

Introduction

The Computer Science Students' Union (CSSU) holds events such as career talks, academic seminars and socials. To get in touch with the CSSU, visit their office at the Bahen Centre, Room 2283 or call them at (416) 978-5354.

Editor

**CSC 104H1S The Why and How of Computing**

Instructor(s): J. Lee

	Resp: 62							Retake: 76%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	0	10	20	40	28	5.8
Explains	3	0	3	8	17	35	35	5.7
Communicates	3	0	0	6	13	29	47	6.0
Teaching	3	0	1	4	19	27	42	5.9
Workload	1	5	20	63	5	5	0	3.8
Difficulty	1	1	20	62	8	5	0	3.9
Learn Exp	6	2	6	29	29	15	9	4.6

Lee was enthusiastic and entertaining. While some students found the course to be interesting, others were not satisfied with the material presented (there seemed to be a misconception that this course was suppose to teach you how to use a computer).

**CSC 108H1F Introduction to Computer Programming**

Instructor(s): P. Gries

	Resp: 72							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	1	16	44	37	6.2
Explains	0	0	2	4	18	28	44	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	30	65	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	2	13	33	50	6.3
Workload	2	5	8	32	23	19	5	4.5
Difficulty	2	5	7	39	22	10	11	4.5
Learn Exp	0	3	1	25	29	27	12	5.1

Gries' teaching methods were very effective and he mixed in the right amount of humour to make the course more interesting. He ensured that answers to students' questions were properly understood before moving on.

A call was made for smaller classes. The Java taught was not at the level of someone who never programmed before. Students should learn some Java before taking this course. The quizzes were also said to have too much weight compared to the time-intensive assignments.

Instructor(s): P. Gries

	Resp: 160							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	9	17	33	37	5.9
Explains	0	0	1	7	15	38	38	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	1	6	17	73	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	3	7	37	50	6.4
Workload	0	1	1	44	23	23	4	4.8
Difficulty	0	1	5	45	18	19	8	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	2	22	30	34	10	5.3

Gries was a very good lecturer and was very enthusiastic. He made an effort in helping his students. Some students felt that the course went by too quickly and the assignments were challenging for people with no prior programming experience.

Instructor(s): D. Heap

	Resp: 26							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	8	13	47	30	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	4	17	47	30	6.0

Communicates	0	0	0	4	8	52	34	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	9	50	40	6.3
Workload	4	0	4	56	13	13	8	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	45	31	18	4	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	23	23	23	30	5.6

Heap was found to be a very good instructor who was always available to help his students.

Instructor(s): D. Heap

	Resp: 34							Retake: 58%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	6	53	37	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	24	45	30	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	19	35	45	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	15	50	34	6.2
Workload	0	0	6	25	25	31	12	5.2
Difficulty	0	3	6	28	18	31	12	5.1
Learn Exp	0	4	0	24	20	32	20	5.4

Heap was considered to be a very good instructor. There were some complaints about the quizzes being marked too harshly.

**CSC 148H1F Introduction to Computer Science**

Instructor(s): F. Pitt

	Resp: 30							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	26	34	26	5.8
Explains	0	0	3	14	29	25	25	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	3	26	42	26	5.9
Teaching	0	0	7	0	28	35	28	5.8
Workload	6	0	3	26	30	20	13	4.9
Difficulty	6	0	0	23	20	33	16	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	11	11	41	35	0	5.0

Students thought that the instructor was very knowledgeable and enthusiastic. Some students found the assignments too long and at times did not reflect the course material.

Instructor(s): F. Pitt

	Resp: 36							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	2	17	48	31	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	8	11	37	42	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	35	50	6.4
Teaching	0	0	2	0	14	34	48	6.3
Workload	0	0	2	20	31	31	14	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	2	25	31	28	11	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	8	28	20	28	16	5.2

"The prof is amazing" seemed to be the general consensus. He went out of his way to help the students.

**CSC 148H1S Introduction to Computer Science**

Instructor(s): P. Gries

	Resp: 27							Retake: 84%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	0	14	25	55	6.3
Explains	0	0	3	3	11	40	40	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	7	3	25	62	6.4
Teaching	0	0	3	0	11	33	51	6.3
Workload	0	3	0	11	44	29	11	5.3
Difficulty	0	3	0	40	22	25	7	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	17	26	21	34	5.7

Overall, students found Gries to be enthusiastic, knowledgeable and helpful. A couple of students said they have switched over to computer science because they enjoyed this course so much.

