

Introduction

The Botany Undergraduate Departmental Society (BUDS) is a student-run organization working on behalf of all undergraduates taking biology and botany courses at UofT. All undergraduates are welcome to drop by the office (ES3084) to obtain copies of past year's exams, ask advice, voice concerns about BOT courses or instructors, chat, make suggestions, buy a botany t-shirt or sweatshirt, eat lunch or just hang out. Members of the BUDS Executive are available to assist students during office hours, which are posted on the office door. Information on certain scholarships, volunteer opportunities and botany-related jobs is also available through BUDS.

BUDS would like to thank everyone who filled out course evaluations, especially those who wrote comments and filled out the little circles correctly.

BUDS Executive

BIO 250Y1Y Cell and Molecular Biology

Instructor(s): F. DiCosmo; M. French

Enr: n/a	Resp: 779						Retake: 56%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>DiCosmo:</u>								
Presents	11	11	24	22	17	11	2	3.7
Explains	5	10	17	27	24	12	3	4.0
Communicates	0	2	5	18	30	28	13	5.2
Teaching	2	4	14	28	25	19	4	4.5
<u>French:</u>								
Presents	1	1	5	12	27	34	17	5.4
Explains	0	0	3	13	31	32	17	5.4
Communicates	0	0	3	18	33	32	10	5.2
Teaching	0	0	2	13	29	38	15	5.5
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	1	41	32	18	5	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	1	33	34	22	6	5.0
Learn Exp	0	1	5	44	28	15	4	4.6

Most students felt that DiCosmo was an enthusiastic speaker, and that the assigned specific readings from the textbook were helpful. However, students would have appreciated it more if DiCosmo spoke slowly and clearly, had a more organized lecture format and wrote legible notes.

Most students enjoyed French's classes. Her notes were very clear and organized, which made them easy to follow. Students felt that French's lectures explained concepts well, and that her availability to address students' questions were much appreciated.

As for the course as a whole, some students found labs interesting while some felt that there was too much lab preparation. Some students felt that tutorials would have been helpful.

Instructor(s): M. Heath; M. Ringuette

Enr: n/a	Resp: 538						Retake: 57%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Heath:</u>								
Presents	1	0	4	13	26	38	14	5.4
Explains	0	0	2	16	26	37	15	5.4
Communicates	1	0	3	17	31	32	13	5.3
Teaching	0	0	3	17	26	39	12	5.4
<u>Ringuette:</u>								
Presents	3	3	13	25	29	20	3	4.5
Explains	1	3	10	30	30	19	5	4.6
Communicates	1	2	6	27	32	20	8	4.8
Teaching	1	3	9	30	30	20	3	4.6
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	2	52	27	13	2	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	1	41	34	18	3	4.8
Learn Exp	1	1	5	47	26	13	4	4.5

Most students agreed that Heath used good examples and well-organized lecture notes. Most students also agreed that she was easy

to understand. Some students though her section could have been improved if she spoke a little bit slower and highlighted key concepts more often. Overall, most students were satisfied with Heath.

Most students enjoyed Ringuette's lectures, but suggested he could have improved his lecture notes by not using handwritten slides. Most students agreed he used good examples in lectures.

Instructor(s): M. French

Enr: n/a	Resp: 183						Retake: 52%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	1	6	17	40	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	4	15	44	34	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	5	17	38	37	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	2	16	38	41	6.2
Workload	1	0	3	42	29	19	3	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	2	37	34	17	7	4.9
Learn Exp	0	2	4	38	36	11	6	4.7

Students felt that French was an excellent teacher. She was very approachable and attended to students' questions clearly and with encouragement. The material was delivered in a clear and well-organized manner. "She is simply outstanding."

BIO 260H1S Concepts in Genetics

Instructor(s): D. Godt; D. Guttman

Enr: 226	Resp: 115						Retake: 45%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Godt:</u>								
Presents	7	4	7	25	31	17	6	4.5
Explains	7	4	13	17	28	24	4	4.5
Communicates	7	4	4	23	23	25	11	4.8
Teaching	5	6	9	27	30	16	3	4.4
<u>Guttman:</u>								
Presents	3	2	6	20	26	31	8	4.9
Explains	5	1	10	18	38	18	6	4.6
Communicates	4	4	4	22	28	25	9	4.8
Teaching	4	2	8	23	33	21	5	4.7
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	1	1	30	32	15	18	5.1
Difficulty	0	1	0	19	23	27	27	5.6
Learn Exp	6	5	7	41	21	15	2	4.2

Overall, students enjoyed the material, but were frustrated that the material taught in class was not the same as on the midterm. Many expressed that practice test questions would have been a huge asset. As well, problem solving techniques should have been emphasized earlier in the course.

