	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	4	28	42	23	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	8	26	41	22	5.8
Teaching	0	0	1	2	31	46	17	5.8
Wiley:							
Presents	0	0	0	3	9	28	58	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	8	26	64	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	1	11	36	50	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	9	25	65	6.6
Course:							
Workload	0	0	0	22	29	31	16	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	2	38	39	13	6	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	6	15	30	47	6.2

Koeberle was good at presenting neuroanatomical concepts. He explained the material with enthusiasm, clarity and was very knowledgeable. Some students commented that he spoke too quickly at times. He was very approachable, friendly and always willing to answer questions.

Wiley was deemed one of the best anatomy instructors at UofT. He was extremely passionate about the material, an effective lecturer who always provided clear and ample examples, and made the dry material interesting. Students appreciated his willingness to help and answer questions, and extending lab hours.

The course was a "fantastic" and "valuable" experience. The use of live specimens in labs was interesting and beneficial in understanding anatomy. There was a lot of material covered, but very worthwhile learning. The tests were "hard" and based on memorization.

ANA 301H1S Human Embryology

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

Enr:		Resp:				Retake:	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Taylor:							
Presents	0	0	2	8	24	40	24	5.8

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Explains	0	0	1	4	18	39	36	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	2	11	37	48	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	5	11	42	40	6.2
Wiley:							
Presents	0	0	1	4	18	38	36	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	3	15	43	35	6.1
Communicates	0	0	2	6	18	42	29	5.9
Teaching	0	0	1	4	12	43	37	6.1
Course:							
Workload	0	0	5	50	26	12	5	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	2	51	27	13	5	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	1	14	23	32	26	5.7

Taylor and Wiley were very good lecturers. The former used "memorable" examples and was very humourous. The latter was very organized and clear with his explanations. Both instructors were a joy to listen to and were extremely knowledgeable.

The material was very interesting. The tests were based heavily on memorization, consisting of multiple choice and each question was weighed 1% - some students found this unfair. A few thought some test questions were "tricky" and both instructors were unwilling to clarify them.

HUMAN BIOLOGY

HMB 201H1S Introduction to Genes, Genetics, and Biotechnology

Instructor(s): P. Thompson

Enr: 84		Resp: 57				Retake: 79%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	3	17	33	30	12	5.2
Explains	1	0	1	8	30	33	23	5.6
Communicates	1	0	0	5	17	41	33	6.0
Teaching	3	0	0	5	27	38	25	5.7
Workload	0	7	25	53	8	1	1	3.8
Difficulty	0	1	30	55	8	1	1	3.8
Learn Exp	0	2	2	34	27	23	9	5.0

Students found the lecturer extremely thought provoking. His lecture style encouraged debate and spurred further research into the subject matter. Students found the poster day to be a valuable learning experience as it provided the opportunity to gain a valuable skill. Students would have enjoyed more means of evaluation.

HMB 202H1F Introduction to Health and Disease

Instructor(s): M. Roksandic

Enr: 82		Resp: 74				Retake: 57%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	5	20	31	24	12	4	4.2
Explains	0	4	5	25	36	24	4	4.8
Communicates	0	2	4	17	31	30	13	5.2
Teaching	1	2	8	17	39	27	4	4.9
Workload	0	8	13	61	10	5	0	3.9
Difficulty	1	2	22	63	9	0	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	7	6	45	23	14	3	4.4

Students found the course very enlightening. They enjoyed the content but would have further enjoyed more scientific content. Students found the instructor started off slow but was open to suggestions and really worked hard to improve the lecture style, content and delivery.

Of their complains, students found the following: the labs were underfunded and needed greater resources and focus. The course material was too easy and should have been more challenging. The course text, while interesting at points was useless. The course organization needed vast improvement.

HMB 300H1F Human Behavioural Biology II

Instructor(s): F. Taverna

Enr: 28		Resp: 22				Retake: 61%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	0	0	13	45	22	13	5.2
Explains	0	4	0	4	45	36	9	5.4

Communicates	0	4	0	0	36	36	22	5.7
Teaching	4	0	0	9	36	36	13	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	27	50	18	4	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	40	27	4	5.1
Learn Exp	5	0	0	21	36	31	5	5.0

HMB 301H1F Biotechnology

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

Enr: 60　　　　　Resp: 48　　　　　Retake: 78%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
French:								
Presents	0	2	4	2	39	39	12	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	12	33	37	16	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	25	27	47	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	4	27	45	22	5.9
Gurfinkel:								
Presents	0	0	6	6	33	39	14	5.5
Explains	0	2	2	14	25	43	12	5.4
Communicates	0	2	0	16	35	20	25	5.5
Teaching	0	0	4	12	31	37	14	5.5
Course:								
Workload	0	0	8	40	29	17	4	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	14	57	23	2	2	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	7	22	42	22	5	4.9

Students urged French to "keep up the passion" for her students and the course. Many acknowledged this course to be the highlight of their academic career. Students loved the guest lecturers who provided fresh, new perspectives every week. They also loved the real-life applicability of the content. In short, students would recommend this course to any student with any interest in biotechnology.

HMB 302H1F Vertebrate Histology and Histopathology

Instructor(s): R. Wilson

Enr: 89　　　　　Resp: 75　　　　　Retake: 69%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	24	33	32	8	5.2
Explains	0	0	4	8	28	37	21	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	4	14	37	43	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	15	26	37	20	5.6
Workload	0	0	4	58	23	12	1	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	2	54	30	9	1	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	8	30	32	22	8	4.9

Students found Wilson to be unique at UofT, in that they truly believe he cared for his students and wanted them to succeed. Students found the material extremely interesting but also very challenging. Many also found this to be great preparation for medical school and relevant to other courses.