## 28 COMPUTER SCIENCE

Some students complained that the course was very difficult.

Instructor(s): P. Gries

	Enr: 160							Resp: 77		Retake: 69%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	2	2	5	15	35	38	5.9			
Explains	2	2	0	5	20	33	36	5.8			
Communicates	0	0	1	2	5	26	64	6.5			
Teaching	1	1	1	2	14	29	49	6.1			
Workload	1	0	1	18	29	32	16	5.4			
Difficulty	1	0	1	22	31	24	19	5.3			
Learn Exp	1	0	1	18	27	35	15	5.4			

Gries was a very good instructor who presented the material with enthusiasm and clarity.

The biggest complaint involved the marking of assignments which took too long. Since later assignments reused code from earlier ones, not having assignments marked sooner cause many students to lose marks for repeated mistakes.

### CSC 150H1F Accelerated Introduction to Computer Science

Instructor(s): K. Reid

	Enr: 36							Resp: 17		Retake: 100%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	5	35	41	17	5.7			
Explains	0	0	0	17	17	35	29	5.8			
Communicates	0	0	0	11	11	17	58	6.2			
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	64	23	6.1			
Workload	11	0	11	47	17	11	0	3.9			
Difficulty	11	5	5	23	41	11	0	4.1			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	14	50	21	5.8			

Students were very enthusiastic about taking this course and were comfortable with its quick pace. Some students felt that they already had an excellent knowledge of practical Java programming and would have preferred more coverage of algorithms and theory.

In general, students felt this course was a very valuable learning experience for anyone with a programming background and should be marketed more by the department.

### CSC 209H1F Software Tools and Systems Programming

Instructor(s): K. Reid

	Enr: 77							Resp: 37		Retake: 84%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	2	8	48	40	6.3			
Explains	0	0	2	0	19	47	30	6.0			
Communicates	0	0	0	2	5	35	56	6.5			
Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	58	36	6.3			
Workload	0	0	2	21	18	48	8	5.4			
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	36	27	5	5.1			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	11	26	42	19	5.7			

Reid was a very good instructor and one of the best in the Computer Science department. Students felt that more instructors should learn from her enthusiasm, teaching style, concise notes and applicable assignments. Students felt they learned a great deal in this course not only about Unix tools and systems programming, but also general programming concepts.

### CSC 209H1S Software Tools and Systems Programming

Instructor(s): A. Rosenthal

	Enr: 149							Resp: 82		Retake: 67%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	5	5	6	30	28	15	7	4.5			
Explains	3	3	11	19	31	20	9	4.7			
Communicates	2	1	2	18	15	38	21	5.4			
Teaching	4	0	5	26	37	17	9	4.8			
Workload	1	0	1	56	30	6	3	4.5			

Difficulty	1	2	1	43	32	18	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	6	40	29	17	6	4.8

Feelings about this course were mixed. Some students really enjoyed this course and found Rosenthal to be extremely knowledgeable. A few found he lacked enthusiasm and lectured too fast. It took forever for marked assignments to be returned (nothing was returned before the drop date!).

Instructor(s): A. Rosenthal

	Enr: 65							Resp: 31		Retake: 82%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	3	0	6	16	38	25	9	5.0			
Explains	0	0	6	16	48	22	6	5.1			
Communicates	0	0	0	12	32	35	19	5.6			
Teaching	0	0	6	25	35	29	3	5.0			
Workload	0	0	3	61	29	0	6	4.5			
Difficulty	0	3	0	61	25	3	6	4.5			
Learn Exp	0	0	4	25	37	20	12	5.1			

### CSC 230H1F Logical Specifications

Instructor(s): H. Levesque

	Enr: 27							Resp: 21		Retake: 50%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	23	19	19	38	5.7			
Explains	0	4	4	38	14	23	14	4.9			
Communicates	0	0	4	23	23	23	23	5.4			
Teaching	0	0	0	9	47	28	14	5.5			
Workload	0	0	19	47	23	9	0	4.2			
Difficulty	0	0	23	28	33	14	0	4.4			
Learn Exp	0	11	11	52	11	5	5	4.1			

### CSC 238H1S Discrete Mathematics for Computer Science

Instructor(s): A. Jepson

	Enr: 57							Resp: 23		Retake: 30%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	13	4	27	40	13	5.4			
Explains	0	0	4	26	34	30	4	5.0			
Communicates	4	0	4	22	40	27	0	4.8			
Teaching	0	0	0	8	52	30	8	5.4			
Workload	0	0	4	34	26	26	8	5.0			
Difficulty	0	0	4	8	30	39	17	5.6			
Learn Exp	0	6	6	37	31	18	0	4.5			

Students found the course to be interesting, but would have liked to see more examples presented in class. The assignments were difficult.