Guttman was described as enthusiastic, however, students felt that at times he presented the material too quickly.

Students had mixed feelings about the tutorials but generally felt they should be more problem-based.

BIO 328H1S Physiological Ecology

Instructor(s): R. Sage

Enr: 23	Resp: 20						Retake: 80%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	35	40	20	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	5	30	35	30	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	5	10	55	30	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	5	5	55	35	6.2
Workload	0	0	5	55	30	10	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	65	25	10	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	31	31	15	21	5.3

Students felt Sage was an enthusiastic instructor. He explained concepts well, was knowledgeable, and very helpful.

Many students also found the course material to be interesting and well organized. Some students felt the course emphasized plants more than animals, instead of an equal discussion of both topics. Overall, a

10 BOTANY

good course.

BIO 428H1S Global Change Ecology

Instructor(s): R. Sage

Enr: 35

Resp: 30

Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	40	36	20	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	3	6	50	40	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	43	50	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	10	60	30	6.2
Workload	0	0	3	48	31	17	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	3	72	24	0	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	17	50	25	5.9

Overall, students felt that Sage was interesting and enthusiastic, which resulted in an enjoyable learning experience.

However, many suggested that the readings were too extensive and therefore should be revised. A few students suggested that tests should evaluate lecture material, rather than the readings. Many commented on the value of discussion in class and the critical perspective that was presented in the course.

BIO 440H1S Ecology and Evolution of Plant-Animal Interactions

Instructor(s): J. Thomson; A. Agrawal

Enr: 28

Resp: 22

Retake: 81%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Thomson:

Presents	0	0	4	27	45	13	9	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	9	33	33	23	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	27	36	36	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	4	36	40	18	5.7

Agrawal:

Presents	0	0	0	0	38	52	9	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	14	23	47	14	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	28	38	33	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	4	38	42	14	5.7

Course:

Workload	0	0	0	11	35	41	11	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	38	22	5	5.0
Learn Exp	0	7	0	23	30	30	7	5.0

Thomson was described as clear and enthusiastic. Students felt that the course material was very interesting. Overall, students felt that fewer assignments and less reading material would have been helpful.

Agrawal was described as helpful. Some students felt more comments on the assignments as well as more concise readings would have been helpful.

Instructor(s): J. Thaler

Enr: 28

Resp: 22

Retake: 90%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Presents	0	0	0	0	31	45	22	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	4	33	47	14	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	40	36	22	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	40	45	13	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	10	45	40	5	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	38	28	0	5.0
Learn Exp	0	5	0	16	44	27	5	5.1

Thaler was described as clear and enthusiastic. Some students suggested restructuring the distribution of assignments to include a midterm test.

BIO 472H1S Bioinformatics

Instructor(s): N. Provart; D. Guttman

Enr: 26

Resp: 20

Retake: 75%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Provart:

Presents	0	0	0	20	20	45	15	5.6
Explains	0	0	10	10	45	25	10	5.2
Communicates	0	0	5	15	50	15	15	5.2
Teaching	0	0	0	20	45	25	10	5.2

Guttman:

Presents	0	0	5	5	30	40	20	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	15	35	30	20	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	10	60	20	10	5.3
Teaching	0	0	0	15	40	30	15	5.4

Course:

Workload	0	0	0	70	20	10	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	55	25	20	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	5	0	35	29	11	17	4.9

Students enjoyed Provart's enthusiastic lectures, citing them as informative and organized.

Students enjoyed Guttman's lectures, however, many felt that too much material was presented in each lecture. Many mentioned the highly organized structure of the lectures.

Overall, students felt that the course was original and beneficial. However, many felt that practical laboratory (computer) sessions would have been appropriate.

Instructor(s): R. Neal

Enr: 26

Resp: 17

Retake: 73%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Presents	0	0	35	29	17	11	5	4.2
Explains	5	5	23	23	29	0	11	4.1
Communicates	0	0	5	35	47	5	5	4.7
Teaching	0	0	11	52	23	11	0	4.4
Workload	0	0	5	47	35	11	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	5	41	35	5	11	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	8	33	33	25	0	4.8

Neal definitely knew the material well, but it was a bit too detailed for students to fully understand.