HMB 303H1F Global Health and Human Rights

Instructor(s): P. Hamel

Enr: 68　　　　　Resp: 54　　　　　Retake: 90%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	12	20	42	24	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	3	12	44	38	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	1	1	27	68	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	1	24	35	38	6.1
Workload	0	1	1	54	16	18	5	4.7
Difficulty	1	0	5	48	29	11	3	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	4	19	26	48	6.2

Students regarded this as one of the most exceptional courses at UofT. Hamel worked tirelessly to see that the students understood the material. While students acknowledged there was a large workload, they felt it was necessary to appreciate the nature of the course. Students loved the interdisciplinary elements and found this course enhanced their perspective as a science student in the global landscape.

Any student who wants to change the world should stop by this course first.

HMB 304H1S Introduction to Biocommunication Visualization

Instructor(s): D. Mazierski; S. Wall

Enr: 14　　　　　Resp: 14　　　　　Retake: 91%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Mazierski:								
Presents	0	0	0	14	14	28	42	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	14	7	42	35	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	7	7	42	42	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	14	14	35	35	5.9
Wall:								
Presents	0	0	0	14	14	28	42	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	14	7	42	35	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	7	7	42	42	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	14	14	28	42	6.0
Course:								
Workload	0	0	14	50	0	28	7	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	21	50	14	14	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	25	33	33	5.9

Students thought the class was "fantastic" and a great experience overall. It was different from traditional science courses and involved hands-on learning. Some felt it required strong background knowledge in computers and art.

Students felt Wall was kind and very helpful, and went out of her way to aid students.

HMB 321H1F Topics in Genetics

Instructor(s): M. Sauer

Enr: 71　　　　　Resp: 60　　　　　Retake: 50%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	6	3	11	25	40	11	1	4.3
Explains	1	8	18	21	20	23	6	4.5
Communicates	0	1	0	6	30	46	15	5.7
Teaching	3	0	15	20	18	33	10	4.9
Workload	0	0	0	16	41	23	18	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	11	33	36	18	5.6
Learn Exp	0	6	6	31	24	22	8	4.8

Despite the 50% retake, students still had positive reviews of the course. They found Sauer extremely helpful - citing her willingness to explain and re-explain lecture topics as long as students required it. Students noted the exhaustive paper reading required but recognized the importance of reading papers for all future academic professions.

Students would have liked to have seen more standardization between tutorial groups. However, all TAs performed effectively at creating a positive learning environment. They emphasized Sauer attending the individual student tutorial presentations (over 70 of them) as a sign of how much she cared for her students.

HMB 420H1S Seminar in Human Behavioural Biology

Instructor(s): G. Einstein

Enr: 22　　　　　Resp: 19　　　　　Retake: 89%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	57	42	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	5	38	55	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	10	89	6.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	27	72	6.7
Workload	0	5	0	31	52	5	5	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	10	57	31	0	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	23	23	52	6.3

Students thoroughly enjoyed the course and found it very interesting. They enjoyed the discussions during the lectures. Students thought Einstein was very well organized and very approachable. It was a great learning experience.

IMMUNOLOGY

IMM 435H1F Practical Immunology

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

Enr: 25   Resp: 24   Retake: 77%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Jongstra-Bilen:								
Presents	0	0	0	8	25	45	20	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	41	33	25	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	4	41	45	8	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	4	37	29	29	5.8
Martin:								
Presents	0	0	0	8	25	45	20	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	4	33	37	25	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	8	37	50	4	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	4	37	29	29	5.8
Course:								
Workload	0	0	4	29	37	25	4	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	8	58	25	8	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	22	27	38	11	5.4

LABORATORY MEDICINE & PATHOBIOLOGY

LMP 300Y1Y Introduction to Pathobiology

Instructor(s): D. Templeton

Enr: 28   Resp: 14   Retake: 92%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	33	33	0	33	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	33	33	33	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	66	0	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	33	0	66	0	5.3
Workload	0	0	0	21	42	28	7	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	21	14	42	21	5.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	30	50	0	5.3

Students found the course overall to be enjoyable and interesting. The material was challenging. Some students complained that lecture notes should have been made available before class to enhance learning.

LMP 363H1F Principles of Pathobiology

Instructor(s): D. Sarma

Enr: 132   Resp: 75   Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	6	14	24	31	21	5.4
Explains	0	0	2	14	22	32	28	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	5	12	35	45	6.2
Teaching	0	0	2	8	30	25	33	5.8
Workload	0	0	5	68	22	2	1	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	2	63	25	8	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	1	0	31	21	31	13	5.2

Most students enjoyed the class tremendously. They found the instructor to be highly helpful and approachable. A few mentioned that Sarma was at times, difficult to understand and the slides were a bit unorganized. But this did not detract from the overall quality of the class.

LMP 365H1S Neoplasia

Instructor(s): M. Ohh

Enr: 32   Resp: 30   Retake: 84%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	13	36	46	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	46	33	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	30	40	30	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	6	50	43	6.4
Workload	0	0	13	44	24	13	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	10	41	31	13	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	27	38	11	22	5.3

Students found this to be an outstanding course. The lecture material was fascinating and engaged the students intellectually. Ohh was very knowledgeable, patient and helpful with student questions. The course was well-organized and tests were deemed to be fair.

Students felt that Ohh was an exceptional instructor who explained the material clearly and at an appropriate pace so that it was straightforward to understand. Many felt that this was one of their best courses.

LMP 402H1F Inflammation and Infection

Instructor(s): M. McGavin

Enr: 36   Resp: 21   Retake: 80%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	14	28	38	14	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	4	42	38	14	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	4	33	33	28	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	4	38	42	14	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	38	42	14	4	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	14	52	19	14	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	38	16	22	22	5.3

In general, students found the lecture material to be very interesting and relevant. Some students complained that the lecture notes were not posted on time, often weeks after the lecture. Some students also found the amount of material a bit overwhelming.