### CSC 258H1F Computer Organization

Instructor(s): R. Hehner

	Enr: 115							Resp: 48		Retake: 81%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	8	8	31	29	21	5.5			
Explains	0	0	12	6	37	22	20	5.3			
Communicates	0	0	0	4	31	33	31	5.9			
Teaching	0	0	0	14	21	31	31	5.8			
Workload	0	2	8	67	13	6	2	4.2			
Difficulty	0	4	8	50	23	10	2	4.3			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	17	25	42	14	5.5			

The instructor taught very well and was praised as knowledgeable, clear and approachable. Many students did not find the textbook useful. The tutorials were valuable unlike the labs that required a long preparation period and was not consistent with the lectures.

**CSC 258H1S Computer Organization**

Instructor(s): A. Rosenthal

	Enr: 126							Resp: 78	Retake: 68%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	9	0	9	25	31	16	7	4.5	
Explains	3	6	18	29	22	12	6	4.2	
Communicates	2	1	1	21	25	26	22	5.3	
Teaching	2	2	9	15	35	29	5	4.9	
Workload	0	1	7	66	15	9	0	4.2	
Difficulty	0	0	8	53	29	7	0	4.4	
Learn Exp	3	3	1	38	32	15	6	4.6	

Students felt that Rosenthal assumed they understood concepts without fully covering them. Lectures were disorganized. However, Rosenthal was extremely helpful during office hours and responded to email remarkably quickly.

Instructor(s): A. Rosenthal

	Enr: 72							Resp: 37	Retake: 52%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	8	8	8	24	21	18	10	4.4	
Explains	8	8	27	21	8	18	37	4.0	
Communicates	5	0	5	16	37	16	18	5.1	
Teaching	5	2	16	18	21	18	16	4.7	
Workload	0	0	2	45	40	10	0	4.6	
Difficulty	0	2	2	32	40	16	5	4.8	
Learn Exp	0	7	14	32	21	14	10	4.5	

**CSC 270H1F Fundamental Data Structures and Techniques**

Instructor(s): D. Heap

	Enr: n/a							Resp: 90	Retake: 61%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	2	7	12	31	33	13	5.3	
Explains	1	1	5	13	32	33	13	5.3	
Communicates	0	0	2	10	15	36	35	5.9	
Teaching	0	1	3	7	27	34	27	5.7	
Workload	0	0	0	21	36	32	9	5.3	
Difficulty	0	0	4	21	38	28	7	5.1	
Learn Exp	0	0	4	28	38	23	5	5.0	

Students found Heap enthusiastic and also entertaining, however, some students disliked the format of the course. Students considered the lack of preparation in C and C++ to be a tremendous disadvantage. Many students found the assignments too difficult and often could not get them back before the next one was due. Students also found the reading material unhelpful or useless and some commented on relying on other texts for information. However, students praised online lecture material and the problem sessions.

Instructor(s): A. Rosenthal

	Enr: n/a							Resp: 63	Retake: 53%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	3	1	3	18	26	36	10	5.1	
Explains	3	1	6	18	32	23	13	5.0	
Communicates	0	1	0	13	25	37	22	5.6	
Teaching	1	1	5	5	35	38	11	5.4	
Workload	0	0	0	10	24	41	24	5.8	
Difficulty	1	1	1	17	27	29	20	5.4	
Learn Exp	4	2	6	24	26	28	8	4.9	

Students universally agreed that Rosenthal was a teacher interested and enthusiastic about the material. Students also praised his exceptionally fast responses to a variety of email questions. However, some students found 270 an exceptionally difficult course. Many felt too much knowledge of C and other computing concepts were assumed. Many also felt that the assignments were too difficult and unclear. Another complaint was a lack of connection between lecture material and the assignments.