BOT 202Y1Y Plants and Society

Instructor(s): S. Barrett; J. Eckenwalder

Enr: 106

Resp: 65

Retake: 51%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Barrett:

Presents	0	0	0	4	15	42	36	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	17	12	45	25	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	6	20	21	51	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	9	25	39	26	5.8

Guttman:

Presents	4	14	18	39	13	8	1	3.7
Explains	3	12	11	33	25	7	6	4.1
Communicates	1	0	3	18	31	26	18	5.3
Teaching	3	4	11	32	30	8	9	4.5

Course:

Workload	0	14	15	65	1	3	0	3.6
Difficulty	0	8	9	49	22	8	1	4.2
Learn Exp	0	2	10	54	14	16	4	4.4

Students enjoyed Barrett's lecture style and enthusiastic personality. Students felt that Eckenwalder was passionate about the material but could have been more organized.

Many of the students also suggested that extra resources such as a textbook, tutorials or extra-help sessions would be beneficial.

Instructor(s): R. Cameron; V. Higgins

	Enr: 97							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Resp: 61 Retake: 64%								
<u>Cameron:</u>								
Presents	0	0	1	15	31	41	10	5.4
Explains	0	0	3	15	29	36	15	5.4
Communicates	0	0	5	10	27	43	13	5.5
Teaching	0	0	3	13	27	43	12	5.5
<u>Higgins:</u>								
Presents	0	0	8	26	37	21	5	4.9
Explains	0	0	3	21	37	23	14	5.2
Communicates	0	0	7	15	26	36	14	5.4
Teaching	0	0	1	25	36	29	7	5.1
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	1	8	16	66	6	0	0	3.7
Difficulty	0	6	11	57	20	3	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	12	45	22	15	5	4.6

Cameron was described as enthusiastic and clear. Higgins was described as enthusiastic and clear, however a few students expressed concern with the scientific language, citing that they did not have adequate familiarity with the material.

Overall, students enjoyed the course but suggested since it was a breadth requirement for many students, that a greater emphasis be put on concepts rather than scientific fact.

BOT 251Y1Y Physiology of Plans and Micro-organisms

Instructor(s): D. Malloch; T. Sage

	Enr: 247							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Resp: 28 Retake: 45%								
<u>Malloch:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	18	25	37	18	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	11	33	40	14	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	11	18	29	40	6.0
Teaching	0	0	3	11	18	37	29	5.8
<u>Sage:</u>								
Presents	11	3	25	22	14	14	7	4.0
Explains	0	11	7	25	33	14	7	4.6
Communicates	3	7	11	33	18	25	0	4.3
Teaching	0	7	15	34	15	23	3	4.4
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	3	81	14	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	3	85	7	3	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	6	0	46	33	13	0	4.5

Instructor(s): R. Sage; N. Dengler

	Enr: 233							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Resp: 104 Retake: 52%								
<u>Sage:</u>								
Presents	2	4	6	19	34	28	1	4.7
Explains	2	4	10	17	36	25	5	4.8
Communicates	2	2	5	22	40	20	4	4.8
Teaching	3	2	7	20	32	29	1	4.7
<u>Dengler:</u>								
Presents	0	1	0	9	29	40	21	5.7
Explains	0	1	4	8	30	45	12	5.5
Communicates	0	0	2	10	28	38	18	5.6
Teaching	0	0	1	9	20	50	14	5.6
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	2	2	7	68	16	5	0	4.1
Difficulty	1	1	8	68	14	4	3	4.2
Learn Exp	1	3	7	57	21	6	2	4.2

Students described Sage as very organized. However, a few commented that the material was overwhelming. A few felt that communicating the expectations of the lab reports at the beginning of the section would have been an asset.

Dengler was described as clear, enthusiastic, and overall a wonderful lecturer. Many commented on the good organization of her lectures.

Overall, students enjoyed the course. Some suggested that the textbook be only recommended since many found that the lecture notes were sufficient. Many students commented that greater detail be given in regards to the outline of the lab reports. Labs were described as tedious and needing improvement.

BOT 300H1S Systematic Botany

Instructor(s): T. Dickinson

	Enr: 23							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Resp: 18 Retake: 43%								
Presents	5	11	11	38	27	5	0	3.9
Explains	0	11	11	41	17	17	0	4.2
Communicates	0	0	11	5	55	11	16	5.2
Teaching	0	6	6	43	31	6	6	4.4
Workload	0	0	11	82	0	5	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	76	17	5	0	4.3
Learn Exp	6	6	6	56	12	12	0	4.0

Generally, students thought the website based lectures were useful, however, many found it difficult to discern the importance of the links for test purposes. Many suggested that the material presented on the website should have been supplemented with further handouts. Students felt that the goals of the course should have been communicated in a clearer manner, especially the material which was important for tests. Some felt the lectures could have been organized better, as well, posting the lectures beforehand would have been helpful.