LMP 403H1S Immunopathology

Instructor(s): L. Zhang

Enr: 38   Resp: 9   Retake: 83%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	66	22	0	5.1
Explains	0	0	0	11	55	33	0	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	66	22	11	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	11	55	33	0	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	75	12	0	12	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	42	57	0	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	57	42	0	0	4.4

Instructor(s): P. Shek

Enr: 38   Resp: 19   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	26	42	26	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	5	31	36	26	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	27	33	38	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	36	47	15	5.8
Workload	0	0	6	60	20	13	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	53	33	6	6	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	66	8	16	5.3

Students found the lectures to be very interesting and enjoyable. The instructors posed intriguing research questions that prompted the students to think. While it was interesting to be taught by a series of guest lecturers, with so many of them, better administration and communication of information was required. The co-ordinators and TAs gave too little guidance before the midterms. Overall, the lecturers were generally interesting and succeeded in raising the students' enthusiasm.

LMP 404H1F Bone and Skeletal Disorders

Instructor(s): W. Vogel

Enr: 44   Resp: 30   Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	37	55	6	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	3	34	51	13	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	3	20	48	27	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	20	58	20	6.0
Workload	0	0	3	62	27	6	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	3	51	41	3	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	41	25	16	5.4

Overall, most students found this course to be well taught and informative.

LMP 406H1S Pathobiology of the Cardiovascular System

Instructor(s): M. Benedeck; S. Heximer

Enr: 17		Resp: 9				Retake: 62%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean

Benedeck:								
Presents	0	0	11	11	55	22	0	4.9
Explains	0	0	0	22	55	22	0	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	22	55	22	0	5.0
Teaching	0	0	0	22	55	22	0	5.0
Heximer:								
Presents	0	0	11	22	55	11	0	4.7
Explains	0	0	0	33	55	11	0	4.8
Communicates	0	0	0	22	66	11	0	4.9
Teaching	0	11	0	33	44	11	0	4.4
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	55	33	11	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	55	11	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	71	28	0	0	4.3

LMP 436H1S Microbial Pathogenesis

Instructor(s): S. Giardin

Enr: 31		Resp: 22				Retake: 94%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean

Presents	0	4	0	23	23	42	4	5.1
Explains	0	4	0	19	28	42	4	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	14	28	42	14	5.6
Teaching	0	0	5	20	35	30	10	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	68	21	10	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	57	26	15	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	40	20	6	5.0

Students found Giardin to be highly enthusiastic and motivated. Lectures were well-organized and clear. Students appreciated that the instructor was approachable and friendly, inside and outside of class hours. The guest lecturers in the course's second term presented material that was very interesting. Overall, students enjoyed the course greatly.

MOLECULAR GENETICS & MICROBIOLOGY

MGY 312H1Y Principles of Genetic Analysis

Instructor(s): C. Boone

Enr: 24		Resp: 21				Retake: 100%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean

Presents	9	9	23	33	19	0	4	3.6
Explains	4	4	0	52	23	9	4	4.3
Communicates	0	0	0	14	38	19	28	5.6
Teaching	0	0	9	14	52	4	19	5.1

Students felt that the section on yeast was poorly organized. It would have been beneficial if the course material was given out at the beginning of the year as a package.

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

Enr: 24		Resp: 23				Retake: 85%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean

Brill:								
Presents	0	0	0	18	18	45	18	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	18	18	36	27	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	4	4	54	36	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	4	19	42	33	6.0
Funnell:								
Presents	0	0	0	13	27	36	22	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	18	31	36	13	5.5
Communicates	0	0	4	9	27	40	18	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	4	27	40	27	5.9

Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	63	13	13	9	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	54	27	13	4	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	47	23	14	5.4

People thought that Brill took the time to meet with students during labs and was very helpful.   In general, the class thought that this course was useful in applying theoretical genetic concepts to practice.

MGY 376H1Y Microbiology Laboratory

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

Enr: 21		Resp: 20				Retake: 80%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean

Brown:								
Presents	0	0	25	10	15	40	10	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	20	35	40	5	5.3
Communicates	0	0	5	15	15	55	10	5.5
Teaching	0	0	5	15	30	30	20	5.4
Bognar:								
Presents	0	5	5	35	25	25	5	4.8
Explains	0	0	10	25	35	25	5	4.9
Communicates	0	0	10	25	15	40	10	5.2
Teaching	0	0	5	30	30	25	10	5.1
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	0	15	35	50	6.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	30	35	10	5.3
Learn Exp	0	5	0	5	11	44	33	5.9

Many students thought that Brown's lectures were organized and she directly answered students' questions. A few felt that she was difficult to approach.

Bognar's lectures were casual but interesting. Some students wanted more structure while others enjoyed this teaching style.

Everyone thought that this course should have been a full-year course because of the excessive workload throughout the year. Lab reports were very time-consuming and were not given enough weight in the marking scheme. Many students thought that the reports should have been worth more than the tests and that problem sets would have been more effective than midterms.

MGY 377H1F Microbiology I: Bacteria

Instructor(s): J. Liu; J. Brumell

Enr: 271		Resp: 103				Retake: 68%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean

Liu:								
Presents	0	0	0	4	21	47	25	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	8	26	41	22	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	13	35	39	11	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	4	25	50	18	5.8
Brumell:								
Presents	0	0	0	5	26	45	24	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	3	22	50	21	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	1	9	51	36	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	3	18	46	30	6.0
Course:								
Workload	0	1	2	49	33	10	4	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	2	48	35	11	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	4	38	35	18	2	4.8

Liu was clear and organized and his material was interesting and informative. He lectured at a reasonable pace and answered questions in class.

Brumell was very enthusiastic and funny - he made class enjoyable. However, many students thought that he had too many slides per lecture and went at a fast pace.

Overall, students thought that both Liu and Brumell were outstanding instructors. However, students thought that there was too much material presented and that more evaluations were required (as opposed to 1 test and 1 exam) to better reflect students' learning.