**CSC 270H1S Fundamental Data Structures and Techniques**

Instructor(s): J. Lee

	Enr: 83							Resp: 50	Retake: 62%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	2	2	4	17	17	29	27	5.4	
Explains	2	0	4	16	20	36	20	5.4	
Communicates	2	0	0	10	12	34	40	6.0	
Teaching	2	0	6	12	26	30	22	5.4	
Workload	4	6	6	48	30	2	2	4.1	
Difficulty	2	2	10	38	31	10	4	4.4	
Learn Exp	7	2	15	28	23	12	10	4.4	

While most students found Lee's teaching style to be entertaining, a few felt that his jokes were bad and were a distraction to the course material.

Many students complained that the material covered in class was useless for completing the assignments.

**CSC 300H1F Computers and Society**

Instructor(s): C. Gotlieb

	Enr: 63							Resp: 39	Retake: 58%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	2	7	10	13	39	15	10	4.7	
Explains	2	12	5	23	33	17	5	4.5	
Communicates	15	0	5	23	30	15	10	4.5	
Teaching	2	5	10	23	35	12	10	4.6	
Workload	0	7	12	58	15	5	0	4.0	
Difficulty	0	7	21	60	7	2	0	3.8	
Learn Exp	0	8	2	40	28	14	5	4.5	

Students universally found Gotlieb knowledgeable, friendly and informative. However, responses to his teaching style varied. Some found the lectures, which consisted of him talking for an hour, boring or not interactive enough. Students mostly agreed that more debate on the topics would have been beneficial. Some also found some assignments poorly organized and with unclear marking schemes.

**CSC 309H1F Programming on the Web**

Instructor(s): D. Penny

	Enr: n/a							Resp: 40	Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	2	7	15	7	28	25	12	4.8	
Explains	2	7	12	10	27	30	10	4.8	
Communicates	2	2	5	7	35	25	20	5.3	
Teaching	2	7	7	15	31	23	10	4.8	
Workload	0	0	0	7	31	31	28	5.8	
Difficulty	0	0	13	23	44	13	5	4.7	
Learn Exp	3	0	15	12	24	30	15	5.1	

**CSC 309H1S Programming on the Web**

Instructor(s): E. De Lara

	Enr: 157							Resp: 60	Retake: 88%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	1	1	8	30	33	20	3	4.7	
Explains	0	1	11	30	35	18	3	4.7	
Communicates	3	6	10	23	36	11	5	4.4	
Teaching	0	5	8	31	33	20	1	4.6	
Workload	0	0	0	18	38	23	18	5.4	
Difficulty	0	0	5	46	25	17	5	4.7	
Learn Exp	0	5	7	10	36	23	15	5.1	

Students felt that the course covered too much material. Topics were only briefly introduced in lectures leaving students to research all topics in more depth for the assignments.

De Lara presented the material in an uninteresting manner.

### 30 COMPUTER SCIENCE

#### CSC 310H1S Information Theory

Instructor(s): K. Sevcik

Enr: 60

Resp: 31

Retake: 86%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	3	3	23	40	26	5.7
Explains	0	3	3	6	25	35	25	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	9	35	41	12	5.6
Teaching	0	0	6	3	13	50	26	5.9
Workload	0	3	20	50	23	3	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	20	46	26	3	3	4.2
Learn Exp	3	3	3	22	25	25	14	5.0

Students found that Sevcik presented the course material well, however, many would have preferred a more indepth look at some of the topics. The tutorials were useless and students would have preferred another hour of lectures instead.

#### CSC 318H1F The Design of Interactive Computational Media

Instructor(s): R. Baecker

Enr: 108

Resp: 50

Retake: 42%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	25	41	16	14	5.2
Explains	0	4	12	24	22	22	14	4.9
Communicates	6	2	8	18	28	24	12	4.8
Teaching	0	4	6	24	30	30	6	4.9
Workload	4	4	2	42	22	20	6	4.6
Difficulty	10	6	14	56	10	2	2	3.6
Learn Exp	17	12	9	36	12	7	4	3.6

#### CSC 318H1S The Design of Interactive Computational Media

Instructor(s): R. Baecker

Enr: 90

Resp: 49

Retake: 57%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	14	28	48	6	5.4
Explains	0	0	2	20	33	31	12	5.3
Communicates	0	0	10	8	40	24	16	5.3
Teaching	0	0	6	18	38	24	12	5.2
Workload	0	0	12	57	21	6	2	4.3
Difficulty	0	4	27	54	12	2	0	3.8
Learn Exp	5	2	5	43	23	17	2	4.4

Students felt that the information presented was too detailed and not useful, apparently a 2 hour lecture on font sizes was a bit dry.