BOT 301H1F Introduction to the Fungi

Instructor(s): D. Malloch; M. Heath

	Enr: 27							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Resp: 17 Retake: 58%								
<u>Malloch:</u>								
Presents	0	0	5	11	47	29	5	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	11	23	47	17	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	5	11	41	41	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	35	41	23	5.9
<u>Heath:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	11	29	52	5	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	11	23	52	11	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	17	23	47	11	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	35	58	5	5.7
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	5	52	35	5	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	5	64	23	5	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	20	20	20	5.2

BOT 307H1F Families of Vascular Plants

Instructor(s): T. Dickinson

	Enr: 27							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Resp: 21 Retake: 80%								
Presents	4	4	0	33	47	9	0	4.4
Explains	0	0	4	14	47	28	4	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	4	19	38	38	6.1
Teaching	0	0	4	14	33	47	0	5.2
Workload	0	0	9	47	33	9	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	9	61	23	4	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	4	33	42	19	0	4.8

Many students felt that this was an interesting course although some felt that it should have covered more information. The majority of the students felt that the website was disorganized and confusing with an endless maze of links, many of which were broken. Most students felt that Dickinson was friendly and approachable. A few felt that greater organization and less reliance on the website during lectures would have been beneficial. Many students stated that they enjoyed the fieldtrip and the labs, although the labs were difficult to make up if missed.

12 BOTANY

BOT 310H1S Comparative Plant Morphology

Instructor(s): T. Sage

	Enr: 40							Resp: 32		Retake: 78%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	3	0	0	21	34	18	21	5.3			
Explains	3	0	0	15	21	56	3	5.3			
Communicates	3	0	0	6	25	32	32	5.8			
Teaching	0	0	0	12	25	31	32	5.8			
Workload	0	0	9	59	18	12	0	4.3			
Difficulty	0	0	6	68	18	3	3	4.3			
Learn Exp	4	0	9	40	18	27	0	4.5			

The majority of students who responded found Sage to be enthusiastic, informative and approachable. Sage attended to students' questions and concerns appropriately.

BOT 340H1F Plant Development

Instructor(s): N. Dengler; T. Berleth

	Enr: 38							Resp: 33		Retake: 56%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
<u>Dengler:</u>											
Presents	0	0	3	3	12	48	32	6.0			
Explains	0	0	3	3	28	43	21	5.8			
Communicates	0	0	0	0	21	48	30	6.1			
Teaching	0	0	0	6	9	45	39	6.2			
<u>Berleth:</u>											
Presents	3	3	12	29	29	6	16	4.6			
Explains	0	3	6	25	37	15	12	4.9			
Communicates	0	3	0	6	25	46	18	5.7			
Teaching	3	0	6	21	21	28	18	5.2			
<u>Course:</u>											
Workload	0	0	3	67	19	9	0	4.4			
Difficulty	0	0	3	50	34	12	0	4.6			
Learn Exp	0	4	4	40	20	12	20	4.9			

Many students felt that the course reader was too expensive. Dengler was considered a very good lecturer with enthusiasm for the material and to be both highly organized and approachable.

Students felt that Berleth presented the course material in an interesting manner, but felt they would have benefited if he had spoken more clearly and been a little better organized.

BOT 341H1F Plant Anatomy

Instructor(s): N. Dengler; T. Sage

	Enr: 21							Resp: 20		Retake: 78%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
<u>Dengler:</u>											
Presents	0	0	0	0	5	40	55	6.5			
Explains	0	0	0	0	5	35	60	6.6			
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	30	70	6.7			
Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	25	70	6.7			
<u>Sage:</u>											
Presents	0	0	0	0	15	45	40	6.2			
Explains	0	0	0	0	5	40	55	6.5			
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	30	70	6.7			
Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	31	63	6.6			
<u>Course:</u>											
Workload	0	0	0	15	31	10	42	5.8			
Difficulty	0	0	0	83	16	0	0	4.2			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	35	21	35	5.9			

Students really enjoyed this course. Both instructors were described as wonderful, amazing, incredible and exceptional. Their dedication to the students was much appreciated. While students found the project very time-consuming, many noted that they were worth the effort and that Sage and Dengler were very helpful with them.