MGY 378H1S Microbiology II: Viruses

Instructor(s): A. Cochrane

Enr: 143　　　　　Resp: 76　　　　　Retake: 52%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	4	5	15	28	36	9	5.2
Explains	0	2	8	18	28	31	10	5.1
Communicates	0	1	6	21	30	26	13	5.1
Teaching	0	0	8	13	32	33	13	5.3
Workload	0	0	1	26	29	34	8	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	19	38	26	15	5.4
Learn Exp	4	3	1	24	32	27	4	4.8

Cochrane provided students with great lecture notes. However, some students felt that his explanation of concepts were unclear at times. This was an interesting and informative class overall, but most students felt the amount of material to memorize was very heavy.

Instructor(s): L. Frappier; C. Tailor

Enr: 143　　　　　Resp: 72　　　　　Retake: 47%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Frappier:								
Presents	0	8	2	4	32	34	17	5.3
Explains	0	5	5	7	38	30	12	5.2
Communicates	0	1	11	11	39	26	9	5.1
Teaching	0	4	5	14	28	38	9	5.2
Tailor:								
Presents	0	1	8	16	30	29	13	5.2
Explains	0	1	2	17	35	34	8	5.2
Communicates	0	0	2	17	34	32	12	5.4
Teaching	0	0	2	15	42	30	8	5.3
Course:								
Workload	0	0	1	27	31	29	10	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	41	24	15	5.4
Learn Exp	6	2	0	34	34	20	2	4.6

Students thought Frappier was one of the most organized instructors but not very enthusiastic. Everyone thought that her slides made studying for the test easier.

Tailor was funny and entertaining, however, he often read from the slides. The class was very worried about the final exam because his sample questions in lectures were very hard and required knowledge of minute details.

Many thought the amount of material covered was high and that tests focussed on memorization of details instead of promoting a general understanding of virology concepts.

MGY 425H1S Signal Transduction and Cell Cycle Regulation

Instructor(s): S. Egan

Enr: 21　　　　　Resp: 15　　　　　Retake: 69%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	7	28	50	7	7	4.8
Explains	0	0	0	33	40	26	0	4.9
Communicates	0	0	7	28	50	14	0	4.7
Teaching	0	0	6	26	40	20	6	4.9
Workload	0	0	0	61	23	15	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	23	46	15	15	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	66	16	8	5.2

MGY 428H1F Functional and Microbial Genomics

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

Enr: 30　　　　　Resp: 25　　　　　Retake: 63%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Roy:								
Presents	0	0	12	28	36	8	16	4.9
Explains	0	0	0	32	40	8	20	5.2
Communicates	0	4	0	8	36	36	16	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	32	32	20	16	5.2
Hughes:								
Presents	0	0	4	24	48	12	12	5.0
Explains	0	0	8	12	48	20	12	5.2
Communicates	0	0	4	8	44	32	12	5.4
Teaching	0	0	4	4	56	28	8	5.3
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	31	40	18	9	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	4	36	22	31	4	5.0
Learn Exp	0	4	4	42	14	23	9	4.8

Most students felt that Roy's quizzes were too detailed and did not reflect students' knowledge. At times, his lectures did not correspond with the slides provided to the students.

Many students thought that Hughes was a good instructor who was able to explain concepts clearly and in an organized manner.

MGY 432H1F Laboratory in Molecular Genetics and Microbiology

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

Enr: 34　　　　　Resp: 27　　　　　Retake: 74%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Blencowe:								
Presents	0	0	3	29	48	14	3	4.9
Explains	0	0	0	26	53	15	3	5.0
Communicates	0	0	3	22	33	29	11	5.2
Teaching	0	0	0	22	55	14	7	5.1
Gray-Owen:								
Presents	0	0	0	7	37	44	11	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	15	26	50	7	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	40	25	33	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	11	25	48	14	5.7
Course:								
Workload	0	0	3	25	37	29	3	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	7	50	34	7	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	10	15	40	20	15	5.2

Both instructors were considered to be approachable, enthusiastic and organized.

Overall, students enjoyed this course and found the topics to be very interesting. The experiments were useful for learning and applying experimental concepts and techniques. The lab manuals were very informative and well-written. However, many microbiology students felt that they were at a disadvantage with the genetics material in the course and wished for more emphasis on microbiology concepts. The tests were also somewhat unclear and did not necessarily reflect material learned in class.

MGY 434H1S Bacterial Signalling and Physiological Regulation

Instructor(s): A. Bognar

Enr: 14　　　　　Resp: 9　　　　　Retake: 75%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	55	33	0	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	11	55	33	0	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	22	44	33	0	5.1
Teaching	0	0	0	11	33	55	0	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	33	33	33	0	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	33	22	11	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	28	28	14	5.3

Overall, the course material was interesting. However, some students felt that the workload was higher than average.

MGY 440H1F Molecular Virology

Instructor(s): M. Brown

Enr: 24　　　　　Resp: 22　　　　　Retake: 57%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	27	22	40	4	5.1
Explains	0	0	0	18	31	36	13	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	4	13	54	27	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	22	22	45	9	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	31	40	18	9	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	19	38	33	9	5.3
Learn Exp	0	6	0	25	31	25	12	5.1

Brown was a good instructor. Overall, the course material was very organized and interesting. However, the midterm and final did not reflect the course material and were marked harshly. Students felt more strict guidelines for the presentation would have been helpful.

There was a lot of material covered for a half-credit course and students found it overwhelming.

MGY 445H1F Genetic Engineering for Prevention and Treatment of Disease

Instructor(s): S. Joshi; M. Brown

Enr: 22 — Resp: 19 — Retake: 56%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Joshi:								
Presents	0	11	11	27	38	5	5	4.3
Explains	0	0	16	22	22	38	0	4.8
Communicates	0	0	16	16	27	33	5	4.9
Teaching	0	0	16	11	55	16	0	4.7
Brown:								
Presents	0	0	5	38	16	38	0	4.9
Explains	0	0	0	27	33	33	5	5.2
Communicates	0	0	5	11	27	38	16	5.5
Teaching	0	0	11	27	22	22	16	5.1
Course:								
Workload	0	0	5	76	0	17	0	4.3
Difficulty	5	0	0	41	23	23	5	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	53	33	13	0	4.6

Some students felt that the course material was interesting and of "high practical value". Other students felt that the material was dry, and that the course evaluations were not equally weighted.

Joshi was described as a passionate instructor. Many appreciated the help sessions, and her ability to accommodate students' needs. Some students thought that she spoke too quickly and her methods of explaining concepts were unclear. Some students felt that Brown should have indicated her standard for answers prior to the test.

MGY 451H1F Genetic Analysis of Development: Yeast and Worms

Instructor(s): A. Spence

Enr: 24 — Resp: 20 — Retake: 70%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	40	40	10	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	15	35	40	10	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	10	40	45	5	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	15	30	50	5	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	60	15	20	5	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	40	30	5	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	22	38	33	5	5.2

Overall, students found the course to be interesting. However, several students expressed their concern for the difficulty of the first term test.

MGY 460H1S Plant Molecular Genetics

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

Enr: 25 — Resp: 22 — Retake: 80%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Berleth:								
Presents	4	0	0	22	22	31	18	5.3
Explains	0	4	0	9	27	36	22	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	9	9	68	13	5.9
Teaching	0	4	0	9	27	45	13	5.5
McCourt:								
Presents	0	0	0	4	27	50	18	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	4	13	59	22	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	9	54	36	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	4	22	54	18	5.9
Course:								
Workload	0	0	4	45	36	4	9	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	4	54	18	18	4	4.6
Learn Exp	5	0	0	11	35	35	11	5.2

Students thought this was a very interesting course, but commented on the lack of online lecture notes. This course required a lot of readings. Berleth was a good lecturer but was occasionally disorganized. McCourt was enthusiastic and intersting.

MGY 470H1S Human and Molecular Genetics

Instructor(s): J. Rommens; A. Nagy

Enr: 44 — Resp: 29 — Retake: 66%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Rommens:								
Presents	0	0	4	16	24	44	12	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	13	43	30	13	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	4	28	36	32	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	16	29	33	20	5.6
Nagy:								
Presents	0	0	10	20	37	27	3	4.9
Explains	0	0	6	20	48	17	6	5.0
Communicates	0	0	3	17	27	31	20	5.5
Teaching	0	0	7	23	46	19	3	4.9
Course:								
Workload	0	0	3	65	20	6	3	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	3	62	20	10	3	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	8	16	41	25	8	5.1

The class thought that there was a lot of material presented in the course but that it was interesting.

Students only had good things to say about Rommens, saying that she was enthusiastic and seemed to care about students. A few had issues with the organization of course material.

MGY 485H1S Vaccines and Vaccinations

Instructor(s): S. Gray-Owen; M. Ostrowski

Enr: 24 — Resp: 14 — Retake: 69%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Gray-Owen:								
Presents	0	0	0	0	42	50	7	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	42	57	0	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	28	50	21	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	28	50	21	5.9
Ostrowski:								
Presents	0	0	0	14	57	21	7	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	7	50	42	0	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	21	35	42	0	5.2
Teaching	0	0	0	7	50	42	0	5.4
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	71	14	14	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	42	28	28	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	10	20	30	40	0	5.0

The course material was interesting, and the guest seminars were beneficial to the students' understanding of the course. Some felt that the title of the course was misleading as the material taught was based around infection and immunity, not vaccines and vaccinations.

Gray-Owen was very considerate and accommodated students' needs. His lectures were paced nicely, and the amount of content was just right.

Ostrowski was engaging in his lectures as he stimulated the students to understand the material on a deeper level. Some students found this excessive and proposed to have two breaks for a three hour lecture.

Students enjoyed how this class focussed on the understanding of the material instead of pure memorization and recall.

NEUROSCIENCE

NRS 201H1S Neuroscience

Instructor(s): J. Yeomans

Enr: 61 — Resp: 47 — Retake: 69%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	6	4	17	31	17	15	6	4.2
Explains	2	0	2	21	29	27	17	5.3

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Communicates	2	0	2	0	17	25	53	6.2
Teaching	2	2	4	20	31	22	17	5.1
Workload	0	0	2	52	28	8	8	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	2	50	21	15	10	4.8
Learn Exp	2	0	4	35	20	15	22	5.1

Students thought that the material was interesting. Yeomans was enthusiastic, but a little unorganized. The slides were never updated on time. The essay evaluation on tests was unfair, and much too much weight was placed on the final.

NRS 202H1S Neuroanatomy

Instructor(s): P. Stewart

Enr: 74   Resp: 52   Retake: 95%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	1	5	21	71	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	3	3	25	67	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	7	15	76	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	3	1	15	78	6.7
Workload	0	0	1	38	38	17	3	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	1	26	36	26	7	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	5	30	57	6.4

Students found the lab to be very valuable and interesting. They really liked the instructor and said she was knowledgeable, enthusiastic, well organized, effective and humourous. Many thought she was one of their best instructors. Students liked that she was so conducive to student questions. Although most found the material to be interesting and useful, some noted that the pace of the class was too fast and that the amount of material was overwhelming.

NRS 302H1F Neuroscience Laboratory

Instructor(s): J. Yeomans

Enr: 15   Resp: 12   Retake: 66%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	41	33	8	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	18	27	45	9	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	8	25	33	33	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	18	36	36	9	5.4
Workload	0	0	8	8	16	41	25	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	18	18	18	45	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	16	50	16	5.7

Students found Kwan to be enthusiastic and approachable. They also found Yeomans to be slightly intimidating. Students felt that lab reports should have been graded sooner and more feedback should have been given.

NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES

NFS 284H1F Basic Human Nutrition

Instructor(s): T. Wolever

Enr: 482   Resp: 201   Retake: 55%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	4	9	37	22	20	4	4.5
Explains	3	4	16	31	26	15	3	4.3
Communicates	3	2	7	24	27	27	8	4.9
Teaching	4	11	18	29	25	7	2	4.0
Workload	0	2	12	68	12	3	1	4.0
Difficulty	0	4	17	55	11	7	4	4.1
Learn Exp	7	7	14	42	12	11	4	4.0

Half of the students who took this course felt that Wolever was a good lecturer who was very knowledgeable about the material. The other half felt that Wolever presented the material with a lack of enthusiasm and interest. The majority thought the testing was unfair and tricky. Some students felt that certain TAs were unreasonable and this affected their performance in the course.

NFS 386H1F Food Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Gurfinkel

Enr: 179   Resp: 115   Retake: 79%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	1	3	14	28	30	15	5.2
Explains	3	1	5	13	32	28	14	5.2
Communicates	0	4	5	9	33	30	15	5.3
Teaching	1	0	7	13	31	30	14	5.2
Workload	0	5	13	64	13	0	1	3.9
Difficulty	0	5	14	64	11	4	0	4.0
Learn Exp	5	1	3	25	36	21	6	4.8

Students enjoyed the course, and found the instructor both enthusiastic and engaging. Though most found her lectures organized and easy to understand, some disliked that she simply read her lectures. A few complained that the readings were very long and difficult to understand.

Most of the complaints for this course revolved around the evaluations. The criteria for the evaluations and the assignments were too vague. Some wished that the evaluations could have been marked and returned more promptly.

NFS 484H1F Advanced Nutrition

Instructor(s): C. Greenwood

Enr: 50   Resp: 33   Retake: 60%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	9	28	21	31	9	5.0
Explains	0	0	6	15	24	33	21	5.5
Communicates	0	0	3	12	15	48	21	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	18	12	60	9	5.6
Workload	0	0	6	63	18	12	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	3	50	28	18	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	3	3	21	32	32	7	5.1

Greenwood was a good instructor who was approachable and showed much enthusiasm in her lectures. She was very knowledgeable and answered questions effectively. Some students were concerned about the fact it was a joint class with graduate students.

NFS 486H1S Nutrition and Human Disease

Instructor(s): M. Keith

Enr: 68   Resp: 22   Retake: 61%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	18	40	27	13	0	4.4
Explains	0	0	9	45	27	18	0	4.5
Communicates	0	0	18	40	22	13	4	4.5
Teaching	4	4	13	45	18	9	4	4.1
Workload	0	0	5	65	25	5	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	15	65	15	5	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	7	21	64	0	0	7	3.9

Keith was unclear as to the requirements and her expectations in this course although she was enthusiastic about the material.

NFS 487H1F Functional Foods and Nutrigenomics

Instructor(s): A. El-Sohemy

Enr: 73   Resp: 33   Retake: 82%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	6	12	46	31	3	5.1
Explains	0	0	3	19	35	29	12	5.3
Communicates	0	3	0	6	43	37	9	5.4
Teaching	0	0	3	18	37	31	9	5.2
Workload	0	0	25	62	3	6	3	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	34	56	9	0	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	0	12	40	32	12	4	4.6

El-Sohemy was a good instructor who was clear and organized. However, some students thought that there were too many guest speakers. They also suggested more genetic-based lectures.

NFS 488H1S Nutritional Toxicology

Instructor(s): A. El-Sohemy

Enr: 127   Resp: 69   Retake: 81%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	17	35	31	10	5.3
Explains	0	0	1	13	29	39	16	5.6
Communicates	0	0	2	11	37	37	10	5.4
Teaching	0	0	1	14	26	36	20	5.6
Workload	0	0	6	78	10	3	1	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	5	76	13	1	1	4.1
Learn Exp	1	0	0	43	30	15	9	4.8

NFS 490H1S International and Community Nutrition

Instructor(s): S. Parker

Enr: 97   Resp: 55   Retake: 92%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	3	29	52	12	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	7	3	41	12	5.6
Communicates	0	3	3	10	27	47	7	5.3
Teaching	0	0	0	7	29	50	12	5.7
Workload	0	1	3	61	23	3	5	4.4
Difficulty	0	1	5	87	5	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	2	0	0	23	47	19	7	5.0

PHARMACEUTICAL CHEMISTRY

PHC 300Y1Y Molecular Pharmacology

Instructor(s): J. Uetrecht

Enr: 21   Resp: 16   Retake: 33%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	0	56	18	18	0	4.4
Explains	0	0	12	43	18	18	6	4.6
Communicates	0	0	12	43	18	18	6	4.6
Teaching	0	0	0	56	25	12	6	4.7
Workload	0	0	6	20	20	20	33	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	20	13	46	5.9
Learn Exp	15	0	23	30	30	0	0	3.6

PHC 320H1F Medicinal Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Dubins

Enr: 32   Resp: 30   Retake: 96%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	3	30	30	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	6	20	36	36	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	6	10	30	53	6.3
Teaching	0	0	6	0	23	33	40	6.1
Workload	0	0	3	62	17	13	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	3	73	6	13	3	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	4	13	9	36	36	5.9

Many students felt Dubins was an excellent lecturer who communicated clearly and with a lot of enthusiasm. Dubins cared for his students and their learning experience.

PHARMACOLOGY & TOXICOLOGY

PCL 201H1S Introduction to Pharmacology: Pharmacokinetic Principles

Instructor(s): W. Burnham; A. Okey

Enr: 472   Resp: 269   Retake: 91%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Burnham:								
Presents	0	0	2	8	24	36	28	5.8
Explains	0	0	2	9	22	34	31	5.8
Communicates	0	0	1	8	21	36	32	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	6	17	35	38	6.1
Okey:								
Presents	0	0	0	8	27	36	26	5.8
Explains	0	0	1	6	22	37	31	5.9
Communicates	0	0	1	7	17	36	36	6.0
Teaching	0	0	1	6	20	37	34	6.0
Course:								
Workload	1	7	18	60	6	2	1	3.8
Difficulty	0	7	16	62	8	3	1	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	1	34	29	21	13	5.1

On the whole, students felt it was a very enjoyable course. Most students thought that both instructors were enthusiastic, approachable and spent a lot of time before tests answering students' questions. Despite the emphasis on memorization, students also felt that the material was understandable and straight forward.

PCL 362H1S Introduction to Toxicology

Instructor(s): P. Wells

Enr: 71   Resp: 34   Retake: 82%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	5	8	0	26	35	14	8	4.6
Explains	0	5	8	23	32	11	17	4.9
Communicates	3	3	9	24	21	30	9	4.8
Teaching	8	5	0	11	38	20	14	4.9
Workload	0	6	6	84	3	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	3	12	78	6	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	14	0	3	32	17	25	7	4.4

A majority of students thought the topics covered in lectures were interesting. The videos were very enjoyable and educational at the same time. There were interesting supplementary material discussed on top of the mandatory lecture slides. On the other hand, the pace of the lectures were slow. Some of the lectures did not reflect what was going to be tested. Overall, students found the course to be interesting.

PCL 470Y1Y Systems Pharmacology

Instructor(s): L. Grupp

Enr: 50   Resp: 14   Retake: 46%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	21	35	35	7	0	4.3
Explains	0	7	7	50	21	14	0	4.3
Communicates	0	0	0	28	35	35	0	5.1
Teaching	0	0	7	38	15	38	0	4.8
Workload	0	0	0	15	23	15	46	5.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	30	15	23	5.3
Learn Exp	0	18	18	36	18	0	9	3.9

Many felt that the course crammed in far too much material and that tests focussed too much on specific details.

PCL 473Y1Y Interdisciplinary Toxicology

Instructor(s): C. Woodland

Enr: 49   Resp: 31   Retake: 75%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	13	23	43	20	5.7
Explains	0	0	3	3	25	38	29	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	3	16	35	45	6.2
Teaching	0	0	3	3	6	48	38	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	50	26	16	6	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	3	45	32	12	6	4.7
Learn Exp	0	4	0	16	41	20	16	5.2

Students thought it was an interesting, well organized course. They thought Woodland was great, funny, effective, engaging, down to earth and very caring about students. A few thought it was a tough course, assignments were worth a lot, some test questions were not well explained.

PCL 477H1F The DNA Damage Response Pharmacology and Toxicology

Instructor(s): P. McPherson

Enr: 28   Resp: 19   Retake: 94%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	42	42	15	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	36	26	36	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	10	15	36	36	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	26	57	15	5.9
Workload	0	5	0	78	10	5	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	63	31	5	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	57	21	0	5.0

Students used words such as "amazing, well-informed, approachable, enthusiastic and available for consultation" to describe the instructor. They felt that he answered questions effectively and gave very useful feedback. Students liked that there was no required text and he provided experimental examples to show how the lab work was done.

PCL 481H1S The Molecular and Biochemical Basis of Toxicology

Instructor(s): P. O'Brien

Enr: 44   Resp: 37   Retake: 45%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	13	32	24	24	5	4.8
Explains	0	0	2	32	32	27	5	5.0
Communicates	0	0	5	10	40	24	18	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	30	36	19	13	5.2
Workload	0	2	2	78	10	2	2	4.2
Difficulty	0	2	5	69	16	5	0	4.2
Learn Exp	3	0	3	57	28	7	0	4.3

Students felt that O'Brien was a good instructor but that the course needed to be better organized.

PHYSIOLOGY

PSL 300H1F Human Physiology I

Instructor(s): T. Lam; W. Mackay

Enr: 31   Resp: 14   Retake: 69%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Lam:								
Presents	0	0	0	7	57	21	14	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	14	35	14	35	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	7	30	46	15	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	7	38	30	23	5.7
Mackay:								
Presents	0	0	7	0	38	7	46	5.8
Explains	0	0	7	14	35	7	35	5.5
Communicates	7	14	7	0	50	7	14	4.5
Teaching	0	0	7	7	35	28	21	5.5
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	21	21	35	21	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	35	14	50	6.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	38	7	7	46	5.6

PSL 302Y1Y Human Physiology

Instructor(s): T. Lam; W. Mackay

Enr: 760   Resp: 216   Retake: 55%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Lam:								
Presents	0	0	1	17	41	31	6	5.2
Explains	0	0	1	20	39	28	8	5.2
Communicates	0	0	5	15	33	32	12	5.3
Teaching	0	0	2	17	37	33	7	5.2
Mackay:								
Presents	1	1	6	15	36	29	8	5.1
Explains	1	3	8	20	35	23	7	4.8
Communicates	6	5	13	20	27	17	8	4.4
Teaching	2	3	6	17	34	28	6	4.9
Course:								
Workload	0	0	1	17	30	23	26	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	8	25	31	33	5.9
Learn Exp	1	0	6	42	22	15	9	4.7

Lam was enthusiastic. He attended to student needs, but he talked a bit too fast. Mackay was clear and efficient. Some students thought more tutorials would have been helpful and that the course material was difficult.

PSL 350H1S Mammalian Molecular Physiology

Instructor(s): Z. Jia

Enr: 106   Resp: 43   Retake: 44%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	9	19	40	21	7	2	4.0
Explains	0	7	22	42	15	10	2	4.1
Communicates	2	7	21	40	16	9	2	4.0
Teaching	2	2	26	34	24	7	2	4.1
Workload	0	2	17	47	22	10	0	4.2
Difficulty	2	2	12	38	30	10	2	4.3
Learn Exp	4	0	13	40	36	4	0	4.2

Most students recommended that Jia should have spoken a bit louder, perhaps the use of a microphone would have been appropriate. Students found the instructor to be knowledgeable but were concerned with his ability to present the material in a clear and organized manner. A few suggested that he should try to decrease the amount of information per slide.

PSL 372H1F Mammalian Physiology Laboratory

Instructor(s): C. Perumalla

Enr: 119   Resp: 58   Retake: 49%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	1	10	13	43	20	6	4.8
Explains	1	0	9	16	40	24	7	5.0
Communicates	3	0	9	9	30	30	16	5.2
Teaching	3	0	1	13	30	38	11	5.3
Workload	0	1	0	7	17	35	38	6.0
Difficulty	0	1	0	7	24	36	29	5.8
Learn Exp	0	0	2	31	17	28	20	5.3

The vast majority of the students considered the workload to be extremely high and the course should have been worth 1.0 credit instead of 0.5 given the amount of effort required. The labs were very interesting to perform, and the instructor was very approachable and knowledgeable. Many complained that the course was fast paced and the expectation and pre-requisites were not clarified to students. Many suggested the lab lecture should be pre-lab oriented.

PSL 374H1S Advanced Physiology Laboratory

Instructor(s): C. Perumalla

Enr: 22   Resp: 19   Retake: 46%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	10	5	31	42	10	0	4.4
Explains	0	0	10	21	47	15	5	4.8
Communicates	0	0	0	10	31	31	26	5.7
Teaching	0	0	5	22	22	33	16	5.3
Workload	0	0	0	18	12	6	62	6.1
Difficulty	0	0	6	31	12	31	18	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	35	35	7	21	5.1

Students appreciated the hands-on experiences and found the labs very interesting. Most students complained about the extremely heavy course load. Many also suggested that the lab manuals be updated and proofread to eliminate the typos for experiment protocols. The lab techniques and equipment were also suggested to be revised since many experiments could not be completed due to technical difficult. Perumalla was very approachable and helpful in attending to questions.

PSL 425H1F Integrative Metabolism and its Endrocrine Regulation

Instructor(s): I. Fantus

Enr: 34　　　　Resp: 24　　　　Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	13	9	9	40	18	9	4.7
Explains	0	4	18	18	27	22	9	4.7
Communicates	0	0	8	13	47	21	8	5.1
Teaching	0	0	9	22	36	18	13	5.0
Workload	0	0	6	25	56	0	12	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	37	43	6	12	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	41	33	0	5.1

PSL 443H1S Motor Control System

Instructor(s): W. McIlroy; W. Mackay

Enr: 25　　　　Resp: 20　　　　Retake: 88%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
McIlroy:								
Presents	0	0	0	5	36	47	10	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	10	30	50	10	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	15	21	31	31	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	10	15	60	15	5.8
Mackay:								
Presents	0	0	5	5	45	35	10	5.4
Explains	0	0	5	5	30	45	15	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	10	31	26	31	5.8
Teaching	0	0	5	5	25	50	15	5.7
Course:								
Workload	0	5	15	57	10	10	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	57	26	10	5	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	29	29	35	5	5.2

Instructor(s): H. Kwan; W. Hutchinson

Enr: 25　　　　Resp: 20　　　　Retake: 83%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Kwan:								
Presents	0	0	0	10	35	40	15	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	5	25	50	20	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	5	25	50	20	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	20	55	20	6.1
Hutchinson:								
Presents	0	0	0	25	25	35	15	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	15	40	35	10	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	10	45	30	15	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	10	45	30	15	5.5
Course:								
Workload	0	5	15	57	10	5	5	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	57	26	5	5	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	37	25	31	6	5.1

Kwan's material was very interesting, but students should refresh their math skills.

PSL 462H1S Molecular Aspects of Cardiovascular Function

Instructor(s): S. Bolz

Enr: 12　　　　Resp: 10　　　　Retake: 70%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	10	40	40	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	20	0	30	50	6.1
Communicates	0	0	10	0	0	60	30	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	10	20	40	30	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	50	10	20	20	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	10	20	40	20	10	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	11	11	44	22	11	5.1

Bolz was found to be a good teacher. The course was good due to its small class size and lots of interaction with the instructor.

PSL 470H1S Cardiovascular Physiology

Instructor(s): G. Van Arsdell; C. Wittnich

Enr: 108　　　　Resp: 35　　　　Retake: 87%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Van Arsdell:								
Presents	0	3	12	21	39	15	9	4.8
Explains	0	0	8	14	41	20	14	5.2
Communicates	0	0	5	11	32	32	17	5.4
Teaching	0	0	9	21	33	21	15	5.1
Wittnich:								
Presents	0	0	6	9	39	33	12	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	12	42	30	15	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	9	21	43	25	5.8
Teaching	0	0	3	9	37	34	15	5.5
Course:								
Workload	0	3	11	51	25	3	3	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	3	44	22	22	7	4.9
Learn Exp	0	5	0	33	33	11	16	4.9

Many students thought that both instructors were funny and made lectures at 9 a.m. much more interesting. However, it was thought that the material was not taught at an undergraduate level. Furthermore, the notes were filled with unexplained acronyms, and were generally disorganized.

Instructor(s): L. Langille; L. Adamson

Enr: 108　　　　Resp: 38　　　　Retake: 82%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Langille:								
Presents	3	0	0	18	48	30	0	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	35	35	27	0	4.9
Communicates	0	0	3	15	51	30	0	5.1
Teaching	0	0	2	20	44	32	0	5.1
Adamson:								
Presents	0	0	5	13	27	44	8	5.4
Explains	0	0	5	8	36	41	8	5.4
Communicates	0	0	2	13	41	36	5	5.3
Teaching	0	0	5	13	30	41	8	5.3
Course:								
Workload	0	3	3	72	10	6	3	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	51	27	13	6	4.8
Learn Exp	4	4	0	33	33	12	12	4.8

PSL 472H1S Sleep Physiology and Chronobiology

Instructor(s): R. Horner

Enr: 25　　　　Resp: 19　　　　Retake: 72%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	15	42	36	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	5	15	36	42	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	5	16	33	44	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	10	26	36	26	5.8
Workload	0	0	11	55	16	11	5	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	31	26	26	15	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	42	28	28	5.9

Horner was found to be very enthusiastic and presented the material in a clear and logical manner. He was very motivating and used relevant problem-based learning applications. However, the tests were found to be difficult with ambiguous questions.