Students felt that Baecker used class time as a self promotion exercise as opposed to providing them with a broader knowledge of HCI.

#### CSC 321H1S Introduction to Neural Networks and Machine Learning

Instructor(s): G. Hinton

Enr: 46

Resp: 33

Retake: 93%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	15	39	39	6.1
Explains	0	0	6	6	21	31	34	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	3	30	66	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	3	50	46	6.4
Workload	3	0	24	48	18	3	3	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	21	39	21	15	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	7	11	18	37	25	5.6

Hinton's enthusiasm was infectious. Many students felt this was the best course they have taken at the University.

#### CSC 324H1F Principles of Programming Languages

Instructor(s): E. Joanis

Enr: n/a

Resp: 64

Retake: 59%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	0	4	31	41	20	5.7

Explains	0	1	1	11	37	33	14	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	8	36	40	14	5.6
Teaching	1	0	1	4	27	41	22	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	36	31	25	6	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	4	43	29	14	8	4.8
Learn Exp	0	4	6	28	22	33	4	4.9

Students agreed that Joanis was a good lecturer. However, many students found ways to improve the course. Joanis enforced many useless policies ("24-hour silent policy") making himself unavailable when it counted. Also, many people in this section were wrongly accused of cheating, creating paranoia. It was also recommended that the textbook be changed because it was useless.

Instructor(s): E. Joanis

Enr: 69

Resp: 22

Retake: 76%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	18	63	13	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	4	18	63	13	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	22	59	18	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	4	27	45	22	5.9
Workload	0	0	4	40	22	18	13	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	18	36	27	13	4	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	6	18	37	37	0	5.1

Students agreed that Joanis was a very good lecturer and knew his material well. However, the workload was very difficult and time consuming.

#### CSC 336H1F Numerical Methods

Instructor(s): K.S. Ng

Enr: n/a

Resp: 50

Retake: 17%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	12	28	36	10	8	4.6
Explains	4	8	16	42	16	6	8	4.1
Communicates	6	8	20	34	20	8	4	3.9
Teaching	6	6	14	30	28	12	4	4.2
Workload	2	0	0	48	28	14	8	4.7
Difficulty	2	0	0	32	28	28	10	5.1
Learn Exp	5	16	22	36	13	5	0	3.5

Students agreed that the course material was boring. Ng was unenthusiastic and monotonous. Lectures were very hard to follow and more examples would have been beneficial. However, Ng was very approachable and helpful during office hours.

#### CSC 336H1S Numerical Methods

Instructor(s): T. Fairgrieve

Enr: 147

Resp: 83

Retake: 57%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	0	0	10	22	26	37	5.8
Explains	2	0	0	6	23	40	27	5.8
Communicates	2	0	2	1	27	40	25	5.8
Teaching	2	0	0	10	13	46	27	5.8
Workload	1	0	3	60	27	7	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	6	58	25	8	1	4.4
Learn Exp	4	0	3	40	39	6	6	4.5

Students found that Fairgrieve was an a very good lecturer and presented the course material in a clear and organized manner. Tutorials were well-planned and were very useful. Students were impressed with Fairgrieve's availability to attend to questions and concerns. The only complaint was that it took too long for assignments to get marked.

**CSC 340H1S Information System Analysis and Design**

Instructor(s): J. Mylopoulos

	Resp: 47							Retake: 51%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	6	2	8	12	36	29	4	4.8
Explains	6	0	17	28	23	21	2	4.4
Communicates	6	2	12	25	27	19	6	4.5
Teaching	2	6	8	23	28	30	0	4.6
Workload	0	0	6	52	15	22	2	4.6
Difficulty	0	6	6	60	24	2	0	4.1
Learn Exp	9	12	9	39	19	9	0	3.8

Expectations were incredibly high for the assignments while not being made clear to the students. Emphasis was placed on quantity instead of analysis, and marks seemed to depend solely on the amount of useless details included.

Mylopoulos' teaching style was dry as he simply read off the lecture slides.

**CSC 350H1F Numerical Algebra and Optimization**

Instructor(s): R. Mathon

	Resp: 35							Retake: 35%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	3	16	25	35	16	5.4
Explains	0	3	15	21	28	18	12	4.8
Communicates	0	0	0	15	21	28	34	5.8
Teaching	0	3	0	18	30	33	15	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	58	29	12	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	3	37	31	18	9	4.9
Learn Exp	4	8	4	54	8	12	8	4.2

While most students liked Mathon, a few found him disorganized. Most students found the midterm to be too long. Some students complained that Mathon did not respond to email or newsgroup postings, and did not make himself available for extra help.

**CSC 351H1S Numerical Approximation, Integration, and Ordinary Differential Equations**

Instructor(s): T. Fairgrieve

	Resp: 33							Retake: 79%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	9	31	56	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	12	36	51	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	15	30	54	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	3	6	45	45	6.3
Workload	0	0	3	51	22	16	6	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	3	54	22	16	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	33	28	9	5.2

**CSC 354H1S Discrete-Event Simulation and Modelling**

Instructor(s): J. Lee

	Resp: 33							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	9	12	38	35	5.9
Explains	0	0	9	16	19	29	25	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	3	31	18	46	6.1
Teaching	0	0	3	25	21	31	18	5.4
Workload	0	3	12	58	12	9	3	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	9	64	9	6	9	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	26	21	31	21	0	4.5

Overall, students found Lee to be very enthusiastic and a fun teacher. Students complained that not enough material was taught and that the material didn't seem overly in-depth. However, the material covered was well-taught. Students also complained that the tutorials were useless and was out of sync with the lecture content. Students felt that their assignments were too large and that they would have benefitted from smaller and more assignments to reinforce concepts. Students also

mentioned that Lee was difficult to reach, especially via email.

**CSC 364H1F Computational Compatibility and Complexity**

Instructor(s): J. Sawada

	Resp: 67							Retake: 24%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	10	21	31	28	6	4.9
Explains	3	1	16	27	21	22	7	4.6
Communicates	1	1	9	19	24	34	9	5.0
Teaching	0	1	7	24	33	26	6	4.9
Workload	0	0	4	19	12	36	27	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	2	2	26	67	6.6
Learn Exp	7	1	17	28	28	14	1	4.2

Some students enjoyed the casual lecturing style of Sawada, although the pace of the course was very fast. Most students thought that the tests were too hard, and the questions were too long to be completed in 50 minutes.

Many students felt more examples were needed. They were disappointed that Sawada omitted entire sections of examples and proofs that were done in lecturing, stating that they were "obvious" or "trivial".

**CSC 364H1S Computational Compatibility and Complexity**

Instructor(s): A. Borodin

	Resp: 38							Retake: 55%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	5	2	13	31	21	10	38	4.7
Explains	2	0	18	13	42	10	13	4.8
Communicates	0	0	0	5	23	36	34	6.0
Teaching	0	0	7	10	26	31	23	5.5
Workload	0	0	5	26	34	18	15	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	21	10	28	39	5.9
Learn Exp	3	3	0	35	10	28	17	5.0

Students felt that Borodin was knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the material. Some students thought that the test material did not reflect what was covered in class. Also, more examples were needed to clarify some aspects.

Instructor(s): S.A. Cook

	Resp: 42							Retake: 56%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	2	20	20	55	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	7	15	20	57	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	19	26	53	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	12	30	57	6.4
Workload	0	2	4	26	21	23	21	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	4	9	19	19	47	6.0
Learn Exp	0	0	3	15	28	21	31	5.6

Cook was an excellent instructor.

**CSC 372H1S Microprocessor Software**

Instructor(s): M. Stumm

	Resp: 13							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	7	38	53	6.5
Explains	0	0	0	0	8	41	50	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	25	75	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	58	41	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	30	30	38	0	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	7	15	53	23	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	0	25	75	6.8

## 32 COMPUTER SCIENCE

### CSC 378H1F Data Structure and Algorithm Analysis

Instructor(s): S. Toueg

	Enr: 78							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	4	14	37	43	6.2
Explains	0	0	2	0	25	29	43	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	18	25	56	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	2	20	41	35	6.1
Workload	0	0	2	47	29	16	4	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	6	45	29	10	8	4.7
Learn Exp	0	2	2	38	30	20	5	4.8

Students thought the instructor was always enthusiastic about the material. He explained complex concepts very well and presented the material in a well-organized manner.

Instructor(s): S. Toueg

	Enr: 65							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	4	15	37	42	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	6	6	37	48	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	2	4	24	68	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	4	11	31	53	6.3
Workload	0	4	2	34	34	25	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	26	37	31	4	5.1
Learn Exp	5	0	2	27	16	30	16	5.1

The instructor was considered to be very effective in communicating and helping his students. He presented material in a well-organized manner.

### CSC 378H1S Data Structures and Algorithms Analysis

Instructor(s): B. Farzad

	Enr: 96							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	3	5	14	29	28	14	5	4.4
Explains	3	5	26	22	26	12	3	4.1
Communicates	3	5	18	24	22	15	10	4.4
Teaching	3	14	10	38	21	10	1	4.0
Workload	1	0	0	24	25	37	11	5.3
Difficulty	1	0	1	3	17	43	31	5.9
Learn Exp	10	15	21	19	17	6	8	3.7

### CSC 384H1F Introduction to Artificial Intelligence

Instructor(s): C. Boutillier

	Enr: 61							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	7	14	55	22	5.9
Explains	0	0	3	11	18	51	14	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	3	7	55	33	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	3	11	59	25	6.1
Workload	0	0	3	25	48	14	7	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	3	44	29	18	3	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	52	33	0	5.2

### CSC 384H1S Introduction to Artificial Intelligence

Instructor(s): P. Poupart

	Enr: 62							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	7	30	26	34	5.9
Explains	3	0	7	19	34	30	3	4.9
Communicates	0	0	7	7	30	30	23	5.5
Teaching	0	0	3	15	42	26	11	5.3
Workload	0	0	0	34	26	30	7	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	3	34	38	15	7	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	9	50	22	18	0	4.5

It was felt that Poupart was a nice and approachable instructor. The tests and assignments were very challenging and lengthy.

### CSC 407H1S Software Architecture and Design

Instructor(s): D. Penny

	Enr: 82							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	10	2	40	38	10	5.4
Explains	2	0	4	14	34	32	14	5.3
Communicates	0	0	4	12	20	38	26	5.7
Teaching	0	4	2	8	32	44	8	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	16	22	36	24	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	2	38	40	14	6	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	22	34	17	14	11	4.6

Students found that Penny was enthusiastic and knowledgeable but did not convey the course material effectively. Students complained that the lecture slides were often changed, causing confusion. Students found the workload of the course was too high and the expectations were unreasonable. Assignment requirements were too vague, students found it hard to understand without clarifications. Students would have liked it if the assignments were group assignments so that they could benefit from sharing ideas and discussing the material.

Students also complained that there was not enough reference material for the last section of the course. Overall, students wanted more examples of the concepts presented in class.

### CSC 408H1F Software Engineering

Instructor(s): D. Wortman

	Enr: 36							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	3	26	20	46	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	6	33	20	40	5.9
Communicates	0	0	7	0	21	21	50	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	13	20	26	40	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	21	50	28	0	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	15	69	15	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	9	9	27	0	54	0	4.8

Students felt that Wortman was a very professional and enthusiastic instructor. Some students thought that the assignments were a bit unclear and required some knowledge from CSC 407.

### CSC 408H1S Software Engineering

Instructor(s): D. Wortman

	Enr: 100							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	2	2	20	41	32	6.0
Explains	0	2	0	8	20	41	26	5.8
Communicates	0	2	2	5	8	37	42	6.0
Teaching	0	2	0	5	29	38	23	5.7
Workload	0	0	2	41	11	38	5	5.0
Difficulty	0	2	14	51	22	5	2	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	3	43	23	26	3	4.8

### CSC 411H1F Machine Learning and Data Mining

Instructor(s): R. Zemel

	Enr: 21							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	6	0	26	40	26	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	20	13	40	26	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	14	14	42	28	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	7	23	38	30	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	40	26	20	13	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	46	13	26	13	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	33	55	11	5.8

Students enjoyed the course and felt that Zemel did a very good job

teaching the course. There were some complaints that the lecture notes were not detailed and organized enough. More information on data mining was desired.

**CSC 418H1F Computer Graphics**

Instructor(s): K. Singh

Enr: n/a Resp: 42 Retake: 87%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	7	17	36	21	17	5.2
Explains	0	0	10	20	25	37	7	5.1
Communicates	0	0	2	7	15	38	35	6.0
Teaching	0	0	5	7	20	48	17	5.7
Workload	0	2	2	35	37	16	5	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	2	44	33	11	8	4.8
Learn Exp	0	3	3	7	30	38	15	5.4

Most students felt that the instructor did a good job teaching. He was very enthusiastic and had a very extensive knowledge of the industry.

**CSC 418H1S Computer Graphics**

Instructor(s): A. Hertzmann

Enr: 106 Resp: 19 Retake: 94%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	21	15	21	36	5	0	3.9
Explains	5	10	26	10	31	15	0	4.0
Communicates	0	0	11	11	22	16	38	5.6
Teaching	0	0	26	10	31	26	5	4.7
Workload	0	0	10	36	31	15	5	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	10	47	21	21	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	6	33	26	13	20	5.1

Students found that Hertzmann did not explain things clearly and should have prepared the lecture material in a more organized manner. Overall, the students enjoyed the course but did not find the lectures useful.

**CSC 428H1F Human-Computer Interaction**

Instructor(s): R. Balakrishnan

Enr: 9 Resp: 6 Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	16	66	0	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	60	20	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	66	16	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	33	50	16	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	33	33	33	0	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	33	16	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	5.5

**CSC 438H1F Computability and Logic**

Instructor(s): S. Cook

Enr: 6 Resp: 5 Retake: 80%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	20	40	20	20	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	40	20	20	20	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	60	20	20	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	60	20	20	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	60	20	20	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	60	40	0	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	33	33	33	6.0

Students commented that this course was an excellent learning experience.

**CSC 443H1S Database System Technology**

Instructor(s): L. Mignet

Enr: 36 Resp: 16 Retake: 14%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	6	6	25	12	31	6	12	4.2
Explains	6	0	31	25	25	6	6	4.1
Communicates	0	6	12	6	31	12	31	5.2
Teaching	0	12	25	18	12	31	0	4.2
Workload	0	0	0	0	13	6	80	6.7
Difficulty	6	0	0	6	33	13	40	5.6
Learn Exp	14	7	35	7	7	28	0	3.7

Mignet was very helpful and approachable. Students agreed on the midterm being too long and very difficult. Also, students felt that assignments involved too much programming.

**CSC 458H1F Computer Networks**

Instructor(s): P. Marbach

Enr: 15 Resp: 14 Retake: 83%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	21	35	42	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	21	21	28	28	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	28	28	42	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	14	21	35	28	5.8
Workload	0	0	14	35	42	7	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	21	28	50	0	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	20	40	20	5.6

Marbach was well-organized, very helpful and knowledgeable. However, students felt that the midterm and assignments were too difficult. Thus, more examples related to the assignments were needed in both the lectures and tutorials.

**CSC 458H1S Computer Networks**

Instructor(s): P. Marbach

Enr: 34 Resp: 17 Retake: 62%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	5	52	41	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	11	41	23	23	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	29	29	41	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	29	35	35	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	35	41	11	11	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	17	29	41	11	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	50	20	10	5.2

**CSC 465H1F Formal Methods in Software Design**

Instructor(s): R. Hehner

Enr: 29 Resp: 22 Retake: 63%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	9	13	50	27	6.0
Explains	0	0	4	36	18	27	13	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	9	52	38	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	4	18	50	27	6.0
Workload	0	0	5	50	35	5	5	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	5	45	30	20	5.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	43	18	18	18	5.1

Students felt that the course was very interesting yet very challenging. The material was hard to grasp sometimes. Some students felt that Hehner did an excellent job explaining the material while others felt that more "non-trivial" examples would have been beneficial.

In general, students agreed that Hehner was very enthusiastic and professional.

### 34 COMPUTER SCIENCE

#### CSC 468H1F Operating Systems

Instructor(s): A. Demke-Brown

	Enr: 84							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	5	27	41	25	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	6	38	36	20	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	8	18	38	36	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	3	29	37	26	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	14	34	36	16	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	26	34	32	6	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	39	28	10	5.3

Students thought that the instructor presented the material in an organized and enthusiastic manner. Some students felt that the lecture slides should have been accessible prior to the beginning of classes.

#### CSC 488H1S Compilers and Interpreters

Instructor(s): D. Wortman

	Enr: 24							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	15	61	23	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	7	30	30	30	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	7	15	38	38	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	15	61	23	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	30	38	23	7	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	46	15	7	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	61	23	7	5.3

Wortman did a very good job clearly demonstrating his love for the subject.