BOT 351H1F Plant Pathology

Instructor(s): V. Higgins

	Enr: 25							Resp: 23		Retake: 73%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	4	4	26	60	4	5.6			
Explains	0	0	0	8	17	60	13	5.8			
Communicates	0	0	8	4	4	43	39	6.0			
Teaching	0	0	0	4	13	45	36	6.1			
Workload	0	0	8	43	30	17	0	4.6			
Difficulty	0	0	0	65	26	8	0	4.4			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	52	15	10	5.2			

Most students enjoyed this class and felt the material was interesting.

Higgins was considered a very good instructor and excellent at answering questions.

BOT 404H1S Biology of Moulds

Instructor(s): D. Malloch

	Enr: 36							Resp: 25		Retake: 95%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	8	4	24	64	6.4			
Explains	0	0	0	0	4	24	72	6.7			
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	8	87	6.8			
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	32	68	6.7			
Workload	0	4	18	72	0	4	0	3.8			
Difficulty	0	0	14	76	4	4	0	4.0			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	21	36	21	5.6			

Students felt Malloch was a knowledgeable, enthusiastic and inspiring instructor. The lectures were interesting and excellent overall. Students regret that Malloch is retiring and will miss him greatly.

BOT 421H1S Plant Cell Metabolism

Instructor(s): F. DiCosmo

	Enr: 22							Resp: 14		Retake: 75%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	7	30	46	15	5.7			
Explains	0	0	0	14	28	42	14	5.6			
Communicates	0	0	0	0	28	42	28	6.0			
Teaching	0	0	0	0	21	50	28	6.1			
Workload	0	0	0	53	23	23	23	4.7			
Difficulty	0	0	0	46	38	15	0	4.7			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	41	25	33	0	4.9			

Students thought DiCosmo was a good lecturer, and was very approachable. Many commented that the method of evaluation was very fair by reflecting the wide range of skills of the students.

BOT 452Y1Y Plant-Micro-organism Interactions

Instructor(s): V. Higgins; R. Cameron

	Enr: 17							Resp: 18		Retake: 56%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
<u>Higgins:</u>											
Presents	0	0	5	17	17	41	17	5.5			
Explains	0	0	6	6	18	37	31	5.8			
Communicates	0	5	5	0	27	27	33	5.7			
Teaching	0	0	0	11	11	55	22	5.9			
<u>Cameron:</u>											
Presents	0	0	5	0	16	44	33	6.0			
Explains	0	0	5	5	16	38	33	5.9			
Communicates	0	5	5	0	38	22	27	5.5			
Teaching	0	0	5	5	33	27	27	5.7			
<u>Course:</u>											
Workload	0	0	5	23	52	11	5	4.9			
Difficulty	0	0	0	22	44	27	5	5.2			
Learn Exp	0	0	8	16	33	25	16	5.2			

Students enjoyed the lecture material and thought Higgins was a good lecturer.

Students thought Cameron was enthusiastic and enjoyed her lectures. They felt she was well-prepared.

Instructor(s): M. Heath

Enr: 17

Resp: 16

Retake: 87%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	18	43	31	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	6	25	50	18	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	6	12	37	43	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	6	6	62	25	6.1
Workload	0	0	13	60	13	13	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	53	26	6	13	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	15	38	38	7	5.4

Most students enjoyed this class. The group discussions of research papers were appreciated although some students were concerned that the correct answers to group work questions were not always clear. The lectures were generally thought to be clear, but students felt that both an updated website and online course notes would have been an asset.

Students felt that Heath was very knowledgeable and a superb lecturer and many proclaimed her the best instructor they had ever had.

BOT 458H1F Plant Molecular Biology and Biotechnology

Instructor(s): R. Cameron; J. Coleman

Enr: 28

Resp: 15

Retake: 80%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Cameron:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	0	33	26	40	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	40	40	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	6	26	26	40	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	33	33	33	6.0
<u>Coleman:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	13	33	26	26	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	7	28	21	42	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	6	26	26	40	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	6	26	40	26	5.9
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	6	66	13	13	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	6	80	6	6	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	46	30	15	7	4.8

Students liked Cameron and noted that she was very approachable and available to provide help.

Coleman was a good instructor. Her lectures were organized and well-paced. Students found reviewing the readings in class helpful. They also appreciated Coleman's availability to answer questions.

BOT 463H1S Fungi in Ontario

Instructor(s): D. Malloch

Enr: 10

Resp: 6

Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	16	16	50	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	16	60	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	33	66	6.7
Workload	0	0	0	33	33	16	16	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	66	0	33	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	25	25	50	6.2

Students felt Malloch was an enthusiastic, and overall amazing instructor. Students also felt that the course material was practical, fun and interesting. Overall, a wonderful